

Connecticut, we shall be giving added meaning and dignity to the accomplishments of our present-day heroes.

I am therefore introducing today a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the anniversary of the birth of Israel Putnam.

Progress in Automobile Liability Insurance Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions I have directed the attention of the House to the complex social problems presented by automobile liability insurance and regulation of this industry by the several States. On those occasions I have indicated my conviction

that State regulation of the insurance industry has often been insufficient to protect the public's interest in reasonable rates, a competitive insurance market and a solvent, responsible industry.

However, I should like to note that recently, in my own State, New Jersey, steps have been taken which will do much to promote the public's interest in effective insurance industry regulation.

Although not required by law to conduct public hearings on applications for insurance rate increases, State Banking and Insurance Commissioner Charles R. Howell has adopted such a policy of free expression where major rate increases are sought.

The first public hearing on a proposed rate increase took place yesterday, Wednesday, July 19. In another unprecedented act, Governor Hughes appointed special counsel to represent the public interest in opposing a 20-percent rate increase requested by the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters.

It was my great pleasure to appear before the commission. I found the proceedings to be conducted in the objective, dignified atmosphere necessary to

appropriately balance the insurance industry's interest in a reasonable profit with the public interest in fair rates and adequate coverage. In adopting this policy, Commissioner Howell has not only assured the New Jersey public of a forum where it may present its case, but also he has assured that the commission's decisions, now and in the future, will be made with full knowledge and presentation of the necessary facts.

It is indeed a tribute to the progressiveness of the New Jersey Legislature and the administration of the New Jersey Department of Banking and Insurance that no insurance company insolvencies have occurred, and that cancellation or nonrenewal of policyholders on the basis of race, age, and nationality are prohibited in New Jersey. It is evident that public hearings on proposed rate hearings will serve to continue and more effectively enforce such policies.

In commending Commissioner Howell, I can do no less than express my hope that other State insurance commissioners will permit free expression and presentation of the public's views and analyses in the ratemaking process.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 20, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert W. Wolter, Trinity Lutheran Church, Whittier, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Heavenly Father, Creator and Ruler of the Universe, who dost guide and govern the nations for Thy purposes and goals in Christ Jesus, look down in mercy upon our Nation and our world, torn by tensions, problems, insecurity, and misunderstanding. Look down in love on these Congressmen. Grant them the needed vision and wisdom, that, forgetting self and personal ambition, they place the good of humanity, the Nation, the carrying out of Thy will, as their goal in life. Be present, O God of wisdom, direct the deliberations and decisions of this honorable assembly. Enable these leaders to bring order out of chaos, harmony and peace out of tension and discord. Let truth and justice, religion and piety, honor and decency prevail. Draw all men to Thee through the power of Thy Word and Holy Spirit, to live the life that is pleasing to Thee. Keep us in Thy grace and favor. Lead us in Thy paths. All this we ask in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our beautiful Saviour, the Lord of all nations.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON THE PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1968

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the public works appropriation bill for 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona reserved all points of order on the bill.

PEACH FESTIVAL HIGHLIGHTS WAGONER COUNTY ACTIVITIES

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite you and the Members of the House of Representatives to attend the first annual peach festival celebration in Porter, Okla., Saturday, August 5, 1967.

The festival is in celebration of the golden anniversary of the founding of the peach industry in the State of Oklahoma. The original orchard was planted in 1913 and started producing under the name of the B. F. Blackledge Orchards in 1917. Since then the Blackledge peaches have been shipped regularly to a 10-State area around Oklahoma. Other well-known producers in the area include the Mack Dean Orchard, the Jack Lewis Orchard, and the Austin Livesay Orchard.

Porter, the peach capital of Oklahoma, is located on Highway 51-B southwest of Wagoner in Wagoner County. Lying just north of the Arkansas River, Porter is in the heart of the black topsoil region of the Arkansas Basin. This land produces a fruit harvest which lasts from late May to early September.

The celebration and entertainment have been planned for early August when much of the fruit of the festival will still be hanging on the trees. Fresh peaches can be purchased by the crate, or if you want even fresher peaches, you may harvest your own at some of the orchards.

The festivities will begin with the peach parade, followed by the crowning of the queen. The peach festival will be climaxed by liberal servings of peaches and ice cream provided by the Porter Lions Club.

Porter, Wagoner County, and the State of Oklahoma welcome you to become a part of their summer fun.

MOISE TSHOMBE WILL BE RETURNED TO THE CONGO

Mr. COLLIER. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it appears almost certain that Moise Tshombe will be returned to the Congo, where he faces the death penalty for alleged treason. The former Premier of that nation has been engaged in a court battle to escape extradition from Algeria to his homeland.

I am not going to hold my breath until world opinion becomes sufficiently aroused to demand that Mr. Tshombe be granted political asylum, but I had hoped that our Department of State would lodge a strong protest with the Government of Algeria. Our country has been very generous with that nation since it gained its independence from France in 1962.

We have dispensed \$165,200,000 in for-

Foreign aid to Algeria during the past 4 fiscal years:

1963	-----	\$76,600,000
1964	-----	52,000,000
1965	-----	15,200,000
1966	-----	21,400,000
Total	-----	165,200,000

The spending of such a substantial sum of money belies the statement of a State Department official that the Tshombe affair is "none of our business." During his tenure as Premier Mr. Tshombe cooperated with the United States in every possible way, especially during the period when his enemies in the Congo were killing American citizens.

COLT STRIKE MEANS LOSS OF PRODUCTION OF M-16 RIFLE

Mr. FINDLEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Colt Industries is still on strike—Colt being the sole producer of the M-16 rifles so badly needed by allied forces in Vietnam. Since the House met at this time yesterday the Colt production lines could have produced enough rifles for a full battalion, and yet not one single rifle was produced. I have urged the President to use the provisions of Taft-Hartley to get the production lines back into operation immediately.

MOBUTO AND THE MERCENARIES

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute about the white mercenaries in the Congo. I do not think it is generally known that the so-called white mercenaries were hired by the dictator of the Congo, the thieving, murderous, treacherous Mobuto whom we are supporting, and they only became bad guys when they got fed up with Mobuto and changed sides.

What has he done? He has had executed all of his opponents that he could lay his hands on. He has abolished the legislature in the Congo. He is running the place as a military dictatorship from a military camp where he cowers in fear of his life. And we, the great United States, really ought to be proud of the fact that we have sent in cargo planes to ferry his soldiers from place to place, and then they have gotten drunk and have killed a lot of people themselves and, it is reported reliably, eaten a few of them. I think it is time the American public knew exactly what the State Department is doing to us.

AVIATION SAFETY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at noon the country suffered from another tragic aviation accident. This one involved a Piedmont Airlines jet and a small twin-engine plane. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been in close contact with both the officials of the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board, as well as in touch with Piedmont Airlines. Many of you will recall that on July 11, I placed in the RECORD a letter from Chairman Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., of the National Transportation Safety Board, which summarized the status of three particular accident investigations and set forth in considerable detail the procedures which have been authorized by Congress and implemented by the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board, and their predecessor organizations, to assure the highest degree of aviation safety which human beings may achieve.

I want to announce now that I have set a hearing on aviation safety for next Monday, July 24. This public hearing will be held for the purpose of having Chairman O'Connell and General McKee spell out for the Congress and for the entire Nation just how their organizations function to fulfill their extremely important statutory responsibility.

In this public hearing I am sure that they will tell us what they can about the midair collision which occurred yesterday. I have been assured that they initiated a full field investigation immediately upon receipt of the news concerning the crash. Obviously it will take hundreds of man-hours of hard work before the probable cause of this accident can be established. Necessarily, the information which they will be in a position to furnish Monday will be limited and of course they will not be asked to speculate or conjecture about the cause or causes of the accident before all of the facts are developed.

Air transportation is a vital and essential part of our national transportation system. It is sad indeed that it is marred as often as it is by accidents which instantaneously end dozens of lives. I offer my deepest heartfelt sympathies to those who were bereaved by yesterday's accident. We will continue to strive for improvements in aviation safety.

TRAGIC AIRPLANE ACCIDENT IN NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ICHORD. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear that the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is going to investigate the tragic accident which claimed the lives of many people among whom was one great American, Hon. John T. McNaughton, Secretary of the Navy. This has been another great tragedy of air history and the causes should be thoroughly investigated. However, I would hope that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce makes certain that he has the complete accident reports from FAA and also from CAB before any firm conclusions are reached as to the causes of the accident. I would point out that such investigations are very time-consuming and laborious processes.

As an active private pilot, with thousands of logged hours and still actively flying, I would hope that we not pass judgment too quickly upon the cause of the accident. The pilot of the Cessna 310 was Dave Adesson from my congressional district. He was a skilled pilot as evidenced by the fact that he was on an IFR flight plan, the same as the Boeing 727.

At this point we can only speculate as to the cause of the accident. It could have been pilotage error, tower operator error, center error, numerous other possible errors. Or it could have been truly an accident. In any event we should not make judgments based on emotion or hysteria but should wait for the facts.

Let me point out that a midair collision is rare, because of the minute possibility of two planes occupying the same place at the same time. Unlike automobile travel on our highways, we not only have horizontal separation of airplanes, we also have vertical separation. However, the chances of two planes occupying the same space at the same time are increased tremendously in areas of dense air traffic, flying in regulated patterns around a busy airport. Pilots must remain alert and maintain a diligent lookout every second.

I would say to the Members of the House that if the person or persons downtown do not permit the FAA to do what it apparently at one time wanted to do—to move general aviation from Washington National Airport to Anacostia Airport—we could very well have the same thing happen here in Washington, because, with the congestion in the area, the chances of two planes occupying the same space at the same time are much greater.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend from Missouri for yielding to me. I just wanted to ask him a question, but, as matter of fact, I think his later remark answered the question I wanted to ask. That is, in trying to assess the blame for the accident that occurred yesterday, I wanted to ask the gentleman if he would agree that having small, slow, propeller-driven air-

planes operating in the same basic traffic pattern as the modern fast jet aircraft presents in itself a dangerous situation which we should take steps to eliminate?

If the gentleman read the remarks I made yesterday, for example, he will recall I suggested exactly the remedy he proposes, that at least in Washington we could move those small planes to Bolling-Anacostia, as the chairman of our own Armed Services Committee has suggested, and leave National for the super-planes.

Mr. ICHORD. I may say to the gentleman from New York, I only partially agree with him, I do not think the small plane per se constitutes as much danger as a large plane within a congested area, because it is smaller and there is not as much plane area involved to come in contact with another plane.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has under consideration a bill for the elected Governor of the Virgin Islands, be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon. This request has been cleared with the minority.

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

There was no objection.

THE TRAGIC PLANE ACCIDENT IN NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. RIVERS. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my sympathy to the remaining family of the distinguished Secretary-designate of the Navy, Mr. McNaughton, whose untimely death yesterday has left a very serious void in the echelon of the Pentagon. Mr. McNaughton appeared before our committee last week and made a very profound impression—so much so that members of our committee congratulated him on his appearance, his immediate response, his understanding, his knowledge, his dedication, and his willingness to respond to any kind of question. He made a great impression on our committee.

As chairman of this committee and speaking for the committee, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this Nation has suffered a great loss. This man would have made a great Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not take such a tragedy as happened in the area of Asheville-Hendersonville, N.C., yesterday to wake up the people of this community to the great danger that hovers over the National Airport.

I hope the distinguished gentleman

from West Virginia will insist, as chairman of that great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as I know he will, that steps be taken to alleviate some of the congestion over there.

They came to me as chairman a year ago and asked for my assistance. My committee has gone as far as it can go in an effort to be helpful.

I am sure the gentleman from West Virginia and his great committee will insist that something be done. Anacostia is available, Mr. Speaker. All it needs is nerves and guts to make a decision. That is all.

"MUST'N'T" SAY THE NAUGHTY WORD "COMMUNISM"

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights of the Organization of American States issued a report regarding the situation of human rights in Cuba. Here are some of the areas covered as they were listed by the table of contents: Death by shooting, without procedural guarantees or right of defense; machinegunning of civilians; concentration camps and various other areas violated by the Cuban Communist Government.

In Vietnam over 11,000 American servicemen have lost their lives to the same worldwide Communist conspiracy in Vietnam. Approximately one-third of the world's population languishes under Communist oppression. Yet there seems an aversion in some quarters to identifying the cancer that is eating away the human rights of mankind. I must admit, though, that this policy is at least consistent. If we are to build bridges to the Communist governments by trade, cultural relations, and so forth, we can hardly identify these regimes as the slavemasters that they truly are.

A recent example of this policy concerns the annual Captive Nations Week proclamation. Compare the wording of Public Law No. 86-90 which established the Captive Nations Week celebrations and the first proclamation of 1959 with the captive nations proclamation just issued for the year 1967.

In the 1967 statement the international Communist movement is not even mentioned. The comparison of these statements reflects, I think, the deterioration of our foreign policy regarding the Communist worldwide threat and the continuing success of the policy of coexistence with the greatest evil yet visited upon mankind.

I insert the three above-mentioned proclamations in the RECORD at this point:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—PUBLIC LAW No. 86-90

RESOLUTION

S.J. Res. 111

H.J. Res. 454, 459

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having

been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to

manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are basic human rights to which all men are entitled; and

Whereas the independence of peoples requires their exercise of the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas these inalienable rights have been circumscribed or denied in many areas of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation has had an abiding commitment to the principles of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1967 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE VIETNAM WORK-IN

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while so many of our college-age Americans seek work each summer to earn money to allow them to return to their studies in the fall, a group of antiwar students are vying for these same positions—except that they will use them to infiltrate businesses, industries, labor unions, even the shop baseball teams—in an effort to spread their antiwar stand and mobilize

American workmen against unions, management, and the Government.

These antiwar students will rally under the slogan of the Vietnam work-in. They will have two jobs and their job in the plant or factory or warehouse or store will only be a carrier for their covert antiwar, anti-American intentions.

According to the radical leftwing National Guardian the Vietnam work-in is sponsored by the Progressive Labor Party—PLP—which has been characterized by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as "one of the most militant organizations whose activities we follow."

Mr. Hoover explained the PLP in these words:

Utilizing what it considers to be ills of a capitalist society, such as unemployment, poor housing, discrimination, police brutality, unequal educational opportunities, corruption, poverty, and the alleged indifference of trade union leaders and employers toward the workers, the Progressive Labor Party aggressively and militantly strives to enlarge its organization and develop followers for its goal, a socialist United States based on Marxist-Leninist principles.

One of the best known of the PLP front groups was the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, which organized and sponsored trips in 1963—53 persons—and 1964—84 persons—to Cuba, in defiance of State Department rulings.

The membership of the PLP is also examined by the FBI Director and he states that it "consists of basically relatively youthful, dedicated revolutionaries who do not hesitate to go forth into the streets to further its programs."

In addition to this incriminating percentage, ample reason for labor leaders, rank and file members, plant and store personnel employees, management and security officials to be on the lookout for this deceit-ridden program is given on the first page of the nine-page manual of the work-in:

A REVOLUTIONARY STEP FORWARD FOR RADICALS WITH A CAUSE BUT WITHOUT A BASE

The Vietnam Work-In will organize thousands of students who will be working this summer, to bring the ideas, the politics and the urgency of the anti-Vietnam war movement, among the workers on their jobs.

The first two pages of the circular are large-type calls to action, but the last seven serve as, and are called, the Organizers Manual. In attempting to provide a base for "Radicals With a Cause," the manual outlines a series of practical considerations, pointers on where and when to lie, fabricate, fake, and rely on a false but carefully preestablished background which would establish a work record, experience, or one must assume, any "facts" which might be needed to gain employment.

The work-in manual appears to be carefully designed to meet as many obstacles as might arise for the job hunter, and often is stated in the stock phrases of the Communist-Socialist line.

Racism, derogation of existing morality, oppression of the workers by the "boss," brainwashing of workers, sellout unions, illusions about getting ahead, and ignorance of the "true" facts—all are alluded to if not stated outright as calls for action.

While a case might be made against

the manual on the basis of its propensity toward the Socialist-Communist line, specific facts about persons leading this movement, and their connections with the PLP, provide valid and concrete indications of what to expect from Vietnam work-in. Students should be aware of the association which they are making, and while there might be reasons to doubt interpretations of phrases in the political context of the manual, there is no doubt about PLP and some of the listed leaders.

Several of the names on the manual are commonly found in the anti-Vietnam legions and their names crop up not only on police blotters but during disturbances such as those before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which investigated antiwar groups involved in obstruction of Armed Forces. Foremost among the names is that of Rick Rhoades.

LEADER FROM THE FAR LEFT

Rick Rhoades, his full name is Richard Mark Rhoades, is an admitted member of the Progressive Labor Party—the Chinese Communist arm of the international Communist conspiracy—and stated before the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

We intend to fight by every democratic means possible that the allegedly and correctly called democratic government of this country will allow us to fight to make this a socialist country, because that is what the people of the United States need. In a socialist United States there will be no need to pursue war of aggression like the present genocide against the people of Vietnam and the American people.

This statement came during testimony concerning the Pool-Ashbrook bill which was designed to set penalties for obstructing Armed Forces of the United States and grew out of instances of this on the west coast.

Rhoades is not only a Communist, he is active. One of only two Americans invited to attend the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana, Cuba, January 1966—the conference pledged all-out wars of "national liberation"—he returned to the United States and reported to the Progressive Labor Party that he had contacted representatives of the Vietcong concerning efforts to step up antiwar activities in the United States and also to the Chinese Communists about a trip to the Communist Chinese mainland by American youth.

He has been listed as staff member, editor, and member of the editorial board of the Free Student, the publication of the May Second Movement, a now dissolved front of PLP, and was also identified as a member of the M2M National Coordinating Committee.

In addition, he was a sponsor of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam peace parade, a signer of a full-page ad in the Free Student stating that he "refused to fight against the people of North Vietnam," and speaker at a rally in the spring of 1965 at Columbia University, condemning the ROTC program. This rally coincided with the annual awards ceremony for ROTC.

Rhoades is not alone; other contacts for this latest PLP front also have arrest records, associations with radical

leftwing groups and several have written for militant radical publications.

This is the company to which some students, wittingly or unwittingly, will submit themselves by joining the Vietnam work-in, and this is also a look at their guiding force of the work-in—keep in mind that the founders of the PLP were expelled from the Communist Party of the United States for being too far to the left.

ORGANIZER'S MANUAL

The organizer's manual is divided into four sections. The first part prepares the antiwar student for job hunting with practical tips on where to look and how to find the major employers.

CONFLICT AND REBELLION

Part II, in contrast to part I, which could be used by any student searching for a summer job, reverses the usual methods. Instead of searching for a summer job for which they are suited—one where they can apply their skills and knowledge—Vietnam work-in students are advised to look for the greatest audience and the largest potential for converts to antiwar, antiunion, antigovernment, anticapitalism, anti-middle-class-morality crusades.

Also in part II, the reader sees blatant anti-Americanism in the program which the manual states later on as, not a refinement of our system of government and life, but "basic changes in the system."

This section states:

Try to get in with a minimum of 400 workers.

Reasons for this include: a) If we want to reach workers with literature, the potential audience is greater; b) the larger the company facility, the better chance that it will be in a basic union, that the workers will have some sense of organization (even if they think the union is a sellout one), and that therefore there will be a tie-in to workers nationally. In larger plants, such as GM, GE, United Airlines, Pennsy RR, Etc., there is a greater tendency for workers to regard themselves as workers, with less illusions about becoming some kind of a "boss." In small shops, where bosses and workers are closer together, more illusions exist about "moving up." In large plants in national unions there is a greater chance that the workers will become part of (and have a history of) mass strike movements, rebellions against sellout leadership, conflict with the government due to "national interest" injunctions . . .

Note that the Vietnam work-in student is aiming at greatest chances of mass strikes, conflict with government, rebellion against union leadership, and national tie-ins, to gain "basic changes in the system."

This section also contains a partial statement of purpose. The leaders of the movement plan to continue efforts—through contacts within the plants—during the school year, and, more importantly, next summer when students will return.

But for this year the manual states:

If you are white, select a plant where the majority are white. While Black (sic) workers might be thought of as more politically conscious, what we are trying to do is reach white workers on the questions of the war and racism, to name two areas (in addition to the day-to-day grievances, trade union questions, etc.). If Black, a student would, of

necessity, have to (and should) get a job where there are large number of Black Workers.

This is a direct quote. It implies that racism is without exception and that "of necessity" Negroes are forced to work into jobs where there are a large number of Negroes. Neither ability nor experience is involved.

Target employers are listed in this section also. They include:

Basic industries, large wholesale and retail outfits, large mail-order houses—Sears-Roebuck, Montgomery Ward; department stores—preferably those with unions; hospitals, telephone companies; gas and light companies; mass transit—if privately owned since government-owned utilities require civil service tests and waiting periods.

BACKGROUNDING LIES

Probably the most shocking part is the third section. Here the antiwar student is told not to mention that he is a student—unless students are being hired, of course—to say he is "just a high school graduate", and has been working for the past few years—the area's group of antiwar workers will have established a central "background" center to provide verification—to slant his desires, alleged abilities, and background toward "manual, heavy work" or whatever else is being done at that particular plant.

If necessary, lie about your transportation, is another instruction, as is "use your wits" when it comes to identifying your draft classification. Also, "avoid mentioning" a dishonorable discharge from the military and if you have been dishonorably discharged, substitute the fabrication that "you've been working since high school."

Other directions include: do not show off when taking tests, do not even answer more than half of the questions and if you have a physical defect, do not mention it—hide it or cover it up if possible.

This last direction is in complete disregard for carefully established safety standards and practices in force by employers and an example of flagrant disregard for the safety of fellow workers, indicating the sincerity of persons in the work-in movement for the American workingman.

One paragraph of part III speaks for itself:

If places require a "non-Communist" or non-subversive signature, sign it. You're not breaking the law. If it's engaged in government work, and you would be breaking a law, it will be so stated on the application. Discuss this beforehand with your group.

This part also gives advice about what to expect on the job.

Don't be shocked by the racist remarks of the white workers, by confused political impressions, by pro-war talk, by keeping-up-with-the-Joneses chit-chat. If workers understood racism, the war, the capitalist class, middle class morality, etc., we'd be on the way "home."

The implications here are evident. In addition, there are implications that the working man is oppressed, that the war in Vietnam is a "war for the rich," and so forth.

The manual also takes time to warn the work-in student that—

If you get involved in discussions with workers whose sons are in Vietnam and want to "support them by going all out," *Be careful.* That's an emotional area.

It might also be wise to counsel the antiwar, anti-American students against attempting to propagandize veterans of World War II, or Korea, or men who were involved in actions in Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, in addition to men who have served their time in Vietnam. The leftwing students might run into a bit of emotionalism from these men too. Most Americans have emotions about their country.

There is much more in the manual which I have not covered and I believe a closer look at this program for a Vietnam work-in is warranted. Granted these people, and names are given for contacts in Ann Arbor, Baltimore, Baltimore-Washington, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, Rochester, and San Francisco—these people are underestimating, by far, the intelligence of American men and women who will be involved, but I think this operation should be brought out into the open. If their cause is so just, if their arguments merit attention and support, let them operate openly, without lying, infiltration tactics, false friendships and hopes of inciting rebellion and mass disturbances. That is, unless these tactics are intrinsic to their beliefs.

Although this summer will probably see only a token effort, these people hope to continue their efforts and the success of even one student is one too many where tactics of this type are used.

The text of the manual follows:

THE VIETNAM WORK-IN—A REVOLUTIONARY STEP FORWARD FOR RADICALS WITH A CAUSE BUT WITHOUT A BASE

The Vietnam work-in will organize thousands of students who will be working this summer, to bring the ideas, the politics and the urgency of the anti-Vietnam war movement, among the workers on their jobs.

THE VIETNAM WORK-IN ORGANIZERS MANUAL

This manual is intended to help Work-in organizers in selecting and getting jobs. It also contains some pointers on approaches to the political issues that we will be raising and encountering at work.

I. How to research the job situation in your area

In every large city and in all states, a Directory of Manufactures is published which lists all the manufacturing plants in the large metropolitan areas and in the state, city by city. It usually reports the number of workers employed in each plant and sometimes gives the breakdown of male and female workers. These directories are usually found in the main (large) city libraries and probably can also be obtained through the publisher if the group wants to buy one. They are expensive (from \$30 to \$60) so it is suggested that someone copy a list out of the book in the library.

These books usually cover only manufacturing. For transportation (railroad, maritime, longshore, airline, teamster) possibly the simplest method is to consult the yellow pages of the phone directory, although there may be additional directories in the library. Consult the librarian about that. This is also true for utilities, etc.

In addition, some people will already know of large plants in their area in which they or

friends have worked in the past, which might be helpful since knowledge of hiring practices might be gained thereby.

II. What jobs to look for

Job-seekers should try to get hired in plants or transport depots that have several hundred (let's say a 400 minimum) workers. Reasons for this include: a) If we want to reach workers with literature, the potential audience is greater; b) The larger the company facility, the better chance that it will be in a basic union, that the workers will have some sense of organization (even if they think the union is a sellout one), and that therefore there will be a tie-in to workers nationally. In larger plants, such as GM, GE, United Airlines, Pennsy RR, etc., there is a greater tendency for workers to regard themselves as workers, with less illusions about becoming some kind of a "boss". In small shops, where bosses and workers are closer together, more illusions exist about "moving up". c) In large plants in national unions there is a greater chance that the workers will become part of (and have a history of) mass strike movements, rebellions against sellout leaderships, conflict with the government due to "national interest" injunctions, etc., which might create the basis for greater mutual exchange about questions relating to opposition to the Johnson Administration policies; d) the larger the company the likelier the existence of masses of unskilled jobs (assembly lines, platforms, etc.) creating a better basis for hiring, especially as replacements for workers taking vacations. Of course, if the summer is slack in a particular industry, this situation wouldn't necessarily hold (i.e., auto, where production on the old model fades into a summer lay-off-changeover before hiring starts around August to September for the new model).

Within the larger plant situation, it might be desirable for students seeking jobs in the area or city in which their school is located, to pick a place which would have follow-up possibilities in the Fall through contacts established within the plant, in line with an on-going worker-student alliance activity.

In general, people should seek unskilled jobs (probably couldn't get a skilled one anyway) and, if given the choice, a job where one would contact larger numbers of workers. If you are white, select a plant where the majority are white. While Black workers might be thought of as more politically conscious, what we are trying to do is reach white workers on the questions of the war and racism, to name but two areas (in addition to the day-to-day grievances, trade union questions, etc.). If Black, a student would, of necessity, have to (and should) get a job where there are large numbers of Black workers. Women should give special consideration to jobs where many women are employed. These include, in addition to basic industries, (like electrical) department stores, telephone companies, hospitals, etc.

In cases where people cannot travel to (or don't want to get jobs in) basic industries, large wholesale and retail outfits within the city proper could be just as advantageous—large mail-order houses (Sears-Roebuck, Montgomery Ward); department stores (preferably those with unions); possibly as non-professional workers in hospitals (although here in many large cities there are large majorities of Black workers, a factor for white students to consider.) Other such places could include the telephone company, gas and light company, mass transit, (if privately owned; government-owned usually requires a civil service test and waiting period). The national Work-In bulletin will carry additional job tips on places to look for.

III. How to get a job

Some places hire students specifically for the summer as replacements for workers on vacations (although usually bosses try to get

away with not filling in, unless the union contract has specific stipulations and they are enforced). Others won't hire you if they know you are a student or if they think you're only working for the summer. In most cases it would probably be best not to mention that you are a student (unless you have advance knowledge that they are specifically hiring students for the summer—which might be found out by someone being sent there first who's NOT looking for a job, saying he's a student and seeing if they are hiring). If, then, it is the case of not being able to state you're a student seeking summer work, you have to come in as a job-seeker who has worked since graduating high-school (you should say you're a high school graduate), which means you have to have a place or person who will say you worked there for the past 1-4 years. Each area should develop "backgrounds" like this for their group. In indicating the kind of work performed, try to slant it to what you presume the work is in the particular plant or depot (assembly, maintenance, shipping, loading, platform, etc.), and in most every case indicate that whatever you did on your "previous job" involved some kind of manual, heavy work. You're not afraid of work, is the idea to get across.

If getting to the place requires a car (or if that is easier even though you can use public transportation) say you have one or a friend who "works around there"/drives near there every day. Some places won't hire you if they think that you are a potential late-comer.

Draft status may be a problem. Job applicants with a 1-Y or even 4-F often find difficulty in getting work. Also, a 2-S classification immediately identifies you as a student. Persons with a 3-A deferment (supporting a parent or child) have an easier time. If you're 1-A, (and possibly someone's tested the draft situation at the place beforehand) you might be able to say you're 1-A and get hired, but here again you may have to 'use your wits'. If you've been in and had an honorable discharge, tell it the way it is. If you've had something other than an honorable discharge, avoid mentioning it; you've been "working since high school".

In cases where you can't mention college, and use a "background", make sure you state you were "laid off" from your last job because it was "slow" or the company's "contracting" or maybe even "going out of business." Whatever salary you decide on (usually around \$85/wk.—that is, not too much lower than what you expect to make, and not too much higher) make sure that your "former boss" knows what it is. For example, if you're going for a teamster platform job that pays \$110 or \$120 a week, say you made about \$100, not \$75. On the other hand, if you're getting a job in a hospital or a department store for \$65 a week, say you made that figure in your old job, not \$120. Anyway, since most large places will check, or may, (unless you're specifically being hired as a temporary worker who's going back to college in the Fall), make sure your "former boss" has the story straight.

Some places give aptitude tests. Don't show off. If there are 100 questions and it's a time test, don't answer more than 50. That's a rule of thumb. If you do too well, they'll either be suspicious or want to use you in the "front office". Of course, it may be hard to judge, not wanting to do below what's required, but again, the first job-seeker's experience will be helpful here. A group should gather all information from each successive job-seeker, so that the next ones will be better prepared.

If you have any physical defects which can't be detected from a normal physical examination, don't mention them. Companies won't hire people with previous injuries or defects which might be re-injured, creating the basis for suits against them.

They're very wary on this score. If it's a defect that's noticeable, either play it down or try to figure a way to cover it up. If you can't you may have to go someplace else where it's not so important. If you wear glasses, some jobs are out (i.e., a railroad brakeman, which usually requires 20/20 vision without glasses). However, most jobs only require 20/20 or even less, with glasses.

You should be at your first place looking at around 8:30 or 9 A.M. and shouldn't go to your last place any later than noon. Otherwise they'll think you'll never get up in the morning for work. You generally should not wear a suit and tie or fancy dress, but don't dress like a slob. Slacks and sports shirt, with or without a sport jacket, depending on the weather, and skirt or summer dress with low heels (or at least not 6-inch spikes) for women.

If places require a "non-communist" or "non-subversive" signature, sign it. You're not breaking any law. If it's engaged in government work, and you would be breaking a law, it will be so stated on the application. Discuss this before hand with your group.

Be straightforward in any interview; you're getting the job because you "need the money". Don't use \$20 words. Don't put on a tough guy act. Just plain, simple language and attitude. Usually the less said, the better. Don't volunteer information. Just answer what is asked.

IV. What to expect on the job

Don't start sounding off the first day on the job; or even the first week. Do your work, learn your job. Don't goof off on someone else's back, but if all the workers are goofing off, or taking a break, go ahead (unless it might cost you—as a new worker—your job, which the older workers will understand). Remember, we're here for a short-term operation. While you can't expect to win over workers in three months, you don't have to wait as long as you might, if it were a permanent job, to "open up" on political questions. Learn from the workers. About the work, the job, the history of the plant, company, union, their attitudes on every question. Listen. You might find out who the finks are. Participate in the bull sessions, the lunch discussions, talking on the job where it's normal, but take it slow the first 3 or 4 weeks, (if the job were to be permanent, this process might take six months or longer) listening and sounding out the workers.

Don't be shocked by the racist remarks of the white workers, by confused political impressions, by pro-war talk, by "keeping-up-with-the-Joneses" chit-chat. If the workers understood racism, the war, the capitalist class, middle class morality, etc., we'd be on the way "home" already. Do let them know you're a student fairly soon, within the first two or three weeks, as long as the foreman won't find out (or someone else who might use it to get you fired). But this isn't fool-proof. You've got to play it by ear. But if you don't say you're a student, they'll know it anyway, and you won't be able to do an honest, straight-forward job. Remember, although workers may think students are snobbish (and many are), they also respect education and want their kids to go to college. (That's why they're working so hard, among other reasons.) Your job is to bring across the identity of interests of students and workers—the fact that without workers, there would be no universities, that the working class is the class with the power, that workers really create the value of society, that without them basic changes in the system can't happen, etc.

But you're there with a purpose—to bring out the relationship of the war to their immediate demands, to the fact that they and their sons die in the war, that it is a war for the rich—the class perspective. And

also, among white workers, the use of racism against their class interests. Black workers aren't "threatening" their jobs. The boss is. He controls both. As long as workers are divided—by race, union, sex, craft, nationally, etc.—it's easier for the boss to sit on them. This is no easy task. It normally takes a lifetime, so don't expect to do it in two or three months! But at least you can begin to question, to point out relationships they might not have thought of or might be afraid to express out loud. Try talking to workers individually, especially those who seem more receptive. Don't start by using a lunchroom or platform for a "soap-box oration." Literature could be given out individually or stuck up in bathrooms at the beginning. Discuss in your group when to start giving it out en masse.

Try to make a few friends among the workers that might last beyond the summer. Two or three—or even one. And try to get their addresses and phone numbers before you leave the job. Otherwise it might be difficult to ever contact them again. Join the bowling league or the baseball team. Avoid running home at the end of the day to the "safe" company of your old friends and political buddies. Concentrate on making new friends. Go to the bar or whatever hang-out they go to after work. Don't try to over-reach yourself here. If you can't hold your liquor, don't make a fool of yourself by trying to be what you think is "one of the boys."

Don't talk to workers like you know everything and they know nothing. First of all it's not true (probably the reverse). Secondly, even if you do know more about a particular subject (i.e., the facts about the Geneva Agreements and the U.S. support of the Diem dictatorship) that doesn't mean that by making a speech you'll get the facts across. Be patient. Make it an exchange of experience, not a one-way affair. You'll make plenty of mistakes. Discuss them in your group. Don't give up the first time you do something wrong. After all, these workers were rookies too once, but they had to survive it because they had to eat.

It would be a good idea to record your experiences by day or week. Just a few notes in the evening about relevant events during the day will be invaluable for other people participating in the Work-in this summer, for those in next summer's program and for people to whom we publicize our work. You'd be surprised how much important information you forget; don't trust to your chances of remembering anecdotes.

Come in to work on time! That's the thing that may keep you the job above all else. Lateness is the first cause of being fired in the trial period. Don't start in with broadsides against the union leadership, even if the workers initiate the sellout talk. Listen, ask questions, ask if anything was ever done to overcome it, suggest types of fights around grievances, immediate things, if you can figure some out. But don't feel compelled (in your three-month sojourn) to give leadership on any and all questions. One important result of your job may just be an appreciation of what workers are up against in their fight against the boss, the government, and a sellout leadership. And acknowledge of what the in-plant grievances are will help if there is to be follow-up along lines of worker-student alliance activity when you get back to school. You will be able to relate leaflets, etc. to the actual problems inside the gates.

Lastly, remember when you start talking about the war (and about how students are seriously opposed to the war for good reasons, not simply engaged in "beatnik pranks") many workers who feel the same way keep silent while those who support the war are many times the most outspoken. Don't get into knock-down, drag-out argu-

ments with the latter, but rather talk individually first to the ones you're making friends with. Don't get into the "box" of making it appear that it's you against the workers. Know the facts about the war, not just the polemics. Facts make a deep impression on workers. And if you get involved in discussions with workers whose sons are in Vietnam and want to "support them by going all out," be careful. That's an emotional area in which it may be very hard to convince such a father that your line on supporting his son is correct. Start by understanding his position of having been brainwashed all these years and seeing his son in daily danger of "being killed by the other side." In learning how to put forward an anti-Vietnam-war approach in such situations, you will really be learning how to talk to people who are not simply on your side or sympathetic.

After being there about a month, try to pick out a few workers who might be more advanced than the rest, concentrating more on individual discussions, with the hope of keeping them as friends or contacts after you leave the place. Talk about the possibilities of the students offering the workers assistance in any struggles coming up in the future, on picket lines, demonstrations, even doing research for them. Don't necessarily start asking about union meetings. Many times they are suspended in the summer. If, not, most workers don't attend and you're not going to build up any active attitude or caucus movement in that direction in 3 months (most of which is spent on a trial period and during which you may not even be in the union.) If, of course, there's something special going on and a lot of workers appear headed toward a union meeting, you can go with them, but more to listen and learn than to orate.

Not everything can be put down here about what you'll face. Keep in constant contact with your group and discuss all problems with them. If possible, try to have at least two students (possibly more) get jobs in the same plant so they can compare notes, exchange experiences, criticize each other's mistakes, and (probably most important) make it possible to get a broader view of the place than that which comes from working in just one department. However, if you do team up, don't hang around together. It will be a constant temptation to talk to, eat and travel with the one person in your work-site who will be easiest to communicate with. This is not to say that you should ignore each other's existence on the job, just that your primary aim will be to work and communicate with the permanent workers in the plant.

WHY, MR. PRESIDENT? WHY? WHY? WHY? WHY?

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, an advertisement in the Tampa Tribune, of June 26, 1967, again asks pertinent questions about the administration's conduct of the war in Vietnam and foreign policy in general. It seems that these questions are frequently put to the President and Secretaries of Defense and State but seldom do they receive replies that satisfy.

Fortunately, in this instance, Sumter L. Lowry, on behalf of the Florida Coal-

tion of Patriotic Societies, has included a few facts which might well serve to change the present blind policy of the administration if they would only own up to them. Among these facts are:

Russia is publicly committed to the destruction of our country. . . . Russia is really the major threat to world peace. . . . she never keeps her agreement nor does she intend to

And so forth.

These are facts. They are established beyond doubt by the actions of the Soviet Union and Communist nations under Soviet control, but they seem beyond the grasp of the administration.

The evasion of these facts—and thus, "the soft-line" policies—should be the substance of a great deal of thought by all voters in coming elections.

I include Mr. Sumter's letter in the RECORD at this point:

WHY, MR. PRESIDENT? WHY? WHY? WHY?—
ANOTHER OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

TAMPA, FLA.,
June 26, 1967.

To the PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We as loyal American citizens, deeply concerned about the dangerous situation confronting our country today, wish to ask you a few questions. We do this by means of an open letter published in the Tampa Tribune because we believe that there are tens of thousands of people in this state who want to know the answer to these questions.

Why is it, Mr. President that our government still refuses to recognize the fact that Russia is our enemy as she has been for the past twenty years?

Why is it that you do not understand that Russia is publicly committed to the destruction of our country?

Why is it, Mr. President, that you forgive and forget all the abuse and insults that we have suffered from Russia and the crimes she has committed against our citizens all over the world?

Why is it that you are not willing to hold Russia accountable for the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in foreign lands fighting wars started and directed by Russia?

Why is it that you refuse to recognize that Russia's full time business and major objective is creating tensions in various parts of the world which invariably costs our government millions of dollars in money and the lives of thousands of our men?

Why is it that you will not see that Russia is really the major threat to world peace and that if she would act as a decent member in the family of nations there would be few wars or world tensions?

Why is it, Mr. President, that after twenty years of dealing with Russia our State Department can never learn—it just keeps making the same mistakes over and over again with the same results? Russia always wins—we always lose.

Why is it, Mr. President, that at this very time you are making every possible concession to Russia in the field of cultural, trade and diplomatic relations when you know that by all past dealings with Russia she never keeps her agreement nor does she intend to.

And finally, Mr. President, you must know at this very time that in the terrible war in Vietnam that Russia is as much our enemy as North Vietnam. The record shows that we have lost 11,000 men killed and 50,000 wounded in this war caused mostly with arms and equipment openly supplied to North Vietnam by Russia.

Why is it, Mr. President, that you will not hold her accountable for the deaths and suffering of our men in Vietnam?

Remember, Mr. President, when *Russia* starts a war in any part of the world the pattern is always the same. We rush in with our men, money and material. Our resources are wasted, our men are killed and wounded by the tens of thousands, while *Russia* never suffers the loss of a single soldier! *Russia* just sits back and laughs at how naive we are and plans where she will start the next war.

And you must know, Mr. President, that *Russia* could end this war in Vietnam tomorrow morning if she wanted to. All she has to do is cut off the supplies and support to North Vietnam and that would stop it. But, she does not want to stop that war. She wants the war to drag on. She wants to see our men killed and our economy and resources destroyed, then we will be an easy prey for conquest.

We notice that the press, television and other news media give the United States and North Vietnam casualty figures each morning, but they never mention the casualties of our real enemy, the Russians. You should require the news media to publish the Russian casualties every day. Of course, their casualties figure would be a Zero each day, because there are no Russians killed in these wars. They only start a war while we fight them. But, seeing this Zero figure for Russian casualties each day would bring home to the people of this country how wrong it is for us to allow this situation to go on where *Russia* is responsible for killing thousands of our men without losing any of her own. This is an outrageous situation.

And, Mr. President, to bring this matter closer to home, *Russia* is now conducting an attack on the very vitals of our country. The riots, insurrection and disrespect for the law are all a part of the Russian strategy to destroy our government. Everyone knows that the Communist Conspiracy in most cases plan, direct and execute riots and insurrections which are happening in cities all over the United States today. Everyone knows that the burning, looting, and the killing of American citizens one by the other is all according to the plan and pattern as directed by the Communists from Moscow. It is also plain to see that the Civil Rights movement has in many places been used as a Communist instrument to divide and confuse the people of this country.

We ask you, Mr. President, why is it that you never mention these facts to the American people or to publicly condemn the Communists for their part in the riots and insurrections? Why is it that you are silent in this matter?

ISRAEL FOUGHT TO WIN—WHY DON'T WE?

Let's take a look at the recent war between Israel and the Arab States.

This conflict was planned by *Russia*. She supplied the equipment, ammunition and the technical advice to the Arabs in the mistaken belief that they would quickly overrun Israel and that *Russia* would dominate the middle east. Her plans miscalculated. She lost the war all due to the courage, the planning and the efficiency of the army of Israel. What happened in that war could be a great benefit and a lesson to the American government on how to fight a war.

Just compare how we are conducting the war in Vietnam and how Israel conducted the war against the Arab States. Israel is a small country completely surrounded by her enemies who outnumber her ten to one; yet, in a week's time she completely destroyed the armies of her enemies and was victorious. But, in Vietnam the great United States with the most powerful army in the world can-

not win from a small weak nation like North Vietnam.

The reason, of course is very plain. Israel went out to quickly crush their opponents and win this war with the maximum speed, effort and efficiency. Her goal was victory. While our policy in Vietnam has been deliberately not to win the war and to put as little pressure as possible on the enemy, just to keep feeding our men into the death trap in the hope that some day in the distant future the enemy will give up and stop fighting.

This is a fantastic way to fight a war. If there ever was a clear demonstration of the military axiom that "There is no substitute for victory," it has been completely shown by the army of Israel.

The people of the United States can be grateful to Israel and the soldiers of that country for proving these things:

1. That the way to win a war is to apply the maximum power, get it over with and to suffer as few casualties as possible.

2. That the conduct of any war should be left in the hands of trained and professional soldiers and should not be turned over to politicians and college professors as is now being done by the United States in its war against North Vietnam.

3. That Israel was not afraid of *Russia* and had courage enough to stand up against her.

4. That *Russia* will back down rather than to get into a war where she might suffer losses.

The behavior of the people of Israel and their fighting army should be an inspiration to the people of the entire world. For it shows what can be done against tremendous odds if the leaders of a nation have the courage, the will to win and determination to achieve victory.

From newspaper accounts of our country's action since the end of the Israel-Arab hostilities it appears that we are doing all we can in the United Nations to let the Russians off Scot-free for her part in promoting this war in the near East. We will not expose *Russia*, we will not hold her accountable, but we try hard to shield her from public knowledge of what she has done. Mr. President, why do we do this? What powerful forces in our government are trying to protect our enemy *Russia*?

Now, Mr. President, the purpose of this letter is to ask that you make the following complete changes in our foreign policy:

That you tell *Russia* that if she wants to be friends with us she must act as a friend.

That our country will no longer cringe with fear in our dealings with *Russia* but that we will stand up against her.

That *Russia* must stop killing our men in Vietnam now or be treated as enemies by our government.

That we will hold *Russia* accountable for all hostile acts.

That we are aware that *Russia* is deliberately engaged in creating tensions all over the world.

That *Russia* is the real threat to world peace.

That we will conduct our foreign policy for our own benefit and no one else's.

That we will do what is best and right for our own country regardless of world opinion.

That we will not support the cowardly actions of the United Nations in their standard practice of being firm with small nations, but never taking a firm stand against *Russia*.

That we will only use the United Nations as an aid to our foreign policy rather than the corner stone of our foreign policy.

That we will go out to win any war we are engaged in, get it over quickly, with as few casualties as possible and bring our men home.

We ask that you do these things, Mr.

President, on behalf of the thousands of people who feel the same way as expressed in this letter.

And above all—and most important—get rid of all those men in policy making levels of our government who in past years have been responsible for our foreign policy. This policy has made the United States the laughing stock of the world—has cost us the friendship and respect of most of our former allies. And has allowed the Soviet Union to reach a point where they challenge our leadership and threaten our very existence. These men must go if our country is to survive.

And never forget Mr. President the Russian government is an evil and Godless institution. The whole world from their past record knows just what kind of a government it is. Yet in dealing with *Russia* our government has adopted the philosophy that you can overcome evil by consorting and compromising with it. This cannot be done. If you embrace evil you will be overcome by evil. God will not prosper a nation who will be a party to this unholy doctrine.

Mr. President, out of respect for the more than 100,000 fine young American men who have been killed or wounded in Korea and North Vietnam we ask that you take whatever steps are necessary to correct this situation.

Mr. President, we respectfully request that you reply to this letter.

Respectfully,

FLORIDA COALITION OF
PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES,
SUMNER L. LOWRY.

DOING SOMETHING FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago one of our colleagues reminded us that we are not doing enough for our young people. I should like to give further testimony in that respect. I certainly agree.

I happen to have my three children with me in the Chamber this afternoon. While our colleague was talking, my young son Tom pulled on my coat tail and said, "Daddy, that man is right. You never do anything we can understand. Let us go to the ballgame."

AIR TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. MINSHALL. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a private pilot. I am also the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Transportation.

We are all vitally interested in the safety of our airways.

In the bill which we passed Tuesday, for the Department of Transportation, we gave the FAA all of the personnel,

648, they requested for their flight service stations and their flight center locations throughout the country.

During the colloquy on that bill we discussed taking over Anacostia Field for private aircraft.

The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], pointed out that General McKee had approached him regarding use of Anacostia because General McKee feared "a terrible accident over at National Airport."

General McKee told Chairman RIVERS he wished to use Anacostia for general aviation purposes. Since we all are concerned about the increasingly obvious traffic hazards at National, the House Armed Services Committee wrote an amendment to the military public works bill which, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] told us the other day interposes "no objection to Mr. McNamara or the DOD entering into an agreement with the FAA for the use of Anacostia for general aviation."

This is very much what General McKee has told me. I refer to page 132 of my Transportation subcommittee's hearings. In answer to my question regarding use of Anacostia for general aviation, General McKee replied:

Anacostia still has a strip of 5,000 feet, and obviously that could be used on an interim basis for light airplanes.

My next question was:

Why have not some steps been taken to use it for light aircraft?

At this point General McKee asked to go off the record and he then told me that it was being held up by the White House. Now there is no arguing the need for low-income housing, but not when it interferes with the lives and safety of literally thousands of air passengers and when it could be located elsewhere.

It was only yesterday morning, about half an hour before this tragic accident occurred, that I again personally talked with General McKee about this possibility, because FAA agrees it will not interfere with the traffic pattern at National Airport. It will take approximately one-third of the slots, as they call them, out of the traffic pattern at National, and will relieve to a degree the congestion which now exists there and consequently make National Airport a much safer airport than it is.

One person is holding up utilization of Anacostia. That person is down at the White House. I say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] it is time that the President of the United States took affirmative action to make Anacostia immediately available to general aviation aircraft. This would be a big step to relieve the congestion at Washington National. Each day delayed increases the possibility of a terrible disaster.

We do not yet know what caused the terrible accident which wiped out so many lives yesterday in North Carolina. It may have been the fault of the pilot of the light craft, it may have been the

fault of the airline pilot, it may have been the FAA's controller's error, or a combination of these factors. Regardless of where the fault lies, it is a grim reminder that the congestion over National Airport is pointing inevitably to tragedy right on the doorstep of the Nation's Capital.

So long as the President refuses to relieve the air congestion over National by not making Anacostia available to light aircraft, air passengers using National Airport are living on borrowed time.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will recall, the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee mentioned the fact that they had stopped some transactions going on over there.

My subcommittee held hearings trying to get this allocated to general aviation. I was unsuccessful at that time, as chairman of the subcommittee.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] then had it set aside so it could not be used for some other purpose.

Mr. MINSHALL. If the gentleman can prevail on the executive department, they can do it tomorrow.

Mr. PETTIS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is shocked and grieved by yesterday's tragic accident near Asheville, N.C., in which 82 Americans lost their lives. It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we pause in recognition of the personal loss sustained by those dear to the victims. We should also be mindful of the loss to our Nation in the death of Navy Secretary-designate John T. McNaughton, who, with his wife and son, were in the ill-fated plane.

But it is also our duty to take steps preventing this kind of disaster. The collision, Mr. Speaker, between the Piedmont Airlines Boeing 727 and the twin-engine Cessna could have been prevented if a collision warning device now in existence had been installed in the planes involved. Such a device would have warned the pilots of both aircraft in time to avert the crash.

It should also be said, Mr. Speaker, that a third set of eyes in the Boeing 727 cockpit would have added immeasurably to the safety of the flight. I am an airlines retired pilot and know well that in an emergency, a third pilot can make the difference between life and death. The second pilot "backs up" the pilot, checking on each split-second move. A third pilot is free to "eyeball" the environment in which the liner is flying. This is especially true in connection with our large, busy airports where both commercial and private aircraft keep the air full of planes.

In yesterday's accident, both the pilot and copilot were extremely busy with necessary cockpit duties involved in the "climbout" to cruise altitude. The Boeing 727 did not have this third pilot.

This Nation's airlines, Mr. Speaker, are spending many thousands of dollars on frills and trimming. They feature mini-skirted stewardesses, television, stereo music. Now, I am not opposed to comforts which are admittedly enjoyed by most of us. I am concerned as to whether these airlines and the Federal Aviation agency are giving sufficient attention to the need for enough pilots and adequate safety equipment up in the cockpit where the lives of passengers and crew are safeguarded. I have heard few passengers' complaints about the trend to reduce the number of pilots. I cannot help but wonder what would happen if we reduced the number of stewardesses.

A number of my distinguished colleagues know that a controversy has for some time been raging between airline pilots who favor retention of the three-pilot system and certain carriers who are changing to a two-pilot plan for jet liners. I have served both as a pilot and in airlines management and I support the judgment of the pilots and carriers who believe that three sets of eyes are vital to high flight safety standards.

I am informed that investigators have not yet determined the angle at which the planes collided. They suggest, however, that the pilot of the smaller craft, who was, incidentally, about 12 miles off course, may have been checking his charts after receiving instructions from the airport control tower.

And this leads to the critical need for more effective air traffic control facilities. It is time that antiquated traffic control systems be updated and that our Federal Government be authorized to do more about this urgent problem. Our Government is subjected to innumerable lawsuits as a result of aircraft accidents due to poor or faulty air traffic control facilities. In addition to the tragic toll in human life and hundreds of millions of dollars paid by private insurers, the Federal Government has, since 1959, paid \$16 million in lawsuits for its responsibility for out-of-date systems. Other lawsuits against the Government from survivors of victims totaling \$203 million are now pending.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that some of the millions of dollars paid to survivors be spent rather on improving air traffic control systems and flight safety equipment and personnel.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN McNAUGHTON

Mr. REUSS. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the death of John T. McNaughton in yesterday's air crash deprives the Nation of one of its

finest citizens. John McNaughton, before coming to Washington in 1961, had a brilliant career in law, journalism, and teaching. As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Arms Control, and as the Department's General Counsel, he served his country well. Within the next few days, he was designated to become Secretary of the Navy.

The disaster which took from us John McNaughton, his lovely wife Sally, and his young son Theodore, is a tragedy for all of us. We shall miss John McNaughton's energy, his great ability, his wit, his integrity, and above all his devotion to his friends, his country, and his fellow man.

I include the remarks on Mr. McNaughton by Chalmers M. Roberts, contained in this morning's Washington Post:

A BRILLIANT PUBLIC SERVANT IS LOST

John T. McNaughton had a sparkling mind, an effervescent wit and great managerial ability. His death in a plane crash yesterday, together with his wife and son Theodore, robs the Administration of one of its most effective executives.

These attributes appealed to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to such an extent that at the time of McNaughton's death he was probably closer to the Secretary in a personal sense than anyone else in the Pentagon.

McNamara said yesterday he was "stunned." Of McNaughton, he said: "All who knew him shared my respect for his courage, his integrity and his devotion to this country. Our Nation has lost a brilliant public servant, and Mrs. McNamara and I have lost close personal friends in John and Sally McNaughton."

President Johnson, expressing grief for all the victims of the air crash, said the death of the McNaughtons "can only be measured by the emptiness it will leave in American hearts and in the pages of American history."

"For six and a half arduous and decisive years, John McNaughton served in the highest councils of our Government. His devoted wife served beside him. He was soon to become Secretary of the Navy and this adds a special poignancy to his death."

On a wall of the McNaughton's home at 5031 Lowell st. nw. hangs a photo showing him waving a paper in his hand as a meeting is breaking up in the Cabinet room. It is signed by the President with this inscription: "Yes, John, you may speak now."

When McNaughton first came to the Pentagon in 1961 he turned his perceptive mind to a subject not generally popular there; disarmament. His first post was Deputy Assistant Secretary for Arms Control. He continued that interest while the Pentagon's General Counsel and in his last post as Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs. It was McNaughton who acted as the chief Pentagon staff man for the nuclear test-ban treaty.

Most recently he had spent perhaps 70 per cent of his time on Vietnam, often going there with McNamara. It was he who strongly urged McNamara, who had first opposed the idea, to back the 37-day pause in the bombing of North Vietnam.

McNaughton had been slated to take over as Navy Secretary on Aug. 6. Robert H. B. Baldwin has been serving as Acting Secretary since Paul H. Nitze moved over to become Deputy Secretary of Defense. Baldwin previously has announced his retirement, so unless he stays, the Navy will have two vacant posts at the top to fill.

McNaughton was born Nov. 21, 1921, in Bicknell, Ind. He met his wife, the former Sarah Elizabeth Fulkman, when they were students at DePauw University. The surviving son, Alexander, 18, is due to enter Cornell this fall. Yesterday he was traveling with a group in Europe.

McNaughton received his law degree at Harvard after serving during World War II as a naval lieutenant in the Caribbean and the Pacific. He was a Rhodes scholar and then assistant general counsel in the Paris office of the Marshall Plan.

In 1951-52 he edited the *Pekin, Ill., Daily Times*, still run by his father, F. F. McNaughton. In 1952 he was an unsuccessful Democratic candidate for Congress. He taught law at Harvard before coming to Washington.

Mrs. McNaughton served as an ensign in the WAVES during World War II. She was fluent in French and Spanish, knew some Italian and was studying Russian.

The McNaughtons enjoyed a backyard pool especially because vacations were hard to take. He was an ardent and highly competitive tennis player, playing to find the other fellow's weakness as he did in his governmental efforts to improve the American position in Vietnam and elsewhere.

THE HONORABLE DAVID S. KING'S SUCCESS IN JOB AS AMBASSADOR TO ONE OF THE NEW NATIONS OF AFRICA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of announcing that our former colleague, the Honorable David S. King, of the State of Utah, who served with such efficiency in this body, is now doing a truly magnificent job as Ambassador to one of the new nations of Africa, the proud Malagasy Republic, which the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is planning to visit this fall.

Mr. Speaker, already Dave King has won the heart of Africa. Under leave previously obtained I include at this point in the RECORD the following communication from Ambassador King:

THE FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF AN AMERICAN AMBASSADOR IN TANANARIVE

Madagascar is sometimes called the Big Island. It could well be called the mysterious island. Its origins are obscure, its history enigmatic. Still virgin forests abound with exotic life-forms known only to the savants, and disciples of the National Geographic.

Peering back through the telescope of time, Malagasy history blurs out after a few generations. Without the benefit of written language, or enduring art forms or monuments, the ancient Malagasy left us only the barest scraps of information to satisfy the hungerings of twentieth-century inquisitiveness.

Through philosophy we deduce that these brown-skinned people came to the island in successive migratory waves, some of them from the West, but more of them from the East. Hence in language and in custom they reflect an Asiatic influence. Until recently, their political and social life was tribal-oriented, and vestiges of tribal sectionalism still remain.

But Madagascar is not without an abundance of assets relevant to modern times. The tranquility of isolation has afforded it the opportunity to reflect. Occupying an island 250 miles off the southeast coast of Africa has not been interpreted as a reproach, but as an encouragement for diversification, and even, perhaps, for peace of mind.

My first impression, upon arrival at Tananarive with Rosalie and our six children, was that Madagascar had been maligned by photographs of itself now in general circulation. Unfortunately, in all black-and-white reproductions, bright red shows up as dirty grey. How could anyone (except those familiar with Southern Utah) form a mental picture of the flamboyance of this rich red earth without having first seen it? It is understandable, then, that when Madagascar is sometimes called "The Big Red Island," geology is the frame of reference and not politics. Speaking of politics, the Malagasy are proud to point out that few people in the world are as anti-Communist as they.

Driving in from the airport we were stopped no less than ten times by large herds of zebu, plodding on their way to market. Almost every animal in Madagascar with hoofs, is a zebu and can be recognized by its impressive up-curved horns and distinctive hump over the shoulder blades. Zebu steaks and filets, zebu tenderloins, zebu soup, and even zebu-burgers constitute our principal fare in the meat department. In addition, Madagascar's most famous foods are its rice, its vanilla and related spices, its bananas, coffee, tapioca, sugar, and then for good measure, more rice. Rice paddies are everywhere, recalling Madagascar's Asiatic origins.

Seldom does one find the past and present so dramatically brought into juxtaposition as here. For the traditionalist looking for color and unspoiled reminders of the past, this is the place to come. He will not be disappointed. It is amazing to see how effortlessly people can live and find rich happiness too, without the clutter of machines which modern man considers so indispensable.

Here are some of the picture-memories of this land that will always stay with me: the swarms of barefoot peasants fishing from their inundated and well-stocked rice paddies; the bustle of the Zoma, where the city's marketing is traditionally done in the setting and the atmosphere (well-flavored) of some exotic story-book land; the spectacle of a procession of patient mothers, carrying enormous loads on their heads and husky infants on their backs; the colorful robes and trappings of Malagasy native dress; and, finally, the strange and exotic Malagasy ceremony of disinterring, rewrapping, and re-interring the dead.

Let it be emphasized that the Christian influence in this land is strong. For over a hundred years Christian missionaries, Protestant and Catholic alike, have worked the vineyard, and effectively. Even though some animism and superstitions still persist, the Malagasy are essentially a religious people. They are also a generous people, and a home-loving people. The devotion which fathers and mothers show their young, and the strong cords which bind their families together—not just parents and children, but grandparents and grandchildren, aunts and uncles and cousins—are facets of their social life which put many other societies to shame.

But progress, even in the modern sense, has also come to Madagascar. There are radio stations. One of them features cultural programs exclusively, of a quality seldom duplicated. Modern buildings are now beginning to show. There are automobiles and busses, and excellent air transportation to various parts of the island. Many Malagasy homes are equipped with modern conveniences.

In this great land, the French influence is understandably strong. Although Malagasy is the common language, French is the official language, and is spoken well by all the educated, though less well by those who aren't. The French have promoted a large economic aid program in conjunction with their impressive educational efforts. It must be emphasized, however, that Malagasy-Franco-American relations here are excellent. Our own U.S. activity has consisted in several modest but effective aid projects, and a vigorous cultural relations program designed to bring the American story and the American dream (through language, art, educational exchanges, and publicity) a little closer to these people. The fact that they have been so friendly to us, and have so genuinely cooperated in our efforts to contribute to peace and freedom throughout the world, would indicate that our efforts here have not been in vain.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has one of its most important satellite tracking stations in Madagascar. Its importance is heightened by the fact that it is the only station in the world located in the immediate vicinity of the intersection of the equatorial satellite orbits (originating at Cape Kennedy) and the Polar orbits (originating at Vandenberg in California).

Three weeks ago I made a ceremonial visit to the port city of Tulear, to greet the USS Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. (named after the older brother of our late President, who was killed in combat). The protocol manual prescribed, to the minutest detail, the various aspects of the ceremony down to the striped pants, and the nineteen-gun salute given to the local "Chef de Province." After the ship was docked, the American sailors came ashore, putting on an exhibition football game, and an evening jazz concert and dance. My official estimate is that those boys created enough goodwill to last the city for a generation.

Since becoming Ambassador, my appreciation and my respect for the Department of State have noticeably increased. My understanding of the problems inherent in diplomacy has greatly modified my former thinking. Let me illustrate. How many times have I heard political orators and editorialists call on the Department of State for an unambiguous and detailed declaration of our foreign policy? "What is our African policy?" I have heard it asked. "Or our Asian policy? Or our global policy? The American people are entitled to know, and in detailed and unambiguous language." My own voice, I admit, has been similarly raised.

The above questions are pertinent, and I am certain that no one in the world would like more than the architects of our foreign policy, in principle at least, to substitute clarity for confusion. However, it is much easier said than done. Although it may sound a little demeaning to compare high-level diplomacy to a poker game, in fact the parallelism between the two is close and relevant. In each, there is a continuing exercise of wits, and nerve, and stamina, in an effort honorably to protect the player's stake in the outcome. The last thing in the world that a poker player will do is to tip his hand ahead of time by notifying his opponents what he plans to do throughout the game. Unfortunately, not all nations are as friendly and cooperative as the Malagasy Republic, so that in dealing with our opponents, secrecy and maneuverability are matters of diplomatic survival.

One writer put it aptly. Diplomacy is analogous to navigating a strong and treacherous stream in a kayak. The traveler's ultimate destination, let us assume, is well known and clearly defined. His charts point out, in a general way, the contours of the river, and the location of its major landmarks. But as for negotiations the thousands of boulders and other obstructions which

he encounters as he is swept along, there can be little use for chart or compass. The adventurer must rely on his good sense and quick wit, with ample room to maneuver. This, in a word, is why the Department of State has not seen fit to publish a diplomatic road map to answer all the detailed questions involving our dealings with our opponents. Whether or not it has formulated our ultimate diplomatic goals with sufficient precision is, of course, another question.

Already I sense that this report has become too long, but when you start talking about Madagascar, it's hard to stop. One point, however, should be made clear before I finish. The official name of the country, considered as a political entity and not as a geographical place, is "The Malagasy Republic" or, in French, "La Republique Malagache." The people and the language are generally described as "Malagasy". However, when the geographical place is referred to, the good old word "Madagascar" which you learned in school is not only proper, but recommended.

BIRTHDAY OF HON. WILLIAM M. MILLER, DOORKEEPER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 35th year of service to the Congress of the Doorkeeper of the House, Mr. William "Fishbait" Miller, who marks his birthday today.

I take this time not only to call the attention of the House to his birthday, but to remind us of the very outstanding service he has rendered. Dedicated and efficient, he pursues his duties with inexhaustible energy. Not only the Members, but also countless visitors to Capitol Hill have been recipients of his many courtesies.

It is a pleasure to join with others in wishing him not only the very best today, but much happiness in the years ahead.

ROLLCALL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the rollcall congressional baseball game is almost upon us, and as this impending confrontation has driven my opposition, under the sinister leadership of Mr. UDALL, to new lengths of verbal and physical attack on my Republican club, I feel that this is the appropriate time to clear the air of any misconceptions my colleagues might have about this hallowed sporting event.

Moreover, in light of Mr. UDALL's futile attempt to outmaneuver the GOP team, I have taken it upon myself to develop some truly effective countermeasures

which I feel will interest Mr. UDALL and his colleagues. Indeed, I have broadened the Republican pitching machine with the acquisition of some new pitches of our own:

"The Humphrey slider," which comes off of the mound with a violent lateral motion, dips and dives on the way to the plate and at the last moment careens into the dugout.

"The Bobby Kennedy 'shrub' ball," a pitch designed to entangle the batter in a sudden growth of shrubbery as the unsuspecting hitter strives to usurp control of the game.

"The Rusk sinker," which steams toward the plate with remarkable slowness then lunges into the dirt at the batter's feet to avoid sailing into further uncharted domains.

We are also going to have the "Mansfield curve," which appears to be heading for the strike zone but suddenly darts into the nearest locker room to delay the ump's recounting of balls and strikes.

Then we are going to have the "McNamara escalator," which floats toward the batter knee high, but quickly rises to an undeterminable height as it floats high into the stands in back of the plate.

Then we will have the "Wayne Morse looney ball," a pitch that hurtles toward the plate eyeball to eyeball with the batter, and then disrupts into a violent whistling sound as it is tossed out of play for not conforming to regulation standards.

Then we will have the "Johnson credibility gap ball," which always appears to be something other than it really is.

We will also have the "Fulbright anti-administration pitch" which starts out with a great gust of wind, but little speed, then falls into the dirt and trickles off toward third base.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say that I am aware of the tremendous handicap that Mr. UDALL and his teammates are playing under. The prospect of performing against such a talented and polished machine as the Republican ball club is indeed a matter to lose sleep over. However, the game must go on.

We will soon have an opportunity to decide the matter at the ball park, so we will see you there.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. It is my understanding that the Republican Party has great talent on the baseball field this year in the persons of those who have come to the Congress for their first term, the Republicans also have such unprecedented athletes as the gentleman from California [Mr. MATHIAS], and another gentleman who was the holder at one time of a big-league contract. It is also my understanding that the Republicans have 25 aspiring players who appeared for practice this morning, so the gentleman is going to have considerable difficulty in deciding who is to play. May I also make note that none of these young athletes have seniority.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the institution of seniority in the House, because I know of no better system. With

25 available players on the Republican side you will be compelled to choose your first string on the basis of seniority. What fairer method could be employed in selecting a team. You must use the seniority system and I am sure we can all predict the outcome of the game.

Mr. CONTE. I might say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have met with Mr. UDALL, and I have offered some help by trading my pitcher, BOB MICHEL, for 2,500 yearbooks, but he has not been able to scrape up the books as yet.

IMPORTED TEXTILES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the increasing problems of imported textiles in the American marketplace demand, in my opinion, immediate attention. We see today a critical threat to one of the Nation's major industries.

With foreign textiles coming into the country in even greater quantities, the economic consequences are clear enough. Domestic textile production is decreasing, work weeks in our textile plants are being reduced, and capital improvements in the industry are deferred. Entire communities dependent upon a healthy and prospering textile industry feel the consequences.

In cases of this kind, I feel we have a clear-cut issue which demands greater attention than it has received. The competition of imported textiles requires us to make a choice. Either we must make a calculated decision to do nothing and, by so doing, sacrifice our domestic textile industry, the jobs it provides, and the communities which depend upon it, or we must provide some kind of reasonable balance to assure that this major industry will not suffer serious and unfair damage.

Many of us in the Congress have joined together in the past to urge in the strongest possible terms that international agreements entered into voluntarily by participating nations assure a more orderly arrangement regarding textile imports into the United States. Failure to work out such arrangements means that American jobs will be exported and a major productive resource of the United States will be lost. This certainly is not a regional problem as it has been characterized too often.

I am convinced that the Congress must take a more active role in this process than it has done up to now. Certainly, the legislation ending the infamous "two-price cotton" program which was draining the vitality from the American textile industry was a milestone several years ago. We must now have legislation to provide a mechanism which everyone understands so that reasonable stability can be restored to the American textile industry.

It is for that reason that I join with others here in the introduction of a bill authorizing and directing the President

to undertake negotiations with other governments with regard to the importation of textile products. This legislation would place limitations upon imports. In general, it would carry out the policy of the Congress that imports should be consistent with the maintenance of a strong and expanding U.S. textile industry, designed to avoid the disruption of U.S. markets and the unemployment of U.S. textile workers.

I urge that this measure be considered by the Congress without further damaging delays.

ROLLCALL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. MULTER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to be at the ball game next week. I have retired for various reasons from participating in the ball game as one of the players for some time, but I would like to apply now for the position of umpire.

I promise my colleagues I will be completely fair. I promise that on that day and on no other, I will not see any of our Republican friends either too far to the left or too far to the right. I will see all the Democrats always right on the line and right. I will declare them all safe. Because of my training I could never call a foul on a Democrat. I will not declare any of the Republicans out of bounds except, of course, I may look the other way occasionally. But I will never overlook their striking out. I am sure we will all have a good time.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I am certain he will not want to wear a Moishe Dayan patch on his right eye. It will be on his left one.

Mr. MULTER. It does not matter whether it will be on the left or right eye. I can see no good except where it should be seen. With either or both eyes, I see the Democrats winning.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report

on the bill (H.R. 10368) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 490)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10368) "making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 31, and 32, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,892,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, and 37.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
GEORGE MAHON,
ODIN LANGEN,
BEN REIFEL,
MARK ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

E. L. BARTLETT,
WILLIAM PROXMIER,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
CARL HAYDEN,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
NORRIS COTTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10368) making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Amendments Nos. 1 through 30, under the "Senate" heading, and Nos. 33 and 34, under the "Architect of the Capitol" heading, relate solely to expenses of Senate operations and activities. Amendment No. 37, under the

"General Provisions" heading, very largely deals with Senate salary matters. Amendment No. 38, also under the general provisions heading, relates to the Senate and House equally.

Amendments Nos. 1 through 30, and Nos. 33 and 34, relating to Senate operations, are reported in technical disagreement. But in accord with the long and well-founded practice, under which each body determines its own housekeeping requirements and the other concurs therein without intervention, the managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in these amendments.

Amendment No. 37 is also reported in technical disagreement, but as in the case of the first group of amendments, a motion will be offered for the House to recede and concur in the amendment. It deals essentially with conversion of the Senate salary system from a "basic" to a "gross" basis, but in so doing, for sake of uniformity for identical positions in the same organizational units, it also similarly converts the salaries of telephone operators and police paid by the Clerk of the House.

Amendment No. 38 relates to administration of the customary stationery allowances long granted to Members of Congress. It is identical in substance to provisions rejected on earlier occasions. It, of course, originated in the Senate although it applies to the House as well as to the Senate. In line with the well-founded practice in respect to determination of allowances and other expenses of the other body, the managers on the part of the House do not object to existing Senate provisions on the subject remaining unchanged. The companion part of the amendment that relates to the House is also omitted.

JOINT ITEMS

Joint Economic Committee

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$401,620 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$383,000 proposed by the House.

Capitol Police, general expenses

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$96,758 for general expenses of the Capitol Police as proposed by the Senate instead of \$75,000 proposed by the House. The extra amount is directly associated with the 46 additional police positions for the Senate in Amendment No. 13.

Architect of the Capitol

Senate Office Buildings and Garage

Amendments Nos. 33-34: Reported in technical disagreement but, as explained earlier herein in connection with other Senate housekeeping items, motions will be offered to recede and concur in the Senate provisions.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$15,892,000 for salaries and expenses of the Library (the main general operating fund) instead of \$15,712,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,078,769 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are agreed that the transfer of \$478,000 made by this bill from the Office of Education to Salaries and Expenses, Library of Congress, for the Russian Accessions project is in addition to the transfer made to the Library in the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act, 1968.

In connection with the special foreign currency program, the conferees are agreed that the statement in the Senate Committee report shall not be construed as an invitation to set up a permanent and continuing program in the Congo and Tunisia in the fiscal year 1968.

Government Printing Office

Office of Superintendent of Documents

Amendment No. 36: Provides a travel expenditure limitation of \$2,700, instead of

\$1,500 in the House bill and \$4,000 in the Senate version of the bill.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 37: Reported in technical disagreement, but as explained earlier herein in connection with other Senate housekeeping items, motion will be offered to recede and concur in the Senate provision.

Amendment No. 38: Relates to a housekeeping matter and action thereon is explained earlier herein in connection with other Senate and House matters.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
GEORGE MAHON,
ODIN LANGEN,
BEN REIFEL,
MARK ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on this bill is printed in yesterday morning's RECORD and is available in leaflet form at the clerk's desk. And you have just heard the clerk read the statement of the managers explaining the conference disposition of each Senate amendment. So I will be brief.

CONFERENCE TOTALS

First, as to the total appropriations: The conference agreement would appropriate a total of \$275,699,035. And I should add that if you were to check against last year's total for this particular bill, you would find it way below today's figure, and the principal reason—though not the only reason—would be that this year, for the first time, the General Accounting Office is included, which adds \$52,800,000 that was not in last year's legislative branch bill.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the conference total today is \$275,699,035.

The conference total is within the total of the budget estimates; it is \$306,176 below the President's budget requests considered in connection with this bill.

The conference total is, however, \$47,609,083 above the House bill total, but that is mainly because of the long practice of omitting from the original House bill all items relating exclusively to housekeeping in the other body. That practice accounts for \$47,388,705 of the increase above the House total. The House total was \$228,089,952.

CONFERENCE ACTIONS

So, in reality, Mr. Speaker, there was only \$407,000, plus, in the way of money differences in conference. The conference agreement drops \$186,769 of that and adds the remaining \$220,378 to the House bill.

Added is \$18,620 to provide for two additional secretaries and miscellaneous expenses for the Joint Economic Committee.

Added is \$21,758 to the general expense appropriation for the Capitol Police force for uniforms and equipment for the 46 additional police added by the

Senate for duty on that side of Capitol Hill.

The remaining \$180,000 was added to provide for 20 additional positions in the Library of Congress and for a larger effort in the Library's continuing program of preserving various deteriorating library materials. The House had allowed, under the Library's main operating appropriation, some 38 new positions of a total request for 98. The Senate restored 41 of the 60 that the House had denied. The conference allowance of \$130,000 additional should provide for about 20 above the House allowance of 38, or a total of about 58 new positions. The \$50,000 additional for the preservation program represents restoration of half of the House cut in that program; the Senate had restored the full cut. So we settled by meeting halfway.

STATIONERY ALLOWANCE

Mr. Speaker, the system of so-called comity under which each House determines its own housekeeping matters is a good system. By and large, it works well. It is a system born of long experience. It is, in fact, probably near perfect—but not quite perfect. The Senate, by floor amendment, undertook once again—as they have on some previous occasions—to make some changes in provisions of existing law with respect to administration of official stationery allowances of Senators. But they did not stop there. They extended the changes to the long-standing provisions with respect to the allowance for Members of the House.

As far as I know, no one on the House side felt the need or saw the justification for the change. No one over here had made a study of the matter—so far as I know. Certainly, no one has spoken to me about the need for any change.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the action was not in harmony with the well-founded practice long followed generally in connection with housekeeping matters of the two houses. As the statement of the managers explains: In line with the well-founded practice, the managers on the part of the House do not object to existing Senate provisions on the subject remaining unchanged—which they would do under this conference report. And so would the House provisions, of course.

NEW SALARY SYSTEM

Mr. Speaker, I might mention one other matter of general interest. Under this bill, the Senate has abandoned the old system of so-called basic salary rates for its employees and adopted an up-to-date system under which salary rates, and office salary allowances of Senators, are expressed on a gross rather than basic basis. That is in one of the amendments. I merely call attention to it. Except as to telephone operators and police, it does not apply to House employees or to clerk-hire allowances of Members. Speaking for myself, I think the amendment goes in the right direction, but as I say, it generally does not apply to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following table:

Legislative branch appropriation bill, 1968

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House	Senate
Senate	\$40,330,050	\$41,460,578		\$44,125,205	\$44,125,205	+\$3,795,155	+\$2,664,627	+\$44,125,205	
House of Representatives	81,475,440	81,326,670	\$80,368,670	80,368,670	80,368,670	-1,106,770	-958,000		
Joint items	9,889,653	11,267,762	11,271,282	11,311,660	11,311,660	+1,422,007	+43,898	+40,378	
Architect of the Capitol	14,548,700	15,523,200	12,045,100	15,308,600	15,308,600	+759,900	-214,600	+3,263,500	
Botanic Garden	513,300	614,500	584,500	584,500	584,500	+71,200	-30,000		
Library of Congress	31,471,100	38,764,800	36,961,400	37,328,169	37,141,400	+5,670,300	-1,623,400	+180,000	-\$186,769
Government Printing Office	42,924,700	34,147,700	34,059,000	34,059,000	34,059,000	-8,865,700	-88,700		
General Accounting Office	49,350,000	52,900,000	52,800,000	52,800,000	52,800,000	+3,450,000	-100,000		
Total	270,502,943	276,005,210	228,089,952	275,885,804	275,699,035	+5,196,092	-306,175	+47,609,083	-186,769

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I understand the figures correctly, the appropriations for the other body in fiscal year 1968 are increased \$3,795,000 over the 1967 level, while the appropriations for the House for 1968 are more than \$1 million less than those available in 1967. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming that more than \$2 million of the increase for the other body is due to the additional \$23,400 a year positions authorized? Was that the reason for the increase over 1967 for the other body?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman is correct. They have the right under our longstanding rule of comity to write the rules for their side of the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that they already had a top employee at \$24,460 and were pretty adequately staffed, but they are still adding another one at \$23,400, at a total cost to the Government of more than \$2,300,000 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes. In fact, under the longstanding practice they could have added 10 employees at that price had they seen fit to do so.

Mr. GROSS. I see. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] such time as he may consume.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the conferees has properly identified to the House the contents of the conference report that is before you. As he has so properly stated, there was little difference in the bill as it had been approved by the House and Senate with the exception of the dollar figures with reference to the Library of Congress. These were settled primarily on the basis of a 50 to 50 division.

I think it is well worth noting, as the chairman has so properly identified, the prerogatives of the House were sustained even in the instance relating to the stationery account, so that we have sustained for the future the right of the House to decide on the activities and the expenditures of the House.

I do think it is worth noting that in this year with a very tight budget situation, the final accounting for the House, is still more than \$1 million below the ex-

penditures of last year and approximately \$958,000 below the budget request for this year.

So, in view of these explanations as offered by the chairman, it becomes my pleasure to recommend the conference report to the House for its approval.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many of the amendments reported in technical disagreement relate solely to house-keeping operations of the Senate—which by long and well-founded practice we concur in without debate—and in order to save the time of the House, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 1 through 30, inclusive; and amendments Nos. 33 and 34 be considered en bloc; and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of these amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection. The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, line 1:

"SENATE

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS OF THE SENATE"

On page 2, line 6:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS

"For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, \$3,299,305."

On page 2, line 10:

"MILEAGE OF PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, \$58,370."

On page 2, line 14:

"EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT, AND MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, \$10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, \$3,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, \$3,000; in all, \$16,000."

On page 2, line 19:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized

by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:"

On page 3, line 3:
"OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$235,080."

On page 3, line 5:
"CHAPLAIN
"Chaplain of the Senate, \$15,995."

On page 3, line 7:
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
"For office of the Secretary, \$1,445,745, including \$156,060 required for the purposes specified and authorized by section 74b of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1967, the gross allowance for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office shall be \$204,300; and the gross salary of the Financial Clerk shall be \$25,611 per annum."

On page 3, line 15:
"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES
"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, \$3,486,060."

On page 3, line 19:
"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES
"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$103,320.

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$103,320."

On page 4, line 4:
"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

"For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, \$20,254,000."

On page 4, line 8:
"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$3,878,510: *Provided*, That, effective July 1, 1967, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to employ the following additional employees: one assistant night supervisor at \$2,460 basic per annum; one automatic typing repairman at \$2,880 basic per annum; one mailing equipment repairman at \$2,640 basic per annum; one senior addressograph operator at \$2,400 basic per annum; two addressograph operators at \$2,160 basic per annum each; one offset press operator at \$2,700 basic per annum; two inserting machine operators at \$1,980 basic per annum each; one Captain, Police force, at \$4,320 basic per annum; one Lieutenant, Police force, at \$3,600 basic per annum; four Sergeants, Police force, at \$2,940 basic per annum each; and forty Privates, Police force, at \$2,160 basic per annum each: *Provided further*, That appointees to the Capitol Police force positions authorized

herein shall have the equivalent of at least one year's police experience."

On page 5, line 3:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

"For the offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, \$172,905."

On page 5, line 7:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

"For four clerical assistants, two for the Majority Whip and two for the Minority Whip, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the respective Whips, \$19,080 each; in all \$38,160."

On page 5, line 12:

"OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

"For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$327,575."

On page 5, line 16:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

On page 5, line 17:

"SENATE POLICY COMMITTEES

"For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$211,325 for each such committee; in all, \$422,650."

On page 5, line 21:

"AUTOMOBILES AND MAINTENANCE

"For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President Pro Tempore, one for the Majority Leader, and one for the Minority Leader, \$44,700."

On page 6, line 3:

"FURNITURE

"For service and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, \$31,190: Provided, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

On page 6, line 8:

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including \$404,335 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, \$5,623,265."

On page 6, line 15:

"FOLDING DOCUMENTS

"For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding \$2.32 per hour per person, \$41,900."

On page 6, line 19:

"MAIL TRANSPORTATION

"For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$16,560."

On page 6, line 23:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$4,088,420, including \$365,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961."

On page 7, line 3:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For postage stamps for the offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, \$140; and for airmail and special delivery stamps for the office of the Secretary, \$160; office of the Sergeant at Arms, \$125; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, \$90,400; in all, \$90,825."

On page 7, line 10:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$303,000; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, \$13,200; in all, \$316,200, to remain available until expended."

On page 7, line 15:

"COMMUNICATIONS

"For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U.S.C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U.S.C. 46d-1), \$15,150."

On page 8, line 3:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS"

On page 8, line 4:

"Effective January 1, 1968, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, and the paragraph relating to long-distance telephone calls originating and terminating outside Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress; 2 U.S.C. 46c, 46d), and the paragraph relating to flat rate long-distance telephone service contracts under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1966 (Public Law 80-90; 2 U.S.C. 46d-2) are repealed."

On page 8, line 17:

"Effective January 1, 1968, and thereafter, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls when so designated in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate."

On page 23, line 15:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

"For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at \$1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901; 80 Stat. 299), to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$3,204,900, of which \$470,000 shall remain available until expended."

On page 24, line 5:

"SENATE GARAGE

"For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, \$58,600."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 30, inclusive; and numbers 33 and 34, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report

the remaining amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows: Senate amendment No. 37, page 34, line 10, insert:

SEC. 105. (a) (1) Whenever the rate of compensation of any employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate is fixed or adjusted on or after the effective date of this section, such rate as so fixed or adjusted shall be a single per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$180.

(2) New or changed rates of compensation of any such employees shall be certified in writing to the disbursing office of the Senate on or before the day on which they are to become effective, except that in the case of any change, other than an appointment, to become effective on or after the first day and prior to the tenth day of any month, such certification may be made at any time not later than the tenth day of such month.

(b) The rate of compensation of each employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate which was fixed before the effective date of this section at a basic rate with respect to which additional compensation is payable by law shall be converted as of such date to the lowest per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$180 and which is not less than the aggregate rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation provided by law) which such employee was receiving immediately prior to such date. Any increments of longevity compensation to which an employee became entitled prior to the effective date of this section under section 106(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60j), shall be excluded in converting such employee's rate of compensation under this subsection, but such employee's rate of gross compensation shall be increased by \$540 (which shall be considered to be an increase under such section 106(b)) for each such increment.

(c) In any case in which the rate of compensation of any employee or position, or class of employees or positions, the compensation for which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, or any maximum or minimum rate with respect to any such employee, position, or class, is referred to in or provided by statute or Senate resolution, and the rate so referred to or provided is a basic rate with respect to which additional compensation is provided by law, such statutory provision or resolution shall be deemed to refer, in lieu of such basic rate, to the per annum gross rate which an employee receiving such basic rate immediately prior to the effective date of this section would receive (without regard to such statutory provision or resolution) under subsection (b) on and after such date.

(d) (1) On and after the effective date of this section, the aggregate of the per annum gross rates of compensation of employees in the office of a Senator shall not at any time exceed—

\$190,800 if the population of his State is less than 3,000,000;
 \$203,400 if such population is 3,000,000 but less than 4,000,000;
 \$214,200 if such population is 4,000,000 but less than 5,000,000;
 \$224,100 if such population is 5,000,000 but less than 7,000,000;
 \$234,900 if such population is 7,000,000 but less than 9,000,000;
 \$247,500 if such population is 9,000,000 but less than 10,000,000;
 \$260,100 if such population is 10,000,000 but less than 11,000,000;
 \$272,700 if such population is 11,000,000 but less than 12,000,000;
 \$285,300 if such population is 12,000,000 but less than 13,000,000;
 \$297,900 if such population is 13,000,000 but less than 15,000,000;
 \$310,500 if such population is 15,000,000 but less than 17,000,000; or

\$324,000 if such population is 17,000,000 or more.

(2) Within the limits prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection, Senators may fix the number and the rates of compensation of employees in their respective offices. The salary of an employee in a Senator's office shall not be fixed under this paragraph at a gross rate less than \$1,080 per annum or in excess of \$14,400 per annum, except that (i) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a gross rate of not more than \$18,180 per annum, (ii) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a gross rate of not more than \$22,320 per annum, (iii) the salaries of two employees may be fixed at gross rates of not more than \$23,400 per annum, and (iv) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a gross rate of not more than \$24,480 per annum. A Senator may establish such titles for positions in his office as he may desire to designate, by written notification to the disbursing office of the Senate.

(e) (1) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), the professional staff members of standing committees of the Senate shall receive gross annual compensation, to be fixed by the chairman ranging from \$14,220 to \$22,320.

(2) The rates of gross compensation of the clerical staff of each standing committee of the Senate shall be fixed by the chairman as follows:

(A) for each committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), one chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk at \$6,120 to \$22,320, and not to exceed four other clerical assistants at \$6,120 to \$10,620; and

(B) for the Committee on Appropriations, one chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk and two assistant clerks at \$15,840 to \$22,320; such assistant clerks as may be necessary at \$10,800 to \$15,660; and such other clerical assistants as may be necessary at \$6,120 to \$10,620.

(3) No employee of any standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the conference majority and conference minority of the Senate), or of any joint committee the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, shall be paid at a gross rate in excess of \$22,320 per annum, except that—

(A) two employees of any such committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), who are otherwise authorized to be paid at such rate, may be paid at gross rates not in excess of \$23,400 per annum, and one such employee may be paid at a gross rate not in excess of \$24,480 per annum; and

(B) seventeen employees of the Committee on Appropriations who are otherwise authorized to be paid at such rate, may be paid at gross rates not in excess of \$23,400 per annum, and one such employee may be paid at a gross rate not in excess of \$24,480 per annum.

For the purpose of this paragraph, an employee of a subcommittee shall be considered to be an employee of the full committee.

(f) No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid gross compensation at a rate less than \$1,080 or in excess of \$24,480, unless expressly authorized by law. In any case in which the fixing of any salary rate in multiples as required by this section would result in a rate in excess of the maximum rate specified in this subsection, the rate so fixed shall be reduced to such maximum rate.

(g) The first sentence of section 106(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60j) is amended to read as follows: "An employee to whom this section applies shall be paid during any period of continuous service as such an employee additional gross compensation (hereinafter referred to as "longevity compensation") at the rate of \$50 per annum for each

five years of service performed as such an employee during such period."

(h) Section 5533(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) Except as provided by paragraph (2) of this subsection, unless otherwise authorized by law, appropriated funds are not available for payment to an individual of pay from more than one position if the aggregate amount of the basic pay from the positions exceeds \$2,000 a year, and if—

"(A) the pay of one of the positions is paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of employees receiving basic rates of compensation); or

"(B) one of the positions is under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol.

"(2) Unless otherwise authorized by law, appropriated funds are not available for payment to an individual of pay from more than one position if the aggregate (gross) compensation from the positions exceeds \$5,987 a year, and if the pay of one of the positions is paid by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of employees receiving single per annum rates of compensation)."

(1) (1) The paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" in the provisions relating to the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (2 U.S.C. 72a-4), is repealed.

(2) The paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their offices in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60f), is repealed.

(3) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "Senate" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60a note), is repealed.

(4) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a-1a), is repealed.

(5) The joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate", approved February 19, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 72a-1), as amended, is repealed.

(6) Section 4(f) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, as amended, is repealed.

(j) The rate of compensation of each telephone operator on the United States Capitol telephone exchange and each member of the Capitol Police, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall be converted to a gross rate in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(k) This section shall be effective from and after August 1, 1967.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tabulations.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. 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. 177]

Adams	Gardner	Pepper
Arends	Goodell	Pool
Ayres	Hansen, Wash.	Pucinski
Blatnik	Howard	Rarick
Brown, Calif.	Hungate	Scheuer
Carter	Jacobs	Stuckey
Cederberg	Karth	Teague, Tex.
Celler	King, Calif.	Tiernan
Conyers	Kluczynski	Utt
Daddario	Laird	Watkins
Dawson	Long, La.	Watson
Dent	Long, Md.	Whitener
Diggs	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Dorn	Murphy, Ill.	Wills
Evins, Tenn.	O'Hara, Mich.	Wright
Ford, Gerald R.	Passman	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THE OUTLOOK IS NOT BRILLIANT FOR THE REPUBLICAN BASEBALL TEAM ON WEDNESDAY—OR NO JOY IN MUDVILLE

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I deeply resent the continuing personal attacks of the managers of the Republican Baseball Club upon the pitcher manager of the Democratic Baseball Club and the fine team that he has assembled. This malicious effort is designed to conceal the defects of the miserable faction-ridden aggregation the GOP has assembled. I call on the gentleman from Massachusetts to deny reports that his team has been infiltrated by the "Rat Finks" and/or the John Birch Society.

This is a continuation of the dirty tactics the GOP has always employed in these contests. Just last year I was charged with throwing a beanball at the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan. I confess I thought he was standing too close to the plate, and I was trying to get a message to him to move back. But I love the minority leader, and I would not deliberately throw a beanball at him, last year or this year.

I pledge that on Wednesday next at the District of Columbia Stadium a beating will be administered to this miserable GOP club that will be long remembered in the annals of sports. I challenge this organization now to hit either one of my two new pitches. They hit the "Great Society gopher ball" last year, but I defy them to hit the "Romney fade-away." This is a pitch, Mr. Speaker, which starts out in a high trajectory, then appears to change position several times on the way to the plate, and then dives firmly into the turf. I challenge them to hit the "Nixon slider," a sneaky pitch which always comes in inside and low.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the members of the Democratic club to support their pitcher this year, to back him up, and give him support. Let there be no unearned runs. I invite Members of this House to witness this slaughter which will occur on Wednesday night.

RAT EXTERMINATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 749, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 749

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11000) to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the Nation develop and carry out intensive local programs of rat control and extermination. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, 30 minutes, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 749 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11000 to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the Nation develop and carry out intensive local programs of rat control and extermination.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can have a lot of fun with this bill. I am sure there will be humor injected into the matter throughout the debate. Some may call it the second "antiriot" bill. Others may call it the civil rats bill. Still others may insist that we should make this applicable to two-legged rats as well as four-legged ones. And there may be those who claim that this is throwing money down a rathole. But, Mr. Speaker, in the final

analysis there is a serious side to this proposed legislation.

The need for this legislation is clearly evident in the fact that last year, in seven cities alone in the United States there were approximately 1,000 reported cases of ratbite. There is reason to believe that the actual statistics are much higher because many persons are reluctant to report ratbite incidents, and many units of local and State government do not require such reports. Only 2 days ago, it was reported by the news media that an 8-month-old boy was bitten to death by rats right here in our Nation's Capital. What a shame that we should allow such a thing to happen in any of our cities or towns in the world's most affluent nation.

In addition to the disease-carrying threat which these pesky animals pose, they, in fact, cause enormous damage to both food and property. It has been estimated that there are at least 90 million rats in the United States and that each causes an average of \$10 damage per year. This means a national loss of \$900 million to the rats every year, unless we do something about it.

The conditions which breed rats, as well as the techniques for removing these conditions, are now well known. However, there remains a critical need to allocate sufficient public financial and technical resources to these problems and to undertake remedial measures on an intensive and continuing basis. Because no present Federal program or combination of Federal programs can assist a locality to undertake, separately, the whole needed combination of rat control activities, it is believed that the proper Federal role in this problem is the provision of Federal grant assistance, limited in time but comprehensive in scope.

H.R. 11000 would authorize Federal assistance to cover two-thirds of the cost of 3-year local programs for rat extermination and control. The grants would be made to local governments, and the bill requires that the community have an approved workable program in order to be eligible for such aid. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who would make the grants, would be required to cooperate and consult with other departments which have responsibilities related to the problem of rat control. Appropriations of \$20 million would be authorized for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 to make these grants. In view of the savings in property damages and the relief in human misery, which are sure to result, this legislation may be properly considered as a worthwhile investment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 749 in order that H.R. 11000 may be considered.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe the gentleman said that there are some 90 million rats in the United States of the four-legged variety. I do not know how many others there may be.

Is that correct; 90 million rats?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It has been esti-

mated by three experts in the area of rat control that there are approximately 90 million rats, or a minimum of that many. The Department of the Interior estimated it to be about 100 million, and the World Health Organization has estimated that there is a rat for every person in the world. The gentleman can take his choice.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman imply that with the passage of this \$40 million bill we are then going to embark upon rat killing around the world?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Not around the world. This bill would be confined to the United States, to cities, townships, and communities within our own country.

Mr. GROSS. I have read the hearings fairly carefully. I do not know whether the gentleman has or not. Nowhere do I find any evidence as to who took the rat census in the United States, much less in the world.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The experts in this area did.

Mr. GROSS. Who are the experts?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. There are three of them.

I cannot think of the names of them right now. I can give them to the gentleman later, if the gentleman will permit. But the report will show too—perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee might be able to help me in this instance.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question—and I think it is a very good question—this census, more or less, was taken by D. E. Davis, of the Department of Zoology of Pennsylvania State University, at the seminar on rodents which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 24–28, 1966, and sponsored by the World Health Organization.

They indicated at that time, as the gentleman has pointed out, that there were over 100 million rats in the United States alone.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of city rats. What about country rats?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The country rats are being taken care of under existing programs.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

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

Mr. BARRETT. I would like to tell the gentleman from Iowa, because he is so very enthusiastic about this type of program, they do have an agricultural program directed toward rat extermination, and there is also a program in the Department of the Interior. They are doing a fairly good job on this problem, but are not doing a consistent job.

Mr. Speaker, what we are after here is a continuity of rat control in the cities in order to exterminate the rats.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the query of the gentleman from Iowa as to what kind of expert it was who estimated that there were 90 million rats in the United States, I would refer the gentleman from Iowa to page 2 of the report where it is said that it has been conservatively estimated there are at least 90 million rats in the United States. This was a conservative expert.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that the gentleman has suddenly turned conservative, if he has.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder sometime if some of our distinguished committees that bring before us a monstrosity such as this, would just take into consideration the fact that we have a lot of cat lovers in the Nation, and why not just buy some cats and turn them loose on the rats and thereby we could take care of this situation, without any \$25 million from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would support such a program, if the gentleman from Florida will introduce such a bill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on page 11 of the report there is a figure specified for expenditures for rat control which is currently contained in the OEO in the amount of \$2,373,671, which was a pilot program in the city of Chicago.

Now, has that program succeeded in doing away with the rat population in the city of Chicago?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would withhold that question until general debate so that members of the committee may answer it for the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii, but I would hope we never get to general debate. However, I withhold the question for the time being.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], that this matter does have a serious side, and I hasten to point out that the serious side of this piece of legislation is the sum of \$20 million for fiscal year 1968 and for fiscal year 1969, another \$20 million, and Lord knows how much thereafter, because this program does not terminate after 2 years. This is the beginning of an all-new program.

Mr. Speaker, every person with experience in this Congress well knows that when these programs start, future years bring greater and greater appropriations. This will be only the beginning.

I say to my colleagues, in view of the fiscal situation facing this country today, this is one program we can do without. This Congress has already raised

the debt ceiling during this session in order to be able to meet its financial responsibilities. We are now to face the possibility of a surtax ranging from six percent to 10 percent. The President of the United States is going to send a surtax message to the Congress. He has been talking about it since the first of the year, and I wager that before the end of this Congress, it will be up here, and you and I will be faced with the question of saddling our constituents, the taxpayers of this country, if you please, with a new tax.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that here is a request for \$20 million for 1968 and \$20 million for 1969, that we can refuse.

Mr. Speaker, there is still some local responsibility remaining in this country and the killing of rats is one of them. This is not a national matter.

There is also some responsibility on the part of individual citizens. Certainly the Federal Government cannot, and should not, fulfill every need or wish of every one of its citizens. Our tax structure cannot stand it. The matter of putting out a little bit of rat poison should not be requested of the Federal Government.

We already have rodent control programs for specific purposes. We have a rodent control program in the Department of the Interior, a rodent control program in the Department of Agriculture, there is a pilot program in HEW, even though they do not want to admit it, out in San Francisco. They have not been known for their success.

Here is what they have been doing in the Department of Agriculture for the farmer—whom this administration seems to have completely forgotten—and the farmer is losing millions and millions of dollars each year to rodents. Here is what they have been doing for the farmers in the State of Illinois. In 1966 the Department of Agriculture spent through the ASCS office the grand total of \$700. In the State of Iowa, in 1966, they expended the grand sum of \$300.

In Nebraska, in 1966, the Department of Agriculture expended the grand total of \$665 through the ASCS program on rodent control, if you please. Anyone familiar with the farmers' plight knows full well they are suffering a loss figured in the millions of dollars every year, but not one single dime—not one single dime of this \$20 million is going to be spent to reduce this loss of the American farmers.

Now, who is getting short-changed? Who is getting short-changed by this administration?

The rat bill before us came to this Congress in a Presidential recommendation, if you please.

It seems to me, my colleagues, that here is a matter, that could be laid aside until the fiscal situation in this country has brightened. Certainly when we are expending the billions of dollars that we are in Vietnam, we can lay this proposal aside. If there is any local responsibility on the part of local government remaining, this proposal can be laid aside. If the individual has any responsibility remaining, we can lay this matter aside. The individual does not want to pay for a new rat control program at this time

with all of the costly new Federal employees to be employed to put out rat poison that the individual citizen could put out for himself.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is extremely broad and the sky is the limit. I call your attention to the bill itself.

On page 2, line 10, it says:

(2) the elimination or modification of physical surroundings and conditions (including rat harborages and food supplies) which encourage or tend to encourage persistent rat habitation and increases in their numbers; and

It reads, "the elimination or modification of physical surroundings." This, if you please, can mean a building. They could move in and tear down a building under this legislation.

Oh, it might be denied that they have that intent and purpose, but I have been around here long enough to know that if you give the bureaucrats the general language, they are going to interpret it and use it any way they see fit.

I say to you, that here is a piece of legislation that this country can do without. When the time comes when you and I are asked to vote for a surtax ranging from 6 to 10 percent, we will be asking ourselves whether it was wise for this Congress today to be taking its time considering legislation local in nature and not as pressing as some of the national problems facing this Congress.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a very clear statement on how this rat bill discriminates against a lot of rats in this country. The committee report also shows that the bill discriminates against 97½ percent of the rats.

But I think the most profound statement the gentleman made is the fact that it does set up a new bureau and sets up possibly a commissioner on rats or an administrator of rats and a bunch of new bureaucrats on rats. There is no question but that there will be a great demand for a lot of rat patronage. I think by the time we get through taking care of all of the bureaucrats in this new rat bureau along with the waste and empire building, none of the \$40 million will be left to take care of the 2½ percent of the rats who were supposed to be covered in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think the "rat smart thing" for us to do is to vote down this rat bill "rat now."

Mr. LATTI. I may say to the gentleman that when he raises the question of discriminating between city and country rats, it also discriminates against persons suffering from bites from other animals.

Forgetting about the rodents for a moment, it was mentioned by the gentleman from Hawaii that we have over 1,000 rat bite cases in the United States in a year's time.

How about the snake bite cases?

If we are going to start eradicating all the rats—how about snakes in the West? How about bugs? You can go into homes and apartment buildings here in the city of Washington and find bugs galore.

What are you going to do about the bugs? Are we to forget about the people bitten by bugs? Should we start a bug corps?

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

Mr. LATTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Do I remember correctly that the gentleman now in the well appeared before the Subcommittee in Interior Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations complaining about the fact that not enough money was being spent on blackbird control and urging and begging for very sizable sums of money for blackbird control, and making no mention of the fiscal problem or local initiative.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is absolutely correct but the figure requested was small compared to the amount in this bill. Blackbirds are migratory and create a national rather than a local problem. I pointed out, and the Department of Interior pointed out, that our American farmers are losing some \$58 million a year in crops due to blackbird damage.

Mr. JOELSON. This report states it is estimated that a billion dollars a year is being lost through rat damage.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I do not know too much about birds and snakes but I think I would support the gentleman in his attempt to control birds, particularly blackbirds, in this country, because I understand that blackbirds do a tremendous job in eradicating snakes.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On the matter of rat bites, it would be interesting to know, how many children are bitten by squirrels that they feed and try to handle. On the basis of that does anyone suggest a program to exterminate squirrels?

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman raises a question which indicates that the bill has a lot of possibilities for amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is so ludicrous that we should not even entertain the rule. We should vote down the rule on this bill, and it is my hope the House will do just that.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has so well said, Congress will soon be confronted with another Federal tax increase. Soon we will receive a tax bill requesting an increase of somewhere between 6 percent and 10 percent. It could be even higher. Today we are being asked to ladle out \$40 million, unknown as to the future, but for the next 2 years \$20 million a year for rat extermination, something the people of this country, the municipalities, and other subdivisions of government, ought to do themselves instead of passing it on to the busted Federal Treasury.

We are asked to raise the debt ceiling, to raise taxes, and yet embark upon another bureaucratic program that is a re-

sponsibility which ought to be discharged by the people themselves.

I have spent some time trying to find evidence to back up this request for \$40 million. I do not know of a legislative committee in Congress that has a larger staff than the Committee on Banking and Currency, yet in the index of the hearings I can find only one reference to rat extermination, and that is to page 39 of the hearings, if I remember correctly.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. I refer the gentleman to the hearings that covered 2 weeks, and particularly the testimony we had around April 20. Many of those who testified in that 2-week period testified on the subject of rat extermination.

Mr. GROSS. I would think that with the staff that you have on this committee, one of the biggest in the House of Representatives, you would tell us where we could find that evidence instead of having to read every line and every word of wholly unrelated testimony in an attempt to find the pertinent material. The only reference, so far as I could find, in your index, is to page 39. Why did you not give us a little help so that we could find what we need to understand what you are trying to do?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield briefly.

Mr. BARRETT. Certainly it would never be my purpose to tell the distinguished gentleman what to do and what to read, because he is one of the most knowledgeable men in the House. But I do want to call your attention to this. We are asking \$40 million to save the buying public \$1 billion.

Mr. GROSS. You can make that speech on your own time. I thought you were going to tell me why you did not refer us to the rat extermination testimony in connection with this bill.

There is a so-called expert running around over the country by the name, I believe, of Leonard Czarniecki. I suppose he is going to be the high cockalorum of the rat corps extermination program, or whatever it is. I do not find in the hearing record a single reference to him. His name does not appear in the hearing index. Why did you not have this so-called expert, who is pushing out publicity over the country in behalf of this \$40 million expenditure, to come before the committee? Or did you have him? The silence seems to indicate you did not.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I can tell you that we had some very fine experts before the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Did you have this Czarniecki individual before your committee? He is apparently set up "to rule the roost" so far as rats are concerned?

Mr. BARRETT. We had the Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of HUD who testified and he is the HUD staff

technician. You will find those figures, I am sure, in the testimony.

Mr. GROSS. I am constrained to believe the program is devised to take care of some more broken down political hacks.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has read the bill, he has to know we are talking about local programs. That is the requirement under the legislation. We are not talking about the establishment of a high commissioner or anything of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. Who is going to run it, there is not going to be a high commissioner or administrator of the rat corps?

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a very modest program.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is—at \$40 million. I have heard that before. Now let me use a little of my time, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean to suggest to the House that in the absence of any legislation to provide for the establishment of a new bureau, that there would in fact be a new bureau created?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I see three names on the bill. I wonder if I can assume that the rat problems of the country are in New Jersey, Texas, and Pennsylvania? Can it be that this is where the rat infestation is heaviest?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield very briefly to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to prevent infant mortality, unnecessary infant mortality, and for the health and protection of the people.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can make that speech if he wants to on his own time.

I am trying to get information as to who is responsible for this monstrosity. I noticed in the paper last night that there is a Peace Corps contingent from Argentina in this country. We are the underdeveloped, the underprivileged country now. The Argentines have invaded us with a Peace Corps, and they apparently are going to hold forth in two of the most underdeveloped and underprivileged areas of the country, in Los Angeles, Calif., and in Boston, Mass.

I would like to suggest that whoever is running the Argentine Peace Corps in the United States—and we are financing it in this country—should assign the members to clean out the rats in Boston and Los Angeles. I believe this would be an excellent undertaking for them and would save the taxpayers of this country some part of the \$40 million that is proposed to be spent.

I will have amendments to offer to this bill if it gets past the rule. It ought to be defeated without further loss of time.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything this country does not need to be plastered with at this time it is a rat killing deal at a cost of \$40 million and no one knows how many more millions after the next 2 years.

It is time for fiscal sanity, not insanity.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Before this bill becomes too funny, I would like to say a few words for it. I am in support of this bill, Mr. Speaker. When I first came to this Congress I asked the Library of Congress how much money this Nation had spent on defense in its history. They put some Ph. D.'s to work on the subject, and after 3 months replied that at that time—13 years ago—we had spent more than \$1 trillion on defense. I observed the other day, when we had the Defense appropriation bill—which as I recall was for more than \$75 billion—there was only one person who voted "No."

I would like to point out to those who may not be aware of it or to those who may have forgotten it, that rats are Johnny-come-latelys to recorded history. They were unknown in the ancient cities of the world. They came in out of the Arabian deserts about the 12th century, and from that day to this they have killed more human beings than all of the generals in the world combined. They have made Genghis Khan, Hitler, and all the other men look like pikers. Man has attempted to kill them and he has won a few battles, but he has lost the war.

The only enemy that has ever really killed rats is other rats.

For the benefit of those who may not know it, the average rat lives 3 years. It has a rootless tooth that grows 29½ inches in those 3 years. They have been known to cut through 4 feet of reinforced concrete.

All of the methods that one could possibly use cannot conceivably kill off more than 98 percent of the rats in one block. If there are left two males and 10 females, there will be 3,000 rats in 1 year to replace those that have been killed.

Perhaps Members think it does not make any real difference, and perhaps they think this is really a local problem, that it is a family problem, and why not get some rat poison and kill the rats in the household?

I should like to remind the Members who sit here in this body that they eat in restaurants night after night after night, and that all that can be done in this Capitol cannot control the rat population.

Rats are a living cargo of death. Their tails swish through sewers and over that food we eat. Their stomachs are filled with tularemia, amebic dysentery. They carry the most deadly diseases, and some think it is funny. Some do not want to spend \$40 million.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to spend \$79 billion to try to kill off a few Vietcong, believe me I would spend \$40 million to kill off the most devastating enemy man has ever had.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11000, a bill to provide \$20 million of Fed-

eral financial assistance to help cities and communities develop and carry out rat control programs, represents a most significant legislative attempt to meet the challenge of an unbelievable problem in our modern industrial age. That rats infest our cities in almost overwhelming numbers in the year 1967, reminiscent of medieval civilization, should arouse the indignation of any citizen to such a point that he would act affirmatively to erase this very dark blot on our society.

As in other large cities, the rat problem in Cleveland is growing. It has progressed to a stage where Federal assistance is imperative. Rat infestation has spread throughout the core of Cleveland proper. Hough, Glenville, Central, and the near west side areas are all badly infested with rats. The fringe areas too have now been affected. The 1962 survey conducted by the Public Health Service revealed that 38 percent of the cities showed a sizable rat population; 1967 surveys, as recently as months ago, involving 132 blocks and 5,500 different properties located throughout Cleveland show that the percentage has increased to 60 percent.

Cleveland averages well over 50 rat bites a year. This figure is low because many persons are reluctant to report such incidents and also because many doctors, totally unfamiliar with the rat bite, do not recognize it. Obviously, rats pose an ominous disease-carrying threat. Were an epidemic to arise, it would quickly spread throughout the city. The great number of rats present also cause great property damage. In 1962, the damage in Cleveland was estimated to be approximately \$2,000,000. This figure has risen to \$3,000,000 annually. These destructive rodents chew up doors, walls, floors, woodwork, undermine foundations both interior and exterior, and undermine sidewalks and streets.

Finally, rat infestation has a tremendous demoralizing effect on the populace in these areas. They are reluctant to admit that rats exist and, thus, frequently do not cooperate with the Federal and State authorities in eliminating the menace. They are reluctant to repair or improve their property, for they know all too well that the rats soon will destroy it again. When the slightly above poverty level or average income neighborhoods become infested, the inhabitants move further out of the central city, thus accelerating the cancerous spread of deteriorated housing.

Under the auspices of Mr. Stephen Chorvat, chief of the bureau of neighborhood conservation, the public health service in Cleveland has been working diligently to contain and eliminate the rats. However, the present lack of manpower and facilities has made the task insurmountable. Cleveland has seven neighborhood sanitarians and 14 sanitarian aides fighting the city's millions of rats. They estimate a need for 25 sanitarians and 100 aides, as well as such additional equipment to exterminate these rodents.

The Federal Government must assist the States to help local governing bodies to undertake truly effective rat control

programs. H.R. 11000 will do this. Therefore, I strongly urge the careful consideration and support for this essential legislation.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is another one of President Johnson's economy-in-Government schemes, although it is hard to try to label this as a reduction in domestic spending. In fact, it rings pretty hollow after the most recent gesture of L. B. J. when he "urges across the board cuts of 15 percent." How in the world does spending \$40,000,000 chasing rats assist in trying to reduce the greatest deficit in history—now predicted at about \$30 billion for fiscal 1968?

Some of us here in this body have been around long enough to remember when the American people were willing to exercise a little bit of initiative and personal resourcefulness and solve local problems on a local level. In fact they were frequently resolved on a personal basis, and Washington was not troubled with dotting every "i" and crossing every "t". The well-known television commercial, "Please, Mother, I would rather do it myself," was a source of pride and personal satisfaction. But, not if L. B. J. has his way.

The committee report claims "many children" are attacked, "maimed and even killed by rats, as an everyday occurrence." Come, now, let us have some supporting information. I am sure if rats were killing children every day, all of us would have heard something about it. The report goes on to say Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Cleveland have all recently averaged over 50 ratbites per year. Golly, almost one a week—so, spend \$40 million.

The committee admits there are a number of Federal agencies already involved in programs for rat control, but, since many cities lack adequate refuse collection service, we better bribe the local officials to do their jobs, and create a new separate program. Of course, as usual, Federal control goes hand in hand with the Federal money and HUD established the program, an approved workable program required by the Secretary, and as an added incentive, to provide employment opportunities for residents in the rat-infested areas.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, some have heard that the White House has a stable of "thinkers" whose job it is to dream up new schemes, and this one sure fits the pattern. Just to make sure, my home city and county figures were obtained in an effort to check the urgency of this legislation. We have a population in excess of 800,000 people. The health commissioner for Columbus, Ohio, reported a total of 75 ratbites during all of 1966 and 1967, including those sustained in experimental laboratories. It was estimated there could be 2½ or 3 million rats in the country, although nobody seems to know who counted them. In any event, another report indicates last year there were 406 bites from "warm mammals." I guess this includes dogs, cats, people, and so forth, in the country, and it appears to be eight or nine times greater than the rat bites. But, so far, nobody has suggested a multimillion program to exterminate these.

Inquiry through local dealers indicates rattraps—not mousetraps—sell for \$3.30 per dozen or about 28 cents each. A pretty fair brand of cheese costs 49 cents per pound and would bait 35 traps. So, for an extremely small personal investment, nearly every citizen could cooperate and eliminate this problem, and at the same time, save their Government \$40 million. Would not this seem to be a wise step, particularly when the President and his advisers are calling on all Americans for more taxes to pay for the costs of Government?

Finally, one of our respected colleagues tells me he has about 23 cats in and around his barns, all of which he will make available to HUD, without charge. These feline ratcatchers are most effective, particularly since they are led by a highly respected tomcat called Cotton that has earned a most enviable reputation in the ratcatching department.

Seriously, here is an excellent opportunity for the President, the administration, the Congress, to do more than pay lipservice to reducing Federal spending, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill known as H.R. 11000.

The following editorial appeared in the June 27, 1967, Wall Street Journal, and deserves the attention of our colleagues:

DOWN THE RATHOLE

If there happen to be any cities around which have no rats, surely they will begin to find some now.

For the House Banking and Currency Committee, by the overwhelming vote of 22 to 6, has approved a three-year, \$40 million program to eradicate and control rats in urban areas.

In the first fiscal year, beginning July 1, the Government would provide \$20 million, and for the next fiscal year an equal amount. Not until the third year would cities be asked to share the cost, paying \$2 for every Federal \$1.

There is no doubt that in many urban areas, and in slums in particular, the rat population is large. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has, it developed at the committee hearing, a rat expert, Leonard Czarniecki, who puts the nation's rat total at 90 million. Which may be conservative; some exterminators number three rats for every human being.

And it is hard to measure in dollars the damage they cause, or to estimate the disease peril they present. In New York, rat bites among slum children unfortunately are not uncommon.

We seem to remember, though, that some years ago when Richmond, Va., found itself being overrun by rats, the city fathers voted money to hire exterminators, and if they did not rid the city of the rodents they at least succeeded in controlling them.

But that was a long time ago, when municipalities were so naive as to believe that their own rats were their own problem.

It is a new day now. Now, it takes a Federal Government program to kill urban rats, at \$6 per head, or so estimates Mr. Czarniecki.

The House, we are sure, is just as concerned about rats as is its committee. But we hope it will take a little harder look at this \$40 million rathole to see if, after all, it is not the business of the cities themselves to plug it.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 11000, the Rat Extermination Act of 1967, is one of the most humane and compassionate bills

ever to be considered by this body. The rat menace which afflicts our urban areas is a shocking disgrace to our Nation, whose affluence is the wonder of the modern world.

This bill would provide the Federal aid our cities need to come to grips with this terrible problem. Frankly, it is incredible to me that any of our colleagues can oppose this bill. Even if they represent high-income suburban areas or areas where rats are not a serious menace to health and safety, they must know in their hearts that in every city in America, particularly in the slums and blighted sections, that talk about the rat problem is not an academic exercise but a grave matter which haunts day-to-day existence. The people in these areas face the threat of diseases borne by rats, they fear for their children's safety in the night, and they experience the disgust—and yes, the horror—of the constant presence of these noxious, vicious, disease-carrying animals.

We must act and act now to rid our cities of this ghastly threat to decent and safe living. And we must provide substantial Federal aid to get the job done because, as everyone knows, our cities do not have the financial resources and the tax sources to even carry on their present level of municipal activities.

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed an unfortunate tendency among a number of people when this bill is discussed to indulge in jesting remarks, puns, and supposedly comical cliches. Let me assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that in many of the areas of our cities this is no laughing or joking matter. It is a matter of the utmost seriousness and gravity. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing funny about rats and rat bites.

In the minority views of our committee report, the point is made that the funds authorized in this bill will be able to finance an intensified attack on rats in areas having a population of, and I quote, "only 5 million." I wish that the bill contained a larger authorization because the more money we authorize, the more rats we will exterminate. The \$40 million authorized to cover 3-year programs was all we believed to be practically achievable. But let us not belittle a program that will offer the hope of ending the rat menace for 5 million human beings. Mr. Speaker, we should bear in mind that these 5 million people are the very millions who live in precisely the neighborhoods where the rat problem is most intense.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beseech and beg my colleagues from the bottom of my heart to vote overwhelmingly for this great, compassionate, and humane program for rat extermination which President Johnson recommended and which our committee endorsed.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested information on annual bites from the health department in Nassau County, N.Y., a part of which county I represent.

The following bites are documented and I list them for the interest of the opponents and proponents of the legislation before us.

Bites by—	
Dogs	5,779
Cats	323
Hamsters	123
Squirrels	73
Rabbits	51
Monkeys	19
Horses	18
Mice	39
Raccoon	7
Gerbils (desert rodent)	5
Possum	4
Chipmunk	4
Guinea pig	4
Bear	1
Mole	1
Chinchilla	1
Woodchuck	1

There were no wild rat bites and 16 bites by experiment-test rats.

In 1963 there was noted one llama bite.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the American people, of a certainty, are against rats; but this bill, which makes control of rats a Federal responsibility, reaches the height of absurdity. Rat control is certainly a local community responsibility. The immediate cost of this legislation if enacted would cost \$20 million for the first year, and would only take care of one-half of 1 percent of our 18,000 communities. Needless to say, this would only be a foot in the door.

Every year the Federal Government would spend more and more money to control rats. Other branches of the Government are already involved in rat control. The Office of Economic Opportunity is spending over \$2 million on merely a pilot project for rat control in Chicago; Health, Education, and Welfare, and General Services Administration also have rat control programs. If the Government expanded its rat program to give equal protection from rats to all communities in the country, it would come to over a billion dollars a year. Next, if the State planners have their way, will come pigeon, starling, English sparrow, roach, and flea control activities.

I am well aware that the liberal left, who would have the Government care for everyone and also have the Government dominate everyone's lives, will accuse those of us who do not want the Government in the rat control business of being for rats. I certainly want to eliminate rats but a Federal bureau certainly is not the answer. Now, I do not believe the Federal Government should pay for haircuts but this does not mean I am for beatniks. Neither do I believe the Government should buy soap for everyone, but this does not indicate I am against bathing.

This bill also contemplates that the Federal Government will become involved in the garbage control business to control rats. Garbage control certainly is important but placing the control of the garbage collection in a Federal bureaucracy would probably be a victory for the rats. We know dogs and cats turn over garbage cans, and we know that our own personal failures to put lids on garbage cans contributes to the rat menace. So, then, we know what we will have to do if under this, or similar legislation, the Government takes on garbage disposal as one of its activities, and your neighbor leaves his garbage cans in a mess: pick up the phone, call the De-

partment of Housing and Urban Development—Code 202-393-4160.

When I was a boy, I did not realize it was the Federal Government's responsibility to eliminate rats. We did it ourselves.

I intend to vote against this bill and against the gradual encroachment of the Federal Government into the personal affairs of everyone, and, in turn, insisting upon the absolute control of the lives of all.

We who vote against this bill are well aware that we will be accused of being for rats, and against people. However, most of us were willing to face that baseless charge, in order to keep our Government from being financially ruined to the point where it cannot carry out its true responsibilities. I trust that the bureaucrats who are so eager to do everything for us will leave us a few pleasures and duties to perform for ourselves.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it surprises me somewhat that no one has rallied to the defense of the rat during the discussion of this bill before the House to spend \$40 million over the next 2 years for local rat control programs. Certainly there must be someone who sees this as a threat to a species of wildlife.

In my State of South Dakota, the Interior Department has been conducting a program to control predatory animals which each year do millions of dollars of damage to the agricultural economy. To be sure, the program has been lukewarm and half-hearted from the start, but what little control has been mustered is continually shackled at every turn by those who see these controls as a threat to the predators.

I have just recently heard from several sheepmen in my district who have suffered great losses because of cutbacks in the Interior program. Many have had to take protective measures on their own. The opponents, of course, do not see the millions of dollars ruined each year. They do not see South Dakota's dwindling pheasant population which has been decimated by predators. This, in turn, has dried up a \$25 million sport hunting economy in the State.

Where are these people now that we are trying to exterminate the rats? Certainly we cannot interfere with "nature's balance," or possible extinction of this species of animal. It would seem if we can spend \$40 million on rat control, it is high time to beef up our predatory animal controls as well.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill with some misgivings. This legislation, although a mere drop in the bucket, constitutes a real breakthrough for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Heretofore, the only bills HUD has sent to Congress have proposed all kinds of tricky housing schemes designed to subsidize the rents of a favored few or to break up existing residential patterns.

For example, only a few weeks ago, I noticed that the "demonstration cities" program is being used as a vehicle to move slum dwellers to the suburbs—at least according to the New York Times—because Congress did not take all the loopholes out of the bill.

Perhaps some of you noticed that Secretary Weaver told the Senate Housing Subcommittee that Newark's rioting means that we have to vote more money for rent subsidies and demonstration cities. Evidently, Dr. Weaver believes that the tranquility of this Nation will be best served by moving the slums to the suburbs—putting a sniper in every subdivision. I seriously doubt that the people of this country agree.

However, I do want to praise HUD for recommending this bill because it is the first HUD bill which is not a payoff to the big builders or a gravy train for ivory tower social planners.

This rat bill is a bold step forward for HUD policy. Many of these rats HUD wants to exterminate have grown fat on liberal benevolence. Many of these same rats were born in slums financed by welfare handouts and perpetuated by proslumlord Democratic Federal tax policies.

I have introduced an antislumlord tax bill which would deny tax breaks to all slums not in compliance with local health and building ordinances. Although the idea has won approval from top architects and planners, I have not heard one word from Dr. Weaver in support of this measure.

For too many years, local city Democratic administrations have been giving tax breaks to slumlords. These same rats that HUD now wants to kill off spent their underprivileged childhoods nourishing themselves on garbage left uncollected by local city Democratic administrations. These same rats hid in darkness perpetuated by payola-ridden Democratic building departments.

For these reasons, I am sure America's rats are going to be bitterly resentful that this administration has turned on them after all these many years.

Perhaps HUD turned against these rats when they started biting rioters. If they had bitten policemen, nothing would have happened.

Frankly, after reading the newspapers and watching television during the past week, I do not think that the problem in the slums is four-legged rats—I think that the problem is the two-legged rats—the two-legged snipers and murderers who beat policemen to death with their own guns.

I will support this bill because it is a step in the right direction in our fight to improve the physical conditions in our slum areas.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation suggests an inadequate and improper solution to a serious problem.

The problems of local government should not be attacked in this halfway, piecemeal fashion by the Federal Government.

In passing, may I point out that here again the tools of authority and responsibility of State government are totally ignored as the Central Government in Washington attempts to act as the sole mother hen of local government.

And again this legislation suggests a further proliferation of grant-in-aid programs, with Washington establishing priorities and criteria rather than local government officials, who know the most

about it, establishing these local priorities and criteria as they were elected to do. Here indeed is a good illustration of the need to replace these grant-in-aid programs and Federal administration with the more workable concept of tax sharing, whereby local and State governments would receive not only funds, but a return of their local responsibility.

If this bill passes, we will have to borrow another \$40 million at high rates just for the first 2 years, and for just 100 local areas. If the program were actually to be expanded in an attempt to destroy every rat in America, at least temporarily, the program would have to be expanded to 800 local areas at least, with the costs so astronomical as to be beyond the merely ridiculous.

I know we have to help eliminate the conditions which breed rats. I know that the filth of outside garbage facilities in many areas of this country are almost beyond comprehension. Perhaps closed paper bags are the answer, along with progress in garbage collection and useful application of garbage, accompanied by a better use of the police power. However, this is a local matter. This Federal program, piecemeal and inadequate, is wrong.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Texas and other Members who are sponsoring and supporting H.R. 11000 have, in my opinion, done our Nation a great service. While our minds have been filled with such common problems as the war in Vietnam, the national debt, a deficit that may approach \$30 billion, race riots, and the Middle East crisis, we are warned of an undetected and obviously neglected emergency, the war on rats.

I would not wish, Mr. Speaker, to go on record as a defender either of the four-legged rats whose future would be in clear jeopardy or of the two-legged tailless variety who, unfortunately, would escape the all-out effort called for in this bill.

I just believe that existing rat control programs can, with the cooperation of the American people, do the job that needs to be done. I do not believe that we need a Federal rat control program. If rats have become a growing problem or a national program, I suggest that our President call for increased vigilance on the part of those responsible for rat control and voluntary action on the part of individuals and groups across the Nation.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that one of our most serious urban problems is the growing tendency to do little or nothing about our environment. Millions sit and grow fat surrounded by ugliness and filth that could be eliminated by even a modest amount of personal pride and industry. Too many of our people are ready to let the Federal Government fight their battles. I am willing that this be the case in some matters, but I prefer to fight my own war on rats. Our Government's performance in some other wars suggests that this war on rats might not be won in 2 years. It is conceivable that a stalemate might develop with neither victory nor a negotiated peace. Since the war involves widespread destruction of habitats enjoyed by the rat

population, it could also end up costing more than the bill calls for.

Promoters identify this rat crisis as a health problem. But this war would be directed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Would we be starting yet another war between this Department and various local health departments who are also fighting wars on rats?

When I was a boy, wars were fought against gophers, rats, and coyotes by placing a bounty on tails brought in. We did not make a lot of money, but we carried on the wars with relentless enthusiasm, developing all sorts of ingenious traps and, incidentally, keeping out of trouble.

The youth of many of our cities are bored nearly to death. Some are responding to the call of race wars and riots. Let us sound the alarm, calling on responsible local leaders and organizations to mount voluntary campaigns against this growing national hazard. Let us join forces and fight rats, not each other.

Mr RYAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11000, the Rat Extermination Act of 1967, is important. It is difficult to believe that anyone can be against the extermination of rats. What can be said in favor of rats? They have, directly and indirectly, killed more human beings than have been killed in all the wars since the beginning of time. Today, in New York City, over 700 rat bites are reported yearly. The rat depends on us for his food and shelter and, therefore, by a concentrated effort, can be eradicated at our will.

It is unfortunate that we have never made the concerted effort to change the physical surroundings and conditions which encourage persistent rat habitation and increase their numbers. It is indeed an unhappy fact that Congress has failed to take the steps necessary to eradicate the slums in our country. It is a tragedy that our greatest cities have ghetto areas in which some buildings, meant to be homes for human beings, have more rats living in them than people.

I hope that H.R. 11000 will be adopted and that Congress will begin to appropriate the funds needed for an effective rat control program.

However, rats are only one of the problems of our cities' slums. Rats and the diseases carried by them are inimical to health, but can one say they are any worse than the other evils characteristic of our urban slums. Is child malnutrition a lesser evil? Is juvenile delinquency of lower priority? Is the solving of drug addiction something we can afford to postpone? Can we wait until later to raise substandard housing conditions to an acceptable level; to eliminate widespread unemployment; to get high school dropouts to go back to school; to create adequate recreation facilities? Are we going to wait until riots flare up in each of our cities? Until the urban ghettos declare war on the rest of the country? It seems that it is the sense of the 90th Congress to indeed wait; to wait until our commitment in Southeast Asia has ended and then to wait some more. Mr. Speaker, I think the 90th Congress has a mandate to act now. A mandate com-

ing from the elections of 1964 and again 1966. The summer riots are only proof of the urgency of this mandate.

Although the rat extermination bill will only be really adequate if it is enacted in conjunction with a massive legislative attack aimed at eliminating the slums, its purposes are nonetheless in the interest of all Americans to whom rats are a recurrent problem. The rat is not just a symbol of poverty. It is one of the cruelest manifestations of the urban slum. For the mother who has to leave her young children alone in her house, the rat is a danger that the mother thinks about in dread. For the family on welfare, the food which the rat seems to so readily devour cuts deeply into their small allowance. For the 14,000 people who were bitten by rats last year, the rat is a cause of great pain. For over 5,000 people who were inflicted with plague, typhus, leptospirosis, and other rat-associated diseases, the rat has caused incomparable hardships. For the Nation that suffers over a billion dollars worth of damages in a year directly because of rats, they are a great economic loss.

The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that we have the technical ability to control rats. We know how to exterminate rats and how to strike at the roots of their environment. Plans have been prepared for nationwide rat control programs, and various local communities have started to treat rat control as a serious problem. The emphasis on any rat control program should be at the community level, but the communities must be aided by the larger financial resources of the Federal Government.

Where community programs have gone into operation they have done a great deal to control rats. VISTA volunteers have taken an active part in mobilizing the community in the war against rats, putting out poison and traps for the rats, teaching families sanitary garbage disposal methods, and encouraging more sanitary neighborhood conditions. In New York City, the health department has carried on a rat extermination program in Harlem, and other areas of the city.

In Detroit an extensive effort to exterminate rats has had encouraging results. The four-point program to starve the rat, demolish his home, protect buildings from rat infestation, and kill the rat, involved improved garbage collection, home improvements, various means of rat extermination, and citizen participation. As a result the incidence of rat bites has decreased to under 20 reported cases per year.

It is a sad commentary that so few communities have even started to use the program that Detroit employed. In many communities the problem of rats has worsened. Not only have cities lacked the will to help their ghetto neighborhoods solve the problem of rats; they lack the money to launch a really effective campaign. The Detroit campaign which relied basically on community education programs cost money; other programs will also call for increased expenditures.

The President's Inter-Agency Task Force report on rat control estimated that an adequate nationwide program would require Federal grants of \$125 mil-

lion annually. It has also been estimated that the total cost of a nationwide program to exterminate rats would reach one and a half billion dollars. Only the Federal Government has the resources to fill such an order. The funds that are called for in H.R. 11000 are only \$40 million over a 2-year period. This is clearly not enough to establish effective rat control programs throughout this country. Let us hope it is enough to make for an effective start.

The Rat Extermination Act of 1967 does have several significant provisions. It will finance and coordinate various community programs and help to initiate programs where there are now none. First, the Federal assistance is given directly to communities for local rat control and extermination programs to allow for a variety of methods especially suited to the needs and circumstances of each area. The communities which are most plagued with rats are those which are least able to pay for private exterminators or even for the metal trash cans which are basic to any eradication program. By giving matching grants on a two for one basis, it is hoped that local governments will be induced to allocate more of their resources to the community rat control programs. Furthermore, the program includes "the elimination or modification of physical surroundings and conditions—including rat harborages and food supplies—which encourage or tend to encourage persistent rat habitation and increases in their numbers; and any other actions which will reduce or eliminate, on more than a temporary basis disease, injury, and property damage caused by rats." It has too often been the case that the conditions which fostered the growth of the rat population in the area continue after the rats have been eradicated, and a new population quickly moves in to fill the ecological niche which has been created by extermination.

This bill does recognize that the problem of rat control is related to the conditions of the urban slums. It has a citizen education component which will train people in the community on basic standards of health and see that sanitary and healthful conditions are maintained after the rats are eradicated.

If the concern about riots expressed on the floor yesterday was genuine, then the House will approve this bill. However, it is not enough if the root causes of urban unrest are to be attacked.

Instead of the legislation now before us, we should be considering an adequate urban redevelopment bill attacking the slums on many fronts. If we use our resources to solve the problems of our slums, we will have solved a lot of related problems.

But because rat control, when we are unwilling to allocate the resources to solve the general problem of urban decay, does exist as a problem, and a very important one to many urban dwellers, I urge support for the rule and H.R. 11000.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rat Extermination Act of 1967 because I think that it is urgent that national attention be called and national impetus given to a program to

eliminate one of the main threats to disease and instigators of damage to property—the rat.

Since the rat is bred where there is poor housing and sanitation, in areas of urban and rural poverty, it is logical for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has the prime responsibility for improving the physical environment of our towns and cities, to work with the local governments in establishing a coordinated attack to combat the nasty and dangerous rodent.

It is not intended that the Federal Government get involved in the full-time rat extermination business; therefore, it is proposed that the Government cover the first two-thirds of the cost of 3-year local programs to provide communities with an initial boost.

It is also recognized that nothing will be gained by giving money to communities carte blanche. They are required to submit plans, tailored to meet their own particular needs and requirements in such areas as building and sanitation codes; adequate garbage and refuse collection; maintenance of public activities and services; extermination; community education and organization; and a system of evaluation, indicating their own intention to follow through.

In Pittsburgh this year so far, there have been over 1,200 complaints concerning rats. And not all of these stemmed from rat bites, for rats do not have to bite to be harmful or transmit disease—they also contaminate food. The annual report of the Allegheny County Health Department, where Pittsburgh is located, shows an appalling 50 percent increase over the last year in reinspections of dwellings to abate garbage, rodents, and other nuisances.

The No. 1 environmental health problem in Pittsburgh is reported to be slum housing, and we all know this to be the habitat of the rat.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I deem it urgent to adopt H.R. 11000 to provide a comprehensive, sophisticated approach toward eliminating this No. 1 public health nuisance—who is certainly no laughing matter—Brother Rat.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The question is on the resolution.

Mr. RHODES 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 176, nays 207, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—176

Addabbo	Brown, Calif.	Delaney
Albert	Buchanan	Donohue
Anderson,	Burke, Mass.	Dow
Tenn.	Burton, Calif.	Downing
Annunzio	Byrne, Pa.	Dulski
Ashley	Cahill	Dwyer
Aspinall	Carey	Eckhardt
Barrett	Clark	Edmondson
Bingham	Cohelan	Edwards, Calif.
Blatnik	Conte	Edwards, La.
Boland	Corman	Eilberg
Bolling	Culver	Esch
Brademas	Daddario	Evans, Colo.
Brasco	Daniels	Fallon
Brooks	de la Garza	Farbstein

Feighan	Kyros	Riegle	Shriver	Stratton	Whalley
Fino	Landrum	Rivers	Sikes	Stucky	White
Flood	Leggett	Rodino	Skubitz	Taft	Whitten
Foley	McCarthy	Rogers, Colo.	Smith, Calif.	Talcott	Wiggins
Ford,	McDade	Ronan	Smith, N.Y.	Taylor	Williams, Pa.
William D.	McFall	Rooney, N.Y.	Smith, Okla.	Teague, Calif.	Willson, Bob
Fraser	Machen	Rooney, Pa.	Snyder	Thompson, Ga.	Winn
Friedel	Madden	Rosenthal	Springer	Thomson, Wis.	Wright
Fulton, Tenn.	Mathias, Md.	Rostenkowski	Stafford	Tuck	Wylie
Gallfanakis	Matsunaga	Roush	Stanton	Waggonner	Wyman
Gallagher	Meeds	Roybal	Steed	Wampler	Zion
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Ryan	Steiger, Ariz.	Watts	Zwach
Gettys	Minish	St Germain	Steiger, Wis.		
Gialmo	Mink	St. Onge			
Gibbons	Monagan	Schweiker			
Gilbert	Moore	Shipley			
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Sisk			
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Slack			
Green, Pa.	Morris, N. Mex.	Smith, Iowa			
Griffiths	Mosher	Staggers			
Gude	Moss	Stephens			
Halpern	Multer	Stubblefield			
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan			
Hanley	Natcher	Tenzer			
Hanna	Nedzi	Thompson, N.J.			
Hardy	Nix	Tunney			
Hathaway	O'Hara, Ill.	Udall			
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara, Mich.	Ullman			
Heckler, Mass.	Olsen	Van Deerlin			
Helstoski	O'Neill, Mass.	Vander Jagt			
Hicks	Ottinger	Vanik			
Hollfield	Patman	Vigorito			
Holland	Patten	Waldie			
Horton	Perkins	Walker			
Irwin	Philbin	Whalen			
Jacobs	Pickle	Widnall			
Joelson	Pike	Willis			
Johnson, Calif.	Poage	Wilson,			
Jones, N.C.	Price, Ill.	Charles H.			
Karsten	Randall	Wolf			
Kastenmeier	Rees	Wylder			
Kazen	Reid, N.Y.	Young			
Kee	Resnick	Zablocki			
Kelly	Reuss				
Kupferman	Rhodes, Pa.				

NAYS—207

Abbt	Derwinski	Lloyd
Abernethy	Devine	Lukens
Adair	Dickinson	McClary
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	McCulloch
Andrews, Ala.	Dole	McCulloch
Andrews,	Dowdy	McDonald,
N. Dak.	Duncan	Mich.
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ala.	McEwen
Ashmore	Erlenborn	MacGregor
Baring	Eshleman	Mahon
Bates	Everett	Marsh
Battin	Fascell	Martin
Belcher	Findley	Mathias, Calif.
Bell	Fisher	May
Bennett	Flynt	Mayne
Berry	Fountain	McKillop
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Michel
Bevill	Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Ohio
Blester	Fuqua	Mills
Blackburn	Gathings	Minshall
Blanton	Goodling	Mize
Bolton	Gross	Montgomery
Bow	Grover	Morse, Mass.
Bray	Gubser	Morton
Brinkley	Gurney	Myers
Brock	Hagan	Nelsen
Broomfield	Haley	Nichols
Brotzman	Hall	O'Konski
Brown, Mich.	Halleck	O'Neal, Ga.
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Pelly
Broyhill, N.C.	schmidt	Pettis
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Pirnie
Burke, Fla.	Harrison	Poff
Burleson	Harsha	Pollock
Burton, Utah	Harvey	Price, Tex.
Bush	Hays	Pryor
Button	Hébert	Purcell
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Qule
Cabell	Herlong	Quillen
Casey	Hosmer	Rallsback
Chamberlain	Hull	Reid, Ill.
Claency	Hunt	Reifel
Clausen,	Hutchinson	Reinecke
Don H.	Ichord	Rhodes, Ariz.
Clawson, Del	Jarman	Roberts
Cleveland	Johnson, Pa.	Robison
Coilier	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Roth
Conable	Jones, Mo.	Roudebush
Corbett	Keith	Rumsfeld
Cowger	King, N.Y.	Ruppe
Cramer	Kleppe	Satterfield
Cunningham	Kornegay	Schadeberg
Curtis	Kyl	Scherle
Davis, Ga.	Langen	Schneebell
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Schwengel
Dellenback	Lennon	Scott
Denney	Lipscomb	Selden

NOT VOTING—49

Adams	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Arends	Hawkins	Pepper
Ayres	Howard	Pool
Boggs	Hungate	Pucinski
Carter	Karth	Rarick
Cederberg	King, Calif.	Sandman
Celler	Kirwan	Saylor
Conyers	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Dawson	Kuykendall	Teague, Tex.
Dent	Laird	Tierman
Diggs	Long, La.	Utt
Dorn	Long, Md.	Watkins
Evins, Tenn.	McMillan	Watson
Ford, Gerald R.	Macdonald,	Whitener
Gardner	Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Goodell	Mailliard	Wyatt
Gray	Murphy, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—49

So the resolution was rejected. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Passman against.

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

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Scheuer for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Wyatt against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Carter against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Whitener against.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Tierman for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Pool against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Gardner against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. CONTE and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution which was just defeated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

SHOCK AND CHAGRIN AT THE VOTE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 749 PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE RAT EXTERMINATION ACT OF 1967

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and chagrined at the vote just now. I say this to those who voted "aye" overwhelmingly on the antiriot bill yesterday, that seldom can one find such inconsistency in such a short period of time.

Mr. Speaker, we asserted yesterday Federal supremacy on a local problem to suppress violent dissent, but today we vote to invite violent dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen rat-infested areas and buildings in the slums of the city of New York. Adjoining the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, is the congressional district represented by ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. One might say that I am serving as the interim voluntary Congressman for that area.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen some of the conditions which exist there.

If you were a hard-working father coming home from work to find one of your children bitten by a rat, you might very well start a small riot yourself.

Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of the vote today on this question.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, there is no further legislative business for this week, and we shall ask to go over until Monday next upon the announcement of the program for next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills.

Tuesday is the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 8630, to extend the authority for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-

payments position of the United States, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate, and

H.R. 9547, the Inter-American Development Bank Act Amendments of 1967, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the majority leader that I hope we can schedule the legislative business on Wednesday so that we can all get out to the ball park for our annual game, commencing at 6:15.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] that we are taking care of that. If the gentleman will read the program for next week carefully, I believe he will find that that has been taken care of.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman for that reassurance.

**ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
JULY 24, 1967**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

**CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS
DISPENSED WITH ON WEDNESDAY
NEXT**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule may be dispensed with on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

THE SO-CALLED ANTIRIOT BILL

Mr. HICKS. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, along with the other Members of the House, I had a very deep interest in the legislation which we acted upon yesterday, the so-called antiriot bill. Along with the other Members, I had been exposed to many arguments pro and con. I had some rather mild reservations about that bill when I came over here yesterday noon, and so I stayed on the floor during the entire course of the debate in order to gain further insight and information through the presentations made by my colleagues.

The result was that, by the time the discussions ended, I was convinced that the bill was and is capable of working considerable mischief in the labor field. I even began to suspect that this was among the intentions of that legislation.

What really convinced me, Mr. Speaker, was the opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. There was much reassurance, you will recall, that the bill would have no adverse effects on labor organizing activities. In fact the committee reports says:

The bill, as amended, will not prohibit legitimate activities by groups or individuals who travel in interstate commerce or use its facilities to plan and participate in public assemblies or other lawful public demonstrations. Obviously, nothing in the bill circumscribes or hinders the objectives of organized labor in a bona fide labor dispute in urging strikes.

So Mr. HOLIFIELD, in effect said, "All right, then, let us say in the bill what it says in the committee report." And he offered an amendment so stating.

This amendment was accepted at once by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], floor manager of the bill. He had no quarrel with it. But others did have many quarrels with it.

The rejection of this amendment by the antilabor conservative coalition convinced me that the bill would indeed be inimical to the legitimate interests of organized labor.

Responsible labor people detest violence as much as responsible people everywhere. But it is a union's business to make every reasonable effort to better the lot of its members and to correct inequities. One method of doing so is the picket line. As we all know, violence sometimes occurs when there are extreme antiunion feelings which a picket line can generate. Clearly, the legislation could apply to union organizers who cross State lines to advocate obtaining labor's legitimate objections through lawful strikes and attendant picket lines.

My reservations were not limited to the adverse effects on labor, Mr. Speaker. In the course of yesterday's discussions I became convinced that the entire bill was unnecessary and dangerous.

It was and is aimed at such people as Stokely Carmichael and other Negro militants, and I see no good reason to play into their hands and make them Federal martyrs.

There presently exists in every State in this Union statutes which make inciting to riot a crime. Mr. Stokely Carmichael and his ilk are amenable to prosecution and punishment under those State laws.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, after 2 rewarding years of waging productive legislative warfare against the causes of discontent and consequent disturbance, I found it dismaying to see this body expending its energies flailing away at effects. That was what the bill proposed to do: To try to do away with the results of many generations of neglect of millions of Americans; it did not even pretend to try to do away with that neglect itself, and thus perhaps take one more step toward eliminating riots.

I abhor violence and disobedience of

the law and the very thought of fellow Americans descending to mob level. I abhor people who encourage these acts.

And I also abhor the conditions that cause these effects, and have supported and will support legislation which gets at those causes. The antiriot bill does not meet that criterion, in my opinion.

The legislation was predicated on an assumption that "outside agitators" foment upheaval. No doubt they do in some cases. But it is interesting to note a recent article by columnist Marquis Childs in which he reported the results of a study made at Brandeis University on the source of violence as sampled in six northern cities, three of which have suffered riots and three of which have not. Mr. Childs said:

The report, based on careful polling techniques, shows that riots grow out of deep, long-harbored discontents in the ghetto. There is an interaction of two factors, the "grievance level" and the inflammatory nature of the incident precipitating the initial outbreak. Where the "grievance level" is high over lack of jobs, miserable housing, or the conviction of police brutality, a small incident will trigger a riot.

On "outsiders" as a cause of riots Negroes and whites differ more sharply than on any of the factors contributing to the violence of this long, hot summer. A large percentage of whites see as the only factor "outsiders coming into a city and stirring up trouble." The vast majority of Negroes reject this as a major cause. In one city . . . 56 percent of the whites gave "outsiders" as the cause and only 7 percent of the Negroes.

This indicates to me that we are no less prone to fool ourselves, to believe what our preconceptions lead us to desire to believe, than we ever were. People who can convince themselves that "outsiders" are doing all the dirty work, do not need then to bestir themselves and take action—action which demands thought and hard work and even makes some demands on their wallets—to eliminate the conditions which breed riots.

Some of the people in this very body who pushed strongly for the legislation which was passed yesterday are the same people who have fought and continue to fight against the programs which would eliminate most of the need for control of riots of the kind we have been experiencing of late because there would be few riots. And I emphasize again that to my mind this was not riot control legislation. I submit that it was more in the nature of a sop to 435 constituencies that are understandably disturbed over rioting in the United States. But a sop is not an answer, and in fact is more likely to become part of the problem itself.

"Inciting to riot" is a criminal offense everywhere in this country, under State statutes and municipal ordinances. If these are not adequate to curb rioting and punish offenders against the public peace, then it is the States and municipalities that should be taking action to strengthen their own instruments of control. It certainly is not necessary for the Federal Government to enter the picture at this time. Indeed, had there been any request for such intrusion from officials of States or municipalities? It is my understanding that there had not been.

To return in conclusion to the prospect

of the provisions of that bill being used against labor, I am not convinced that it would be applied in 1967 for I have considerable faith in our judicial system. But we do not legislate merely for 1967, Mr. Speaker, not merely for 1968 nor merely for next several years. And I do not have that much confidence in the status quo as regards interpretation of today's laws in terms of conditions of the future especially in the light of the rejection of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLFIELD].

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation enacted yesterday, the so-called antiriot bill, is unnecessary in its concept and dangerous in its implications, and should have been rejected.

TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

Mr. HARVEY. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, when the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 was before the House of Representatives in August of last year, I expressed my support for the legislation but with numerous reservations. My congressional district, as I pointed out in debate at that time, is vitally dependent upon the automobile industry. Many of my constituents, both workers and executives, had written me last year expressing the fear that the industry would be harassed by unreasonable regulations and that the mass production of automobiles and parts would be slowed down, if not brought to a complete halt, as a result thereof.

As I sat up the other night reading the recommended findings and the report of the presiding officer, Mr. Russell A. Potter, hearing examiner for the National Transportation Safety Board, all of our debate came back to mind. When we were considering this legislation, one of the things that concerned me most was the necessity for turning over vast discretionary authority to the administrator of the program. I said at that time:

I believe some of this concern from those in the auto industry comes about because of the very vast discretion that is turned over to the Secretary in this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that I cannot think of any way to get around. We must empower him with the authority to get out these particular standards. Whether the Secretary truly understands when we talk of the model year—whether he truly understands when we talk of the leadtime necessary in new model production and comprehends these things are tremendously important, not only to the automobile industry but to all our country. What the Secretary does and what he says in these regulations will affect directly the lives and the earnings of one out of every seven Americans in the 50 States of America.

In my district, I am sure that not only one out of seven but the majority of the people are either directly or indirectly dependent upon the auto industry. So it is very vital to them.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the chairman that this House in supporting this legislation has to be mindful of the fact that no matter whom we have in the position of Secretary, I believe we must assume that this person is going to act reasonably and that he is going to act wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to my constituents that if the recommendations of the initial vehicle safety standard 201 by Hearing Examiner Russell A. Potter is an example, and I think it is, we can feel that the Administrator is indeed going to act "reasonably" and "wisely." Safety standard 201 dealt with the safety production to be afforded by 1968 automobile interiors. Four basic questions were presented for decision by the hearing examiner. They were as follows:

1. Is Standard 201 stated in clear and objective terms;
2. Is Standard 201 limited to performance requirements, and are these practicable;
3. Does Standard 201 meet the need for "motor vehicle safety" as that term is defined in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 718); and
4. Is it reasonable to require all passenger cars to be produced so as to comply with Standard 201 by January 1, 1968.

The full report of Hearing Examiner Russell A. Potter in answer to these questions is more than 50 pages in length. So that all Members will be apprised, however, I am inserting his actual findings in response to these questions immediately following my remarks.

I was particularly interested in the answer to question No. 4 whether it was "reasonable to require all passenger cars to be produced so as to comply with standard 201 by January 1, 1968."

Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question went right to the heart of my fears concerning the administration of this legislation for it concerned the leadtime necessary in new model production in the automobile industry, as well as among the industry suppliers. While reading the report of the hearing, I was impressed with the abundant testimony of industry witnesses that compliance with standard 201 could not possibly take place in 11 short months.

One industry witness for a domestic manufacturer pointed out that this one standard alone necessitated a complete redesign of substantial portions of the interior of that particular 1968 model, and more than 4,800 different parts and assemblies would therefore, have to be redesigned. Even after the specific intent of standard 201 was made clear, industry witnesses testified it would take not months but several years to accomplish these changes. Furthermore, witnesses made clear these changes were not such as could be accomplished while production was in progress but would have necessitated a complete shutdown of production, similar to that during the model changeover.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read the report and findings of Hearing Examiner Russell A. Potter concerning standard 201 because I believe his findings demonstrated the "wisdom" and "reasonableness" necessary to the enforcement of this program. These qualities are essential if our goal of saving lives by manufacturing safer vehicles is to be

accomplished, and at the same time mass production of automobiles is to continue without interruption.

The complete findings of the hearing examiner with regard to standard 201 are set forth below:

VI. FINDING

On the basis of the entire record, it is found:

1. Standard 201 in the following particulars is not stated in clear and objective terms:

1. The definition of the terms "head impact area," "knee and leg impact area," and "pelvic impact area" are vague, inexact, and unworkable for automotive design purposes;

2. The anthropometric data in Public Health Service Publication No. 1000, Series 11, No. 8, is too incomplete to serve as a basis for a precise three-dimensional standard to delineate impact areas and to measure compliance of interiors of automobiles with the requirements of the regulations;

3. Three-dimensional manikins and crash dummies do not articulate as human beings; they are relatively inflexible as compared to human beings; they cannot be manipulated and maneuvered within the interior of an automobile in precisely the same manner by different operators, or in precisely the same manner by the same operator at different times; for these reasons repeatable results in delineating impact areas, and measuring compliance with the requirements of the regulations cannot be expected from their use;

4. Three-dimensional manikins and crash dummies are not acceptable as standards since they cannot be used for the initial design of the interior of an automobile;

5. A graphic, one- or two-dimensional, standard is required for the layout of impact areas; and for determination of compliance with regulatory requirements;

6. Use of the term "H" point in section 255.3 of the regulations is inappropriate and misleading for the reason that it has reference to a specific manikin, the "H" point of which, when the manikin is placed in an automobile, cannot be expected to coincide with the design "H" point;

7. It is possible to devise a graphic system, acceptable to petitioners, for the layout of impact areas;

8. The term "protrusions" as used in Standard 201 is not defined, and its meaning is not clear, for no method is prescribed for measuring protrusions; and

9. The following words and phrases "most adverse normal position," "direction of impact," "anticipated direction of contact," "largest manikin that can be accommodated in the space available," "substantially vertical," and "bezels" are ambiguous.

II. Standard 201 in the following particulars is not limited to performance standards and standards which are practicable:

1. Sections S3.3 (b) and (c) of Standard 201 when applied to parts and components which are shielded or recessed are design criteria which do not serve a useful safety purpose;

2. Section S3.3(a) (3) when applied to window regulator handles, door locking knobs, coat hangers, door pulls, and ignition keys results in awkward shapes and sizes which are not suitable for the purposes which these parts serve;

3. Section S33(a) (1) when applied to windshield headers, windshield and window pillars, roof rails, and to belt lines of door panels results in a very substantial loss of visibility from the interior of the car; and

4. Standard 201 exceeds the requirement of GSA standards in that:

(a) GSA standards permit use of test devices having "H" point-to-top-of-head dimensions of 33 and 29 inches rather than requiring use of three-dimensional manikins for the 95th percentile adult male and 5th

percentile adult female secured by a slack seat belt;

(b) GSA protrusion requirements apply only to instrument panel instruments and control devices, window and door controls, ashtrays and lighters, and armrests;

(c) GSA standards do not impose deceleration requirements on the knee and leg impact areas; and

(d) GSA Standard 515/2a increased the deceleration requirement from 80g/3 milliseconds to 80g/1 millisecond but this requirement was not published until July 15, 1966, and was not made effective until October 13, 1967.

III. Standard 201 in the following particulars does not meet the need for motor vehicle safety:

1. The 80g/1 millisecond standard exceeds the minimum standard required to protect persons from unreasonable risk of injury;

2. The 80g/1 millisecond standard is deficient in that it does not limit the duration of acceleration forces at the 80g level, and it does not limit the magnitude of acceleration forces of 1 millisecond or less duration;

3. The 80g/1 millisecond standard is not an appropriate standard to apply to the knee and leg impact areas for the reasons that:

(a) At the instant of collision the relative speed of knees and legs is substantially less than that of the head; and

(b) The test device specified in Standard 201 is too large and too light to indicate acceleration forces which would be imposed upon the knees and legs; and the standard should be expressed in pounds of pressure rather than in units of acceleration force.

4. There is insufficient evidence to establish a "motor vehicle safety" need for the application of the present protrusion requirements to window regulator handles, door locking knobs, coat hangers, and other similar fixtures on the interior sides of an automobile;

5. There is insufficient evidence to establish a "motor vehicle safety" need for the application of present protrusion requirements to knobs, switches, levers, handles, bezels, and seat backs in the knee and leg impact areas; and

6. There is not a "motor vehicle safety" need to apply Standard 201 to the instrument panel directly forward of the steering wheel.

IV. It is not reasonable to require compliance with Standard 201 by January 1, 1968.

V. The interior of the car is designed during the first planning and engineering phase in the production of an automobile, and pertinent regulatory standards should be available to the manufacturer at that time; and

VI. It is not reasonable to require all components and parts of an automobile interior to comply with Standard 201 within specified time limits without allowances for the varying degrees of difficulty entailed in their redesign and production.

Dated this 22d day of June 1967.

RUSSELL A. POTTER,

Hearing Examiner,

National Transportation Safety Board.

AIRLINE SAFETY IMPERATIVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for months now I have been calling for open hearings on the question of air safety, both as it relates to pas-

senger and training flight operations. It is indeed tragic that we must have horrible incidents as that which occurred yesterday in North Carolina to add emphasis to this point and accent the need for these hearings.

Air transportation, both airline and general aviation, is now experiencing almost unprecedented growth. While the problem of air traffic control is more acute in the airlines, around the large metropolitan centers such as Washington, New York, Atlanta, Chicago, and Los Angeles, the incident yesterday in which the newly appointed Secretary of the Navy, John McNaughton, and his family, along with all other passengers and crew of the Piedmont airliner—carrying a total of 79 persons—was killed along with the three occupants in the twin-engine aircraft which apparently collided with the airliner, only adds emphasis to the fact that collisions can occur even in relatively uncrowded air spaces such as that which existed in the mountainous areas of North Carolina where the crash occurred.

It was only 4 shorts weeks ago that the Air Line Pilots Association held a safety panel here in Washington where the question of midair collisions was one of the main topics discussed.

I, myself, made a point a few weeks ago and several months before that, on the Floor of this Congress, to the effect that we must investigate in open public hearings all aspects of air safety. It was only 4 months ago in New Orleans where a training accident not only took the lives of all of the crew and FAA personnel on board a jet liner, but snuffed out the lives of nine Juda, Wis., high school students sojourning in a motel near the airport.

Only yesterday the tape from the cockpit voice recorder was released and it was confirmed that an emergency condition was being simulated wherein two engines had been shut down when this crash occurred.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we should not delay any longer setting hearings as to one, air safety; two, aircraft training; and three, aircraft control procedures which are under the supervision of the Federal Aviation Administration. The interest of our country and our people demand such action.

UNITED STATES MUST CURB ECONOMIC AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Americans were shocked to read today that the administration is moving toward a revival of its policy of providing arms and economic aid to Jordan.

Prior to the war in the Middle East last month, 20 percent of Jordan's revenue came from a 30-million "budgetary support" supplied annually by the United States.

After the war last month, the administration froze all aid to countries in that region.

Earlier this month, the administration quietly gave \$2 million in "budgetary support" to Jordan.

It has also been revealed that the Export-Import Bank, at the request of the Defense Department, loaned Jordan, Israel, and Saudi Arabia and other countries funds at a low interest rate of 3 percent to purchase arms. Ironically these arms supplied by the United States were used by these countries against each other.

I think this year we should review our foreign aid program from 1917 to 1967—50 years of foreign aid and foreign loans—half a century of handouts all around the world.

The sums of money we have loaned, given away, thrown away are so prodigious that they pass belief that a halt has not been called long since to this incredible global spending spree. Since 1917, the tax funds disbursed by the U.S. official loan and foreign assistance programs total nearly \$204 billion.

As of today, there are 14 major departments of the U.S. Government that act as principals or agents for the various programs that extend assistance to foreign countries.

This is the overall picture. We have literally given 'till its painful—given until national bankruptcy is not as impossible a fact as it sounds. We have pulled more than half the nations of the world from impending ruin to prosperity to lives of good living.

And, in all these countries, we really haven't a true friend left. In fact, many of them are now our avowed enemies.

Because of the recent developments in the Near East, I am going to concentrate on the loans and grants we have made to the Arab nations that recently received such a thorough beating from little Israel. These nations, I might note, are now showing their true colors, openly allying themselves with Russia and the Communist world.

We first started providing assistance to these countries around 1945. Here are the figures from 1945 to 1966:

Iran has received \$1,000,000,752.
Iraq has received \$102 million.
Jordan has received \$573 million.
Lebanon has received \$88 million.
Saudi Arabia has received \$209 million.
Syria has received \$73 million.
Egypt has received \$1,133 million.
Yemen has received a total of \$42 million.

There is considerable interest in a proposal by one of my colleagues to seek an amendment to the Foreign Aid bill when it reaches the House floor to ban U.S. military equipment or training assistance to any country collaborating with the Soviet Union or cooperating with the Vietcong. Such an amendment would have prevented the administration from supplying assistance to the Arab Nations if it had been on the books.

Since the Soviet Union was involved in aiding these countries, I should point out that the technical advances in U.S. military equipment were exposed to Russian military experts. By giving the

Arabs the same weapons which we are using in Vietnam, we have enabled Russian technicians to study this equipment and come up with the best defensive techniques against them in Vietnam. The Russians could send the Vietnamese Communists the proper weapons and technical data to destroy such U.S. weapons and kill our soldiers over there.

Like my colleague, I am concerned about this as well as the fact the United States trains foreign officers of a pro-Communist nation such as Syria, which we have every reason to believe passes along every vantage of intelligence gathered in U.S. training bases to Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi. This, too, has got to stop.

In closing, let me say that I feel we have too long let our hearts rule our heads. The result has been to build up our friends into enemies—to leave us isolated and without real allies—to raise our taxes enormously—to make bankruptcy far from an idle threat.

TAX INCREASE

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the leaders of the administration are all beginning to speak in unison again concerning another "threat" to our country. Gardner Ackley, the chief economic adviser for the President, has seen a tax increase as a solution to the country's economic problems. W. McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, has joined in the crocus sounds of summer's financial crisis, and his vibrations create the same old song—a tax increase. The President has now reindicated that he would appreciate Congress raising taxes before the first of the year.

This whole business really stretches credibility. The administration hailed the 1964 tax reduction as a clear indication that it would seek to expand private economy, rather than expand the Government. The economic indicators that the administration used to justify the need for the restoration of the investment tax credit have changed so dramatically that we can now justify slowing down the economy.

Mr. Ackley has now admitted that the Council of Economic Advisers' January estimate of a \$787 billion GNP for this year was too high. In all likelihood, a GNP of \$780 billion would be more realistic. The President, in January of this year, proposed a budget which reflected expenditures in the area of \$135 billion. Along with this budget came a deficit of slightly over \$8 billion.

To even approach a deficit figure of \$8 billion the President was relying on the contingency of \$4.7 billion additional in increased taxes, \$700 million in increased postal rates, approximately \$800 million in tax acceleration, and an increase of \$5 billion from the sale of participation certificates.

The total of these contingency items amounted to approximately \$11.3 billion. If we in Congress chose not to follow these proposals, the potential deficit could have been stated last January as \$19.3 billion. In all likelihood tax receipts will fall at least \$3 billion short of the administration's expectations. The additional costs of fighting the war in Vietnam have been stated to be in the neighborhood of \$8 billion—a conservative estimate. With these two items totaling \$11 billion added to the potential deficit of \$19 billion, our Nation is faced with a total potential deficit of \$30 billion, which some will admit may even be exceeded.

Many individuals and responsible organizations, both conservative and liberal, have reluctantly concluded that rising Federal Government spending, both defense and nondefense, requires a tax increase. I submit that this need not—and should not—be the case. Unfortunately the President reportedly decided at his ranch almost a year ago not to take a responsible approach toward reducing less essential programs. This administration has continued to suggest ways of spending as if the Nation was not faced with a growing conflict in Vietnam and with other defense commitments having a priority status.

This continuous growth of nondefense spending is the heart of the Nation's present fiscal dilemma. The funding of a deficit of the magnitude suggested would place severe strains on the Nation's credit resources, and raise interest rates to a level which would make it extremely difficult for the private sector to provide capital, particularly in such fields as housing, State and local construction, and business investment. Alternatively, if the Federal Reserve System were to expand the credit base so as to accommodate funding so large a deficit at low interest rates, the powerful inflationary pressures already at work would accelerate to an alarming degree.

I submit to my distinguished colleagues that the only desirable method of dealing with this problem is to eliminate or greatly reduce the threatened 1968 deficit by a cut in expenditures. To control inflation, expenditure reduction is more effective than a tax increase which may be passed on in part in higher prices. We here can no longer dodge the issue. We are not looking at partisanship or the election in 1968 when facing up to this problem. We are concerning ourselves with the plight of future generations to follow, who, after all, must pay for this folly. The spirit of "Folly-Bush Ranch" must not prevail in this Congress, if we are to act responsibly for the future.

This body must undertake immediately a program for reducing Federal expenditures and controlling their future growth. This program must be carefully planned and organized, and specific responsibilities for the program must be assigned to definite persons in the administration and to definite Members of Congress.

The program must have the short-range objective of reducing the deficit in 1968 and the long-range objective of regaining control over the growth of spending in the future. This will, of

course, require consideration of changes in substantive legislation, as well as appropriations. This longrun effort would be necessary to insure that if there is a tax increase enacted in 1967 or 1968, it would only be temporary in nature, and would not be used to support even more increases in the level of spending. The concept of a Government Program Evaluation Commission comprised of private citizens whose duties it would be to evaluate existing Federal programs and make recommendations to the President and to the Congress as to their effectiveness, as to whether they should be continued, and their relative priority, must be incorporated in this Congress. This concept, as introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, in H.R. 10520, merits our support in this regard.

In undertaking such a program, we must make a firm declaration of our intention to halt the excessive growth of Federal spending, and be guided in both substantive legislation and in appropriations by that one objective.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this administration will not recommend other than a tax increase, and in the near future. I will oppose such a measure until the measures I have outlined have been first accomplished by this Congress. We must take these first steps if we are to fully protect the American people from rapidly rising living costs which will cancel out wage increases, drain family budgets and savings, and shrink the pensions of the aging even further. To do otherwise would shirk all responsibility to those who will be paying over a billion dollars a month on the national debt in the years to come.

LAND OF THE FEE OR THE FREE

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing wave of resentment among the people at the imposition of admission fees and now dock fees at our Federal reservoirs by the Johnson administration. The escalation of these additional charges for the right to enjoy the outdoors is an injustice to thousands of Americans whose recreational opportunities are limited by meager incomes. In addition the nuisance factor is discouraging to both visitors and business establishments resulting in a "bled white" backlash. Twenty-five Members of the House have joined in sponsoring H.R. 11236, which would remove these fees once and for all, and I urge the House Public Works Committee to hold early hearings on this measure, and to press for its adoption.

Last year some of my colleagues accepted at face value a so-called compromise offered by the President, which had the effect of removing some of the fees in order to forestall consideration of a

bill which had been approved by the Public Works Committee. Recent events have shown that the camel's nose which entered the tent for the first time last year has now been followed by the rest of the camel. I have received a number of letters from various individuals and organizations in opposition to the new fee program, and I insert at this point in the RECORD a sampling of these protests:

OZARK PLAYGROUNDS ASSOCIATION,
July 14, 1967.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
Congressional Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Enclosed is a copy of a letter received from a member of the Ozark Playgrounds Association showing how our Organization is and will be affected by "Golden Eagle" fees.

It is hoped that you can add this to the petitions, letters, etc. you have to support your legislation H.R. 11236, at Committee hearings.

In talking to several retired persons, who have moved to the Ozark Playgrounds area of southwest Missouri and northwest Arkansas, they have expressed concern over the increasing costs being placed on their fixed income. They have expressed thoughts of leaving because of these costs, which will certainly hurt our economy more than the fees will help.

Please send us a copy of your proposed bill H.R. 11236.

Cordially,

D. D. HETER,
Executive Manager, Ozark Playgrounds
Association.

JOPLIN BUTANE GAS CO.,
July 12, 1967.

To Whom It May Concern: Enclosed please find our check in the amount of \$1.00 to cover the violation of parking a butane service truck on the Big M Table Rock Recreation Area.

This is the first time we have ever been notified of charges such as this, we have never noticed any signs pertaining to a fee for parking at such an area.

For the past 27 years we have made a considerable donation to the Ozark Playgrounds Association for the promotion of entertainment and recreation for this Ozark region and we would like to go on record at the present time that as long as a condition such as this exists, we have made our last donation for the promotion of recreation in this area.

Very truly yours,

GAYLE CHILDRESS.

GAINESVILLE, MO., July 15, 1967.

HON. DR. DURWARD HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington D.C.

HON. DR. HALL: We appreciate the way you have been fighting the bill on charging fees on our lakes. It was proven over the week end of the fourth of July, that it almost stopped business in the Pontiac and Theodosia, Mo., area.

Hope you can find some way of stopping this foolishness. Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GRADIE SANDERS.

JU-MAR-DE COTTAGE RESORT,
Shell Knob, Mo., July 12, 1967.

HON. DURWOOD HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I am writing to ask your help in effecting some relief from the pressure that is being put on us by the Corps of Engineers through the use fees as imposed under the Golden Eagle permit, the

dock fees, and the removal of permission for properly licensed guides to use resort docks.

As a small resort owner and operator I feel that this is adversely affecting the successful operation of our resort in rendering services and facilities to the guests who patronize our place of business.

Above I mentioned the dock fee. This is a new fee being levied on all businesses and/or individuals having private boat mooring facilities, duck blinds, ski jump floats, diving platforms, fishing piers, rafts and similar installations on Corps projects throughout the United States. The annual rate for this fee will be \$10.00 for the initial 200 square feet, plus 7½ cents per year for each square foot in excess of the initial 200 square feet.

In the case of my facilities this would figure out at the rate of approximately \$200.00 per year. I am already paying the Corps of Engineers \$2.00 per month, per boat, per year for my registered fishing boats. This amounts to \$96.00 per year. Two hundred dollars for the new dock fee, plus \$96.00 for the boat rental registration fee, amounts to almost more than the total income I can realize out of my dock facilities. Since my dock facility at a small resort is primarily for the convenience and accommodation of guests registered at my resort I feel that I am being unjustly imposed upon by the excessive fees being levied by the Corps of Engineers in the administering of Table Rock Lake.

I thank you for any consideration you may be able to extend.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM L. BRAME,
Lieutenant Colonel, USAF, Retired.

CAMP ROYAL,
Viola, Mo., July 11, 1967.

CONGRESSMAN DURWARD HALL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I wish to call your attention to the two latest regulations set out by the Corp of Engineers which effect operation of my resort.

First was the letter of April 20, 1967, advising that fishing guides will not be allowed to render their service from a resort's private dock. This order means this to a resort operator: A party of four people call for reservation for two rooms, two boats, two motors, and two guides for four days, but since we are not permitted to have guides work from our docks and have to so advise the party, we cannot furnish guides, they tell us that they are sorry but they will have to go to a resort on a lake not regulated by the Corps of Engineers, so that they can get the services they require. By this order from the Corps of Engineers they have reduced our earning as follows:

2 rooms (4 days)	\$68
2 boats and motors (4 days)	80
Fishing lures, gasoline etc	30
Total	178

This is just one party for which we would have at least ten during the fishing season. This order has reduced our earning \$1,780.00.

June 26, 1967, I received as registered letter (Cost 40 cents) from the Corps of Engineers advising that our dock permit will be cancelled as of January 1, 1968 and of this date will be required to pay \$10.00 for the first 200 sq. ft. and .075 cents per sq. ft for additional dock area. My dock will cost \$89.50 per year. This in addition of the \$24.00 per year per boat, we pay the Corps of Engineers for our rental boat, which we can only rent to people who are staying in our resort.

The two above orders unquestionably will reduce my earning to the point of limiting our lively-hood.

I am against all the fees that have been put into effect on all government lakes by the Corps of Engineers.

I ask that you as my representative in gov-

ernment that you do all in your power to see that this money grab is rebuked.

Sincerely,

TETE HENSY.

SHELL KNOB, MO., July 15, 1967.

Congressman DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you in regard to a letter received by me from the Corps of Engineers at Little Rock, Arkansas, dated June 26, 1967.

In this letter they inform private boat dock owners that effective January 1, 1968 a fee will be charged for the use of private installations on Table Rock Lake and other Federal impoundments.

The Corps of Engineers quote Federal Law (65 Statute 290.5, U.S. Code 140) and state "the annual rate will be \$10.00 plus 7½ cents per year for each square foot of area in excess of 200 square feet." These charges figure up to a "fair rental for private use of federally owned property" of between \$2,000.00 and \$3,000.00 per acre per year.

I consider these charges to be unreasonable, unfair and unjust since we dock owners receive no other benefits from these charges.

I respectfully ask your support of H.R. 11236, which is designed to eliminate these charges by the Corps of Engineers.

Thank you.

EDWARD L. LOGSDON.

CRASH PROGRAM TO FIGHT AGAINST RIOTS, CRIME, AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am calling for a crash program to aid in the fight against riots, crime, and juvenile delinquency in the teeming tenement districts of America.

The young people have been forgotten and an attitude of "no one cares" exists throughout the Nation. While we are being called upon to support all kinds of spending programs, it is very apparent that these programs have failed to reach the youth of our country.

I have filed legislation which calls for the Department of the Interior to set up a grant-in-aid program to provide free tickets to professional and amateur sport events which would be distributed by the local police and fire departments. Our youngsters should have available to them the opportunity to review and participate in events which can give them the opportunity to see such great athletes as Willy Mays, Mickey Mantle, Tony Conigliaro, Louis Aparicio, Bill Russell, Wilt Chamberlain, Gordie Howe, Lance Alworth, and many others.

This program would serve a twofold purpose in sending the kids out into the fresh air to let them see wholesome games which they can imitate in their parks and playgrounds, and would encourage a better understanding of their police and firemen. Our young people should know and learn that their policemen and firemen are there to help them and to assist the community in maintain-

ing order and peace. They are the friends of the youth of America.

I am calling upon my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to join me in the promotion of this program, to reach into the ghettos and bring some concern and understanding about the plight of these youngsters. The program which was very popular many years ago in Boston was the "knothole gang," which provided free tickets to the neighborhood of Boston and allowed the youngsters to see the Boston Braves—it had an immediate reaction. Youngsters quickly began to emulate these ballplayers in their own backyards and playgrounds.

Ten million dollars a year for 2 years would provide tickets for approximately 80 million games and the opportunity for 20 million youngsters to see four or five amateur or professional games played by our finest athletes.

I know it is possible for our amateur and professional leagues, including baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and soccer, to set aside a number of their seats each game for the purpose of this program, which would prove beneficial to their own popularity and eventual paid attendance. The money the Federal Government could provide would pay for the price of admission for your youth, and the State and local community could provide the funds and arrangements for transportation to and from the games. Nothing would prevent the local business community from participating in the program by supplying pocket money for the purchase of hot dogs, soda, and refreshments so the youngsters could enjoy the game to its fullest degree.

I would like to see the encouragement and development of more people like Sandy Koufax, Ted Williams, Babe Ruth, Lou Gehrig, Jackie Robinson, Tony Lazzari, Steve Spurrier, Sam Jones, K. C. Jones, and other alltime greats.

It is regrettable that many of our large universities and colleges have moved away from athletic programs as a regular part of their curriculum. Although the need for education in America is continually on the increase, the need for a spirit of cooperation and teamwork is now in the critical stage. Let us take our young people out of a dissident atmosphere and give them direction to good outdoor and indoor activity—let us show them that America really cares and really wants the young people to enjoy this great country of ours—let us stop taking negative steps and act in a positive way, to reach down into the grass-roots of the problem of our youth.

I am today contacting President Johnson; Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY; Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK; Democratic House majority leader, CARL ALBERT; Republican House leader, GERALD R. FORD; Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, asking them that they interest themselves in this type of program.

CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a comprehensive consumer credit protection bill which incorporates "truth-in-lending" legislation as one of its titles, but which also includes provisions dealing with many other problems in connection with the utilization of credit. It is a very far-reaching measure with admittedly highly controversial features.

I am being joined today by a bipartisan group of members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the introduction of this bill. Not all of the cosponsors endorse all of the provisions of the proposed Consumer Credit Protection Act, but all of us agree that the subjects covered in this bill should be explored in our hearings along with the title applying to credit disclosure.

The cosponsors of the bill—all of them members of the subcommittee—are Representatives HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of Texas, JOSEPH G. MINISH, of New Jersey, FRANK ANNUNZIO, of Illinois, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, of New York, and SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York. Other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and additional Members of the House who have seen this proposed Consumer Credit Protection Act, have indicated their intention of sponsoring similar legislation, but the bill going in today, as I said, carries only the names of sponsors from the subcommittee handling the legislation.

I know there will be great interest in this legislation and in the hearings we intend to hold early next month. I want to make it clear that by including so many additional aspects of consumer credit protection in this bill, we have no intention of delaying action on truth in lending, now that a bill on this subject has finally passed the Senate after 7 years. We do not think the Senate bill is adequate and it is our intention to strengthen it as much as possible in order to protect the consumer in the use of credit for himself or by others.

Mr. Speaker, I submit at this point in the RECORD a copy of a press release being issued at this time to explain the provisions of the proposed Consumer Credit Protection Act, as follows:

MRS. SULLIVAN INTRODUCES COMPREHENSIVE NEW BILL SAFEGUARDING CONSUMERS IN "UTILIZATION OF CREDIT"

Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, announced today a plan to incorporate "Truth-In-Lending" legislation into a broadly enlarged bill with bi-partisan sponsorship to "safeguard the consumer in connection with the utilization of credit."

Its "Truth-In-Lending" section duplicates the scope of the original Douglas bill, which Mrs. Sullivan has sponsored for four years on the House side of the Capitol, but with many of the technical language changes recommended by the Proxmire Subcommittee in the Senate, including the use of an "annual percentage rate" instead of "simple an-

nual rate." It does not, however, contain the exemptions or modifications in coverage made by the bill passed by the Senate compared to the Douglas bill. Thus, it includes revolving credit and first mortgage real estate credit left out of the Senate bill.

"Required disclosure of finance costs in credit transactions is vitally important to the intelligent use of credit," Mrs. Sullivan declared. "But there are many other serious problems in connection with the use of credit than merely the need for disclosure. This bill, which other Members of the Subcommittee handling this legislation have joined me in sponsoring, touches on all of the important gaps in the protection of the consumer in connection with the use of credit. Not every co-sponsor agrees with all provisions because it is a very broad bill with many controversial sections. We are introducing it for the purpose of outlining and dramatizing the scope of this issue, and as a vehicle for hearings.

Members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs co-sponsoring the measure, Mrs. Sullivan said, include: Representatives Henry B. Gonzalez of Texas, Joseph G. Minish of New Jersey, Frank Annunzio of Illinois, Jonathan Bingham of New York, all Democrats, and Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York. Similar legislation, she said, will probably be introduced by other Members of the full Committee and of the House.

CONSUMER PROTECTION FEATURES

Mrs. Sullivan said the bill, known as the "Consumer Credit Protection Act," would cover the following areas of consumer protection in the use of credit:

1. Require full disclosure of all finance charges in terms of an annual percentage rate in credit transactions or, where applicable, in "offers to extend credit";
2. Establish a Federal ceiling of 18% on the finance charge in any extension of credit "to a natural person" (without disturbing state laws which provide lower ceilings);
3. Prohibit the garnishment of wages to satisfy debts;
4. Create a National Commission on Consumer Finance to investigate all aspects of the consumer finance industry and report to Congress by December 31, 1969, on the adequacy of existing regulatory programs and the desirability of Federal regulation or chartering of consumer finance companies.

INFLATIONARY USE OF CREDIT

In addition to the above safeguards for the consumer in his own use of credit, the bill includes two sections to protect the public from the consequences of excessive use of credit contributing to inflation, particularly in periods of national emergency.

Thus, it would restore to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System standby powers, such as it exercised during World War II and part of the Korean War, to restrict or control the use of credit during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Another section of the bill gives to the Federal Reserve System the same powers to set margin requirements in connection with trading in commodity futures contracts that it now holds in the setting of margins for credit transactions on the stock exchanges. The purpose of this section, according to the bill, is to prevent "the excessive speculation in and the excessive use of credit for the creation, carrying, or trading in commodity futures contracts having the effect of inflating consumer prices."

Congresswoman Sullivan said that Chairman Patman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has authorized her Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs to proceed with hearings early next month on "Truth-In-Lending" and related bills, including her proposed "Consumer Credit Protection Act." Members of the Subcommittee, in addition

to the co-sponsors of the new bill, are Representatives Robert G. Stephens, Jr., of Georgia, and Richard T. Hanna, of California, Democrats; Representatives Florence P. Dwyer of New Jersey, Paul A. Fino of New York, Chalmers P. Wylie of Ohio, and Lawrence G. Williams of Pennsylvania, Republicans.

OTHER ISSUES NOT TO DELAY TRUTH IN LENDING

"Nearly all of the Members of my Subcommittee have indicated their strong support for effective 'Truth-In-Lending' legislation," Congresswoman Sullivan declared. "But I think there is general agreement also that disclosure of finance charges is not, in and of itself, sufficient to protect millions of consumers from the depredations of loan sharks or the tragic consequences of overuse of credit by many families misled into undertaking credit obligations they cannot handle.

"Personal bankruptcies reflect this increasing problem. We have never held hearings on consumer credit problems and so we want our hearings to be broad enough and complete enough to cover the full extent of the consumer credit issue. My own study convinces me that the bill which I have prepared deals realistically with urgent problems which requires Federal legislation for effective solutions.

"I hope we can enact the 'Consumer Credit Protection Act' with whatever modifications the hearings dictate, but I certainly want to make it clear that the controversy which is bound to develop over some features of this legislation will not be permitted to stymie effective 'Truth-In-Lending' legislation, now that the Senate has finally, after seven years, passed a credit disclosure bill."

Mrs. Sullivan expressed her deep admiration for the pioneering work done by former Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois in originating and battling for "Truth-In-Lending" legislation. She also praised Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin for his leadership and hard work in winning Senate passage this year for the first time of any bill on this subject.

"Our purpose is to try to build a much stronger consumer protection measure on the foundation of 'Truth-In-Lending' legislation, including a section on 'Truth-In-Credit Advertising' which originated with Chairman Warren G. Magnuson of the Senate Commerce Committee which we have incorporated into this bill. Other sections of this bill grew out of studies by the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and the full Committee."

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT

TITLE I—CREDIT TRANSACTIONS

Disclosure

This title provides for the full disclosure of the terms and conditions of credit in connection with consumer credit transactions. Disclosure requirements provided for are applicable both with regard to the advertisement of credit in connection with a sale or a loan, as well as in the conduct of an actual credit transaction. In advertisement, as well as credit transactions coming within the scope of this act, the creditor is required to provide the buyer or borrower with a statement of the cash sale price, the finance charge, and the annual percentage rate applicable to the credit transaction. In addition to the foregoing, other detailed information must be provided to the consumer in connection with the advertisement or credit transaction involved.

Maximum finance charge

In addition to such disclosure, the act provides that a creditor may neither demand nor accept a finance charge in connection with the extension of credit which exceeds the maximum rate permitted under ap-

licable State law or 18 percent per annum, whichever is less.

Responsible agency

Regulatory authority to implement the provisions of this title are vested in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In addition to authority to issue regulations, the Board is given powers of administrative enforcement to secure compliance with the act. In addition to such administrative enforcement, individuals to whom information is required to be given under the act are authorized to bring civil suit where such information has not been properly provided.

Confession of judgment

With regard to credit transactions coming within the scope of this title, the Act prohibits the use of confessions of judgment (cognovit notes), whereby a debtor waives his rights to full legal process in the creditor's attempt to obtain legal judgment against him.

Criminal penalties

Violation of the act may further result in the imposition of criminal penalties when suit is brought by the United States Attorney General.

Regulation of credit for commodity futures trading

For the purpose of preventing the speculation in, and the excessive use of credit for, the creation, carrying, or trading in commodity futures contract, tending to inflate consumer prices, the act provides that the Board of Governors shall issue regulations governing the amount of credit that may be extended or maintained on any such contracts.

Emergency control of consumer credit

This title further provides that whenever the President determines that a national emergency exists which necessitates such action, the Board shall issue regulations to control the extension of consumer credit.

Effective date

The act provides that this title shall take effect on July 1, 1968.

TITLE II—PROHIBITION OF GARNISHMENT OF WAGES

This title provides that the garnishment of wages is frequently an element in the predatory extension of credit and that such garnishment frequently results in the disruption of employment, production, and consumption, constituting a substantial burden on interstate commerce. Accordingly, provision is made prohibiting the garnishment of wages or salary due an employee. Violation of the section subjects an individual to possible fine or imprisonment.

TITLE III—COMMISSION ON CONSUMER FINANCE

This title provides for the establishment of a bi-partisan national commission on consumer finance to be composed of nine members: 3 members from the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; 3 members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by The Speaker; and 3 persons to be appointed by the President. The Commission is called upon to study and appraise the functioning and structure of the consumer finance industry in the United States and to report its findings, recommendations, and conclusions to the Congress and the President by December 31, 1969. The Commission is specifically called upon to include within the scope of its report and recommendations a discussion of:

"1. The adequacy of existing arrangements to provide consumer financing at reasonable rates.

"2. The adequacy of existing supervisory and regulatory mechanisms to protect the public from unfair practices.

"3. The desirability of Federal chartering of consumer finance companies, and other regulatory measures."

MILITARY POTENTIAL OF SST

Mr. RYAN. 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. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee stated, on July 18 in support of the funds for the development of a supersonic transport that this plane will have great military value. He said:

I do not care who makes a statement to the contrary notwithstanding.

By this I take it he refers to the comments of the Secretary of Defense.

According to Aviation Daily, February 23, 1967, Secretary of Defense McNamara said, for example, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the fiscal year 1967 supplemental defense budget:

Except in the most indirect way, I anticipate no military benefits from the production of the supersonic transport . . . I see very little benefit even of a spin-off character to military technology and military programs.

The House has already taken action on H.R. 11456, the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation, in which the funds for SST development are included, but the matter is yet to come before the Senate. I think it would be useful to clarify for the record, and for the consideration of Members of the other body, the military potential of this aircraft.

On March 15, 1967, Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Brown, testified before the House Appropriations Committee on the fiscal year 1968 defense budget as follows at page 768:

Some of the technology having to do with structures, engines, and so on, which was learned in the United States supersonic transport program, will be applicable in a supersonic bomber development, and vice versa, but neither one really provides any substantial help toward the engineering development and detailed design of the other.

The technology actually has been flowing the other way, because the supersonic transport design, which the United States is now going ahead with, includes two things: First, a variable sweep wing which is an outgrowth of the work done on the F-111 and second, titanium from the Air Force YF-12A program. The B-70 used stainless steel construction, which probably will not be very much used in the SST. We did, however, use a good amount of a type of stainless steel honeycomb in the B-70 which may be adaptable to various structures such as doors and panels on the SST. So, the technology has really flowed mostly the other way, Mr. Andrews, with the YF-12A, B-70, and F-111 contributing to the U.S. supersonic transport.

Prior to the occasion of this testimony, Secretary Brown sent a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations dated March 7, 1967, ex-

plaining the situation in greater detail. In the course of this letter he said:

Our studies have shown that even when no development costs, other than modifications, are charged to a bomber version of the SST, the cost per weapon delivered to the target is greater than could be achieved with a new advanced bomber of quite different characteristics, even though complete development costs would have to be paid for the latter.

The Secretary's letter states at another point:

The SST provides, at considerable cost, a capability to operate in a flight regime that does not represent the best means of penetrating projected enemy defenses.

And finally:

The Air Force design for an advanced bomber has the required performance and payload in a vehicle about one half the size of the proposed SST. Although the advanced bomber would have a supersonic speed capability, its top speed would avoid the more severe environmental problems of the SST. Its reduced weight and complexity result in lower procurement and operating costs. This together with its increased effectiveness (range, dispersal capability, reduced radar cross section, ride quality at low altitude, et cetera) provides the advanced bomber with a very substantial overall cost effectiveness advantage over a modified version of the SST.

Mr. Speaker, it is not clear why the United States is so anxious to rush into a costly program of SST development involving many unsolved problems and great economic risk on the strength of a nebulous national prestige. It may well be that our prestige will lose a great deal more if we show ourselves to be a nation whose commitments and investments are based largely on a hysteria about our "image"—largely and simply because the British and French are building the Concorde—unable to wait and learn from their experience—and unable to take the advice of a multitude of technical and economic experts within our own country as to the inadvisability of this effort. It may well be that the commercial developers of the SST could learn a great deal from the advanced aircraft planners in the Department of Defense instead of merely rushing to build a plane that is bigger and faster than the Concorde regardless of the additional problems involved, regardless of the expense, and regardless of the fact that it may eventually prove to be an unsound investment.

We have experienced difficulties and disaster in the Apollo program based on a race to the moon. Are we not a nation that can learn from such experiences and apply the lessons learned to a venture such as the SST?

To be sure, the military will learn something from all possible civilian developments in aeronautics. This does not mean that public funds should be hastily invested in all possible and perhaps unwarranted projects. On the assumption that the Senate will give sober and serious consideration to the SST before taking action, I think it appropriate to include the entire text of Secretary Brown's letter to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee at this point in the Record:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 7, 1967.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of February 10, 1967, on the subject of the supersonic transport (SST) as a strategic bomber.

The Air Force has studied the utility of a modified supersonic transport for the strategic bomber role and is continuing to review this possibility as the characteristics and cost of the SST become better defined. In general, our studies have shown that a modified SST configured as a bomber could perform strategic missions. However, its characteristics are far from the optimum ones in terms of survivability and penetration to the target. Therefore, it is far from the most effective approach to the bomber component of our strategic forces.

While a joint development program (FAA and DOD) of a commercial transport and a bomber version of the SST may result in a lower total development cost than would separate development programs for a SST and a new advanced bomber, the extent of any potential savings is critically dependent upon the degree of compromise that could be tolerated in each version in order to achieve commonality. Beyond the development program, when all factors such as procurement costs, ten-year operating costs, and operational effectiveness are considered, the separate development of a new bomber appears to us to be a more cost effective approach for accomplishing the military tasks. Our studies have shown that even when no development costs, other than modifications, are charged to a bomber version of the SST, the cost per weapon delivered to the target is greater than could be achieved with a new advanced bomber of quite different characteristics, even though complete development costs would have to be paid for the latter. There are a number of reasons for this, some of which are discussed below.

The SST design is a large gross weight (675,000 pounds) vehicle incorporating structural materials, aerodynamics, engines and environmental control equipment for high altitude supersonic cruise at Mach 2.7. It does not represent the best design approach for a high altitude bomber because of its large fuselage, high radar cross section and lack of compatibility between the bomber refueling requirements and fuel availability of the KC-135 tankers.

Further, the SST provides, at considerable cost, a capability to operate in a flight regime that does not represent the best means of penetrating projected enemy defenses. Studies and simulated tests have shown that penetration of sophisticated enemy defenses including surface-to-air missiles can best be accomplished by flying at low altitude at the highest speed compatible with attaining the necessary range. A bomber version of the SST without structural and engine modifications suffers very severe degradation in performance when operated at low altitude. Its top speed would be about 330 knots and its range would be very limited because its engines are not designed to operate efficiently at low altitude. This performance could be improved by structural reinforcement of the fuselage, wings, and tail assembly plus the installation of new engines. This would still not provide a very good bomber aircraft because of the large amount of fuselage volume available for the low density payloads associated with commercial operations. This large volume is not required for the higher density military payloads and results in higher aerodynamic drag and greater range loss than would result from a fuselage designed specifically for military weapon payloads.

The Air Force design for an advanced bomber has the required performance and payload in a vehicle about one half the size of the proposed SST. Although the advanced bomber would have a supersonic speed capability, its top speed would avoid the more severe environmental problems of the SST. Its reduced weight and complexity result in lower procurement and operating costs. This together with its increased effectiveness (range, dispersal capability, reduced radar cross section, ride quality at low altitude, et cetera) provides the advanced bomber with a very substantial overall cost effectiveness advantage over a modified version of the SST.

Despite the above described limitations of the SST, we will continue to review its utility in the strategic bomber role. We are presently updating our analyses to reflect the most recent cost and performance estimates proposed to the FAA for the commercial transport. We will be happy to discuss this in more detail as our updated analyses are completed.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BROWN,
Secretary of the Air Force.

BOYD URGES NEW LOOK IN LABOR STRIFE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the massive national rail tieup this past week has brought home to Americans the urgency for remedial action.

To ignore the basic problem of strikes in the transportation industry that harm the public interest simply because the trains are rolling again is not the best approach to the problem.

The public is going to get hurt again unless the Congress, management, labor, and the administration resign themselves to the fact that they are going to delve into the problem.

The main responsibility, I believe, rests with the Congress since by nature the general health, safety and welfare of the public is in their hands.

There was much heated debate, both pro and con, on the merits of the resolution that this body passed 3 days ago, and no matter how you felt on that particular measure, I think that individually each one of us has a responsibility to those we represent and the Nation to seek impartial, permanent solutions to the problem of crippling work stoppages.

I am sure that many of you realize I have offered such legislation, H.R. 5638. Legislation, I believe, will modernize our national labor policies while at the same time upholding the traditional rights of negotiation that have contributed so greatly to the strength of the labor movement and industry in this country.

I urge the Members to support these needed revisions, or to offer any other suggestions, particularly where the transportation industry is concerned, and I think the Congress ought to hold hearings on such measures soon.

In this same light, I would like to bring to your attention a discussion of the problem by Transportation Secretary

Alan Boyd as reported in this morning's issue of the Washington Post.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1967]

BOYD URGES NEW LOOK IN LABOR STRIFE

(By Andrew J. Glass)

"The best brains in the United States" have been unable to find a formula to cope with strikes that harm the national interest, Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd said yesterday.

In a press conference held in the White House, Boyd said a solution to the problem has eluded the Johnson Administration, the Congress and the academic community.

Boyd met with reporters after briefing President Johnson on the restoration of normal rail service following passage, on Monday, of legislation that halted a U.S. railroad walkout.

The Transportation Secretary felt that a new attitude was needed in labor management disputes. It was an attitude, he said, where "major controversies having a tremendous impact on the national interest" can be resolved with the acceptance of decisions "whether or not they are appreciated."

As matters now stand, Boyd added, labor walkouts that affect the national interest can be dealt with only on a piecemeal basis, in the same fashion as the current rail dispute.

Although the President called for a measure to deal with such strikes in his State of the Union Message in January, the Administration has all but given up on its plans. At one point, Mr. Johnson asked congressional leaders to seek an acceptable formula.

In his discussion Boyd ruled out both a general compulsory arbitration law and special labor courts as effective means of dealing with the problem. Boyd also said he was "terribly concerned" about the operation of the Railway Labor Act. As he put it:

"In controversial cases, it appears to me that you don't have any collective bargaining, that the parties sit back and wait until the situation develops into a crisis and then there is an emergency board and then nobody seems to pay a great deal of attention to the emergency board, so it gets escalated into what I believe is called a Federal case.

"This is a violation of the whole concept—the spirit of the law. Somehow, some way, either there has to be some influence brought in from the outside or a greater sense on the part of the negotiating parties that they must resolve their own problems. But they just can't keep them dragging like a cancer, month after month after month."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. WINN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I reminded the House earlier this week, this is Captive Nations Week and this year's observance has special significance as we note the involvement of the Soviet Union in the Middle East and its obvious attempts to expand its colonial empire. Another major address delivered at the Captive Nations Conference at the Mayflower Hotel on July 15 was by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, professor emeritus at Marquette University and a visiting professor at Catholic University, who has

authored a most widely recognized publication on the captive nations. The text of Professor Smal-Stocki's speech follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS, MIDDLE EAST AND VIETNAM

(Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, the Catholic University of America, address delivered at the Captive Nations Conference, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., July 15, 1967)

Every morning everyone of us opens the daily paper and reads about Vietnam. Many of us ask the question: Why is it that we must fight in Vietnam? Who supplies the Viet-Cong with the weapons, ammunition, rockets and airplanes they use for their aggressions?

What has happened? Were we not twenty years ago the top world power with a monopoly of atomic weapons and absolute air-power superiority? Currently we have Cuba in our own backyard, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and now the war in Vietnam.

Cuba and Vietnam are the results of the foreign policy our country has had for the past decades. What went wrong in the planning of our foreign policy? There are a number of answers to this question. But on one point all scholars—true specialists—agree: The main reason for our catastrophe in foreign policy has been and is still the American failure to understand Russian Communism. I do not underestimate the achievements of Alger Hiss and his kind, but this main reason remains.

This failure led to our abandonment to Russian Communist imperialism (with a complete disregard to all the principles of the Atlantic Charter) of the Baltic States, of Ukraine, Byelorussia and the other Captive Nations inside the Soviet empire; to the abandonment of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia. Then came the abandonment of China to the "agrarian reformer," Mao Tse Tung, of North Korea, Tibet, the abandonment of Cuba to "agrarian reformer Castro," and then North Vietnam. And finally comes the latest move of Moscow to erase Israel and to establish its dominion over the Near East as a springboard to Africa and for the partition of Turkey so-long-planned-by-the-Tsars. I have enumerated to you the *stepping stones* of Russian imperialism which have finally led to Korea, Cuba, and Vietnam where we have been and are being forced to make a stand and fight.

It is worthwhile during the Captive Nations Week, and it is the moral duty of a historian, to analyze all the angles of this American failure to understand Russian Communism, because this failure has resulted in the present tragedy of the whole free world with its disintegrating alliances in Europe and Asia because nations have lost confidence in our leadership.

The most important mistakes of our diplomats were and are first and above all, a false image of the Soviet Union as a homogenous country, equivalent to "Russia" and populated by "Russians." This "Russia"—the Soviet Union—is really a colonial empire with many problems. The empire is surrounded by satellites ruled by dictatorships by the grace of Moscow. The Moscovites inside the empire practice the most brutal exploitation of the submerged colonial peoples, who are forced to pay for the Communist imperialism. The second fallacy is the slogan: "One world." Only in the technological sense does a "one world" (of electricity, motors, cars, machines) exist, but in the cultural sense there exists no "one world" between our Judeo-Christian civilization and the principles of the Soviet civilization merged with materialism and atheism, which for a half a century has developed and is imposed by the Russian Communist dictatorship in the Soviet police state. The characteristic of this Soviet civilization is a Russian master-race and superiority complex—an avante garde complex with a Moscovite Messianism sup-

ported by Neo-Panslavism and Eurasianism aiming still at the "World Soviet Union."

The third point of which America is not aware is the moral abyss between our world outlook and the Soviet world. The basic problem is concerning what is good and what is evil. Our Judeo-Christian world answers this question with the decalogue: but for Moscow, according to Lenin, everything is morally good which advances the victorious march of Communism, I say everything: lies, murder, poison, genocide. And everything is evil which opposes the expansion of Russian Communist imperialism. What sense does it make to negotiate treaties with this Moscow, the only power expelled from the League of Nations in Geneva, the ally of Hitler, the aggressor against Finland, the aggressor against Poland, the Baltic States, and the Captive Nations, and now the real aggressor against Israel? What sense is it to trust a power which repeatedly has violated all the principles, letter and spirit, of the U.N. Charter? How can a power be trusted which attempted to wipe out—to "Genocide" a fellow member of the U.N., little Israel? This "would-be" murderer has even the arrogance to moralize and to pontificate in the U.N.—while our State Department does not have the moral courage to enumerate and list all the Captive Nations whose free, democratic, even Socialist states were by Muscovite aggression liquidated and integrated into the Russia Communist empire.

The fourth point is: Semantics. Moscow has created a real up-side-down "language," a "double-talk" and "double-think." Moscow has changed all the meanings of international terminology of liberalism, democracy, humanism into their very opposites and imposed a semantic tyranny on a large part of American public opinion. Lenin himself advised his collaborators: "Confuse your enemies" and in this field Moscow has gained a great victory by semantics. My warnings and publications since 1950 have been disregarded by our intellectuals. Even President Kennedy had to learn it face to face from Khrushchev in Vienna.

"The facts of the matter are that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: war, peace, democracy and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong, of what is an internal affair and what is aggression. And above all, we have wholly different concepts of where the world is and where it is going." (Time magazine, June 16, 1961)

But 80 percent of American public opinion is still being confused, and especially our intellectuals, who do not grasp Russian propaganda terminology, are being fooled by "peaceful coexistence" campaigns. Already Communist propaganda has led many in the academic world to respond to "peaceful acceptance" of Communism. The propaganda campaign slogans of "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competitiveness" can be seen in their true meaning in the Near East, the Far East, Latin America and Africa, where Russian subversion is evident.

The fifth reason for the American misunderstanding of Russian Communism is that the Communist Party is regarded as a bona fide American political party. The history of other Communist parties outside the Soviet Union proves something different. They are all ideological foreign armies in civilian clothes, which fulfill functions from the point of the global strategy of Communist imperialism in the struggle for the world.

The sixth and last point which I want to stress is the usual misidentification of Russian Communism. It is a fallacy to make the Western Europe and Marx responsible for Russian Bolshevism. In Bolshevism, Marxism is window dressing. Bolshevism is basically Bakunism. We cannot ignore the opinion of the great Russian philosopher, Nikolay Berdyaev, who convincingly identified Russian

Communism with its despotic aspects as a Russian National creation and the third appearance of Russian autocratic imperialism, its first appearance being the Muscovite Tsardom and the second, the Petrine Empire, after the defeat of the Ukrainian Hertman Mazepa and Charles XII of Sweden at Poltava in 1709.

Summing up: Russian Communism was and is in fact Russian imperialism, which was and is confused by Liberals in America as a "progressive movement" with an evolution towards some "liberalism." This evolution is simply wishful thinking of American Kerenskys. Russian Communism represented and represents the blackest Russian reaction, realizing the program of the old Tsarist Black Hundreds and the political visions of the Russian poet, Flodar Tynchev (1807-1873) in his poem "Russian Geography":

"Moscow and the city of Peter (present Leningrad) and the city of Constantine (Constantinople) . . .

These are the sacred capitals of Russian Tsardom . . .

But where is its end? And where are its borders

To the North, to the East, to the South, and toward sunset?

They will be revealed by the fates to future times . . .

Seven internal seas and seven great rivers . . .

From the Nile to the Neva, from the Elbe to China,

From the Volga to the Euphrates, from the Ganges to the Danube . . .

This is Russian Tsardom . . . and it will not disappear with the ages

As the Holy Spirit foresaw and Daniel foretold."

This "vision" of the borders of Russian Tsardom has for half a century been pursued successfully through Communism.

Let me continue my talk relating Vietnam to an interpretation of the recent events in the Near East from the point of view of the Captive Nations' ideology, because America and her intellectuals still do not grasp the present real aims of Moscow and the involvement of the Soviet nationality problem into the Near East. Behind the Near East crisis is the explosive Nationality problem in the Soviet Union. The basic fact for the understanding of the Near East crisis is the fact of the existence of more than 40 million captive Islam (Muslim) nationalities in the Soviet empire. Before World War I, they were dedicated to the ideologies of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism. Their great leader Ismail Gasprinsky in 1908 propagated the plan of an All-Muslim Congress in Egypt, Cairo, in order to get the backing of all Muslim nations for the Muslim resistance against the Russians inside the Russian empire. During the Russian revolution Idel-Ural (Tatars), Azerbaijan, Turkestan, North Caucasus and Crimean Turks proclaimed their free states and resisted by arms the Russian Communist aggressions and forced integration into the Soviet Union.

Moscow feared and fears these conceptions of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism, expressions of a strong revolutionary nationalism. Moscow feared (since the monarchy was overthrown in Egypt) that the Arab nationalist revolution would unite all Islam peoples under Egypt's leadership, that it would be joined by Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan and form a mighty bloc for the liberation of the Islam nationalities in the Soviet Union. Such a proclamation for the liberation of Islam nations would put on the agenda of world politics immediately the whole Captive Nations problem of the Soviet empire.

The Communist counteraction against this pressing danger was: (a) the Nile dam, (b) penetration by thousands of "advisors", diplomats, "consuls," and spies of the whole Near East, (c) large deliveries of different

kinds of arms, (d) a systematic propaganda of Anti-Semitism.

Using Anti-Semitism (Moscow long ago liquidated the Jewish autonomous republic Biro-Bidjan and completely weakened Judaism, the progenitor of Christianity) as a common ideology of hate, Moscow formed with Arab Anti-Semitism a common front against Israel, thus diverting Arab nationalism from its natural aims in the Soviet Union—the liberation of Muslim nations—and directing it towards the genocide of Israel.

This conception of Russian imperialism includes for Moscow these great possibilities: (a) a de facto control of the Suez Canal, (b) a second front in the back for our allies Turkey and Iran, (c) the loss of the oil-basin for the free world, (d) a political domination of the whole Near East, (e) a further advance of Russian imperialism in North Africa—Algeria—towards the African bank of Gibraltar, (f) the final aim is a Russian Communist Mediterranean Sea and a Communist "Pan-Europe," which Communists in Italy and France will welcome, (g) the final result: an isolated America, (h) what the Communist domination of the Near East means for our defense of Southeast Asia, everybody can surely imagine. Thus it is not the end of the crisis in the Near East but just the beginning, and pokerface Kosygin frankly lectured our President in Hollybush about the meaning of peaceful coexistence: "Russian Communism keeps the basic Communist Doctrine to promote world revolution by wars of liberation."

Also in the light of the events in the Near East, the reason for the diplomatic actions of Podgorny in Rome become clear. These actions were the diplomatic preparations for the planned explosion in the Near East, aiming at the genocide of Israel. But Israel victoriously resisted to the Russian planned genocide, therefore, according to "Muscovite justice," Israel is guilty of destroying Moscow's "liberation" conceptions for the Near East—and Israel must be punished. "Israel must be punished"—and our State Department has not the moral courage to demand that the Muscovite warmongers and war criminals, the former allies of Hitler and the teachers of Gestapo be put before a war crime tribunal of the U.N.

Moscow started the "celebrations" of the semicentury of Russian Communist imperialism, its expansion and genocide. Surely, the climax of the celebration had to be the realization of the "great Communist designs" for the Near East with a total pogrom of Israel through Arab Nationalism. The descendants of Ivan the Terrible keep their glorious traditions. . .

But neither our Department of State, nor the Secretary General of the U.N. are aware of what is happening. Professor Brzezinski acts as funeral director and assures them that "Communism is dead."

Our answer to all these plans of Russian imperialism should be a Captive Nations World Movement. In Europe the ideals of the Captive Nations have always had the strongest backing among Democratic Socialists, Liberals, Intellectuals, and especially university professors. Most university professors were united in a common front for the Defense of Academic freedom against Communist dictatorship. Intellectuals in Europe had a deep understanding for our demand of self-determination, religious and political freedom, for our fight for the dignity of the person and for our struggle against Red Fascism.

But where is the help of American Liberalism and Socialism for the ideals of the Captive Nations? Where is their support for these ideals of the Captive Nations? Their record up to now is, with only a few exceptions, support for the preservation of Russian imperialism and malicious silencing of the Captive Nations struggle.

Where are the voices of American universities and their professors in the defense of academic freedom in the Soviet Union? Professor Sydney Hook is an honorable exception. Some professors from the Universities of Bridgeport, Rutgers, Yale, MIT were a year ago guest speakers at the testimonial dinner for Herbert Aptheker! What's happening? Socialists and Communists in America maintain a common front for the preservation of the Russian Communist Empire and for the continuation of the colonial enslavement of the Captive Nations?

We, American intellectuals with a Captive Nations background, feel a deep resentment and disappointment towards the majority of American intellectuals and the academic world. They have in our American society the moral authority and prerogative of being a moral guide and critic to the world and world affairs. This moral authority and prerogative they have prostituted.

Publicly ask them: where was your guidance in the last quarter of a century and your criticism of Russian imperialism as it swallowed one nation after another? And now, the Kennans happily accept as a "fact" the existence of "Russia," and justify it by their complete moral nihilism. Thus, the American intellectuals kowtow before Moscow, completely forgetting that the U.S. was and should be a revolutionary society, founded on revolutionary principles and offering all enslaved peoples of the world a true revolutionary promise: the supreme value of freedom!

Our Congress through the Captive Nation Resolution saved the honor of the American Nation by condemning Russian Communist Imperialism. We are proud that a great American labor leader, George Meany, is our partisan. I, an old university professor, want to publicly pay tribute to him in deep gratitude for his defense of academic freedom in the Soviet police empire.

But where are the voices of American Liberals against Russian tyranny, against the enslavement of workers and peasants in the Soviet Union? Why do they not also fight for the human rights and civil liberties for the Captive Nations? Why do they not re-establish in America a free market of ideas for East European matters, why do they not abolish the dictatorship of the Soviet dogmas and the tyranny of Soviet Semantics in America? This is the question.

Thank you.

THE CASE OF THE MISSING TURKEYS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, I made some remarks directed at an error made by the Department of Agriculture in reporting the turkey population for 1966. I spoke of how the error had a price inflating effect on the 1966 turkey market and how the inflated prices of 1966 contributed to overproduction and depressed prices in 1967.

Walter Wilcox, Director of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, in a letter I recently received from him said he was "at a loss to understand" my reasoning. He does not seem to understand why this admitted error had an effect on the price of turkeys.

My remarks were based on a statement by Richard Larkin, Poultry Division, USDA, which admits and explains the error, and state that the error did have an effect on the price of turkeys. I would like to insert the statement in the Record at this time, as follows:

THE CASE OF THE MISSING TURKEYS

(By Richard C. Larkin, Poultry Division)

There was a period in mid-summer 1966 when in excess of 5 million turkeys appeared to be "missing." As the turkey industry well knows, these "missing" birds showed up later and were largely carried over into 1967 either on the hoof or as storage stocks. The turkeys were "missing" only when comparing estimated marketings, based on poult placements, with discrepancy was a factor influencing the price of turkeys marketed during the main 1966 turkey marketing season.

Now that 1966 is history, it is evident that these turkeys were not "missing" but rather were marketed later than predicted. When the turkey slaughter for the year was totaled, practically all of the poult placements could be accounted for.

Estimating turkey marketings accurately depends in large part on correctly predicting the growing period, in weeks, from poult placements to maturity for both the "heavy" and "light" breeds. We estimate the length of this growing period on the previous year's experience.

In retrospect, it appears that this growing period in 1966 was longer than in 1965. Based on the seasonal pattern of slaughter in 1966 it appears that a 10-day to two-week error was made in predicting the period from poult placement to marketing. This error, history now tells us, accounted for the "missing" turkeys which subsequently came home to roost.

It further appears that the 1966 marketing prediction error was compounded by both a relatively long growing period in 1966 and a relatively short growing period in 1965. Taken together this made the difference between the two years much more pronounced than is usually the case. Growing periods have been declining over the years but the average difference from one year to the next has been a matter of days, not weeks. Thus, the 10-day to two-week difference in 1966 as compared to 1965 was most unusual.

Mr. Speaker, the instance of 5,000,000 missing turkeys was not an isolated example of erroneous use of statistics having undesirable effects on markets.

In March of this year an issue of the publication Livestock and Meat Situation announced that the Department of Agriculture had underestimated the cattle population of America. It said:

The January 1 estimates in Tables 1 and 2 have been revised for 1961-1966 on the basis of data obtained from the Census of Agriculture and other data which have become available since the original estimates were made.

In that instance the cattle population statistics were off by 2,305,000. When the figures were revised upward, the effect was a depression of the prices farmers received.

Mr. Speaker, the prices producers receive for their cattle normally rise from the month of February to March each year. The average rise in prices for the past 3 years has been 76 cents a hundred. From February of this year to March the average price per hundredweight fell 25 cents. This represents a change from the past averages of over \$1 per hundredweight. In the week of March 15, 1967, when the cattle popu-

lation figures were revised upward, prices fell 75 cents per hundredweight.

Certainly, some of the price reduction in the last 6-month period suffered by cattlemen was caused by rapidly rising production and near-record imports. It is significant, however, that the traditional March price rise did not materialize when the revised cattle population figures came out.

Last year, the Agriculture Department understated demand and overstated carryover in forecasts for four other major farm commodities. The mistake in each of these cases depressed prices received in the prime selling period of the particular crop, resulting in a loss of income to farmers.

Last fall, Congressman QUIE estimated that \$300 million was lost from corn revenues, \$400 million was lost from soybean revenues, \$180 million from wheat revenues, and \$25 million from grain sorghum revenues. The curious coincidence is that the statistical errors in each of these four major products had the effect of keeping prices down.

What is needed? Orville Freeman on one hand says:

The accuracy of production estimates becomes vital as crops move into close supply-demand situations.

On the other hand, we see USDA production, population, demand and carry-over statistics in error. It is time for a change. The Secretary of Agriculture keeps claiming he is in favor of a fair return for a farmer's production, but the black cloud of the "cheap food policy" continues to follow him around. The "errors" that the Department attributes ex post facto to "famine in India" or "too much rain in Iowa" keep popping up.

I would suggest to the Secretary of Agriculture that more effort be devoted to the accuracy of all USDA statistics. Traditionally, the career employees working in agricultural reporting have been conscientious. I believe they remain so, and they generally deserve the thanks of American agriculture.

I cannot help but feel, however, that policymakers in the Department of Agriculture have been content with methods that do little but uphold a "cheap food policy."

The career economists and statisticians of the Department should be allowed to remain free from political influence. They should be free to use the latest economic methods to come to accurate conclusions about supply-and-demand functions.

The second area that needs immediate revision is the way statistics are presented. Most farmers must be part economist to judge the upcoming market and plan production. Many are prone to accept USDA publications as gospel. And, the Department all too often has presented its predictions in ways that lead to that conclusion. I would suggest that in the future all USDA predictions, estimates, and "guesstimates" be clearly labeled as such.

These measures would be a first step. Farm costs have skyrocketed in the past few months and the prices farmers receive in many areas are below levels of

20 years ago. The Economic Research Service expects net farm income in 1967 to drop by 5 percent. I hope this is one case where the ERS is not fully correct, but if it is, the farmer can certainly not afford to bear the cost of erroneous statistics on top of everything else.

CRIME RATE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURTON] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the crime rate in the United States is growing approximately six times faster than the population. This has created a situation which is totally repugnant to the American public. In 1966 there was a serious crime committed every 11 seconds.

The executive branch through the President's National Crime Commission has been investigating this situation and has asked Congress to pass a package of crime-control bills designed for alleviating this problem from the national level. Today I am introducing a bill which would create a joint committee to study crime and recommend legislation to Congress. Congress must have the facility to investigate this problem and write original legislation as it is needed.

The distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] introduced this bill on January 10, and a companion bipartisan measure has been introduced in the Senate. The joint committee created by this bill would consist of seven Members of the House appointed by the Speaker and seven Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore, in each case no more than four Members would be of the same party. The committee would be empowered to investigate and study crime—its elements, origins, and effects, and measures for crime control and improvement of detection of crimes, law enforcement, and the administration of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that now is the time for the Congress to take this needed step in safeguarding our Nation from crime. I urge prompt passage of this resolution so that Congress can assume a primary responsibility in combating this great national problem.

HELP THE MAIL

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial from the Daily News, Camarillo-Port Hueneme, Calif.:

HELP THE MAIL

The mail to this office Monday brought five publications from the Office of Economic Opportunity. All had been sent free.

The same mail brought a news release from the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. It was paid for. Interestingly, the paid for mail complained about the free mail from the OEO, also known as the poverty program.

The mail from the OEO told us about the work of the director, Sargent Shriver, and all that his program is doing to help people in Harlem and in Boston, to name a few places, and recent testimony by the director to get more money to fight poverty.

The letter from the National Federation told of a survey conducted by the federation which showed that 82 per cent of the independent businessmen contacted had voted in favor of an increase in third class mail rates to help offset high post office deficits.

Further, the National Federation called for an end to the free use of the mail by the OEO. There is no reason to wonder about this. The poverty program is trying to impoverish business.

What is happening is this. The OEO is working to establish certain businesses to help the poor people, cooperatives which would work in competition to private enterprise.

And to do this, the poverty program is using the United States mails, and not paying for it, either. With the third class mail, the OEO is blanketing certain populated areas with junk mail promoting its own businesses.

Since the post office is operating at a deficit, and taxes must make up deficits, it is easy to see that the small businessmen have a gripe. They are paying taxes to subsidize the post office and the poverty program which is trying to take away their business.

Under a general rule of the government, federal agencies are barred from using the mails to distribute information to people who have not asked for it. However, this rule has been waived in the case of the poverty program. The OEO can mail unlimited quantities of mail to every postal patron in the nation.

Uncle Sam should look to the operation of the poverty program before it sinks the already staggering post office department.

INCREASING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT PAYMENTS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have today—along with other Republicans—introduced legislation to increase social security benefit payments, retroactive to January 1, 1967, representing the maximum increase possible without an increase in the social security tax rate. Surely we owe this to our elderly citizens who helped build the society in which we live.

Continuing inflation has robbed these Americans of much of their purchasing power, and it may be months before Congress finally agrees on permanent social security benefit increases. Therefore, it is urgent that this increase be enacted immediately to relieve our older citizens from the effects of inflation and its resulting rise in prices.

A BILL TO REBATE EXCISE TAXES ON EXPORTED TIRES AND TUBES TO EXPORTERS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that U.S. exports of tires and tubes are somewhat impeded by a regulation of the Internal Revenue Code regarding the rebate of the excise taxes we collect on tires and tubes.

Taxes collected indirectly, such as excise taxes, or in the case of European Economic Community, turnover or value added taxes, are usually rebated on exports. This rebating procedure is allowable under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and is acceptable international commercial practice. The effect of the rebate is to permit exports to be free of an added charge that might increase their cost and make them less competitive in foreign markets. Imported foreign tires and tubes are also subject to the addition of our excise tax.

The excise tax on tires and tubes is one of four U.S. excise taxes on manufacturers remaining after the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 and the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. The other three are excise taxes on motor vehicles—both passenger and commercial, and truck parts—petroleum products—gasoline and lubricating oil used in highway vehicles—and recreational equipment such as fishing equipment and firearms. The proceeds of the excise taxes on motor vehicles and related items including petroleum and tires and tubes go to the highway trust fund. The excise tax proceeds on fishing equipment and firearms go to a special fund for conservation.

Tires may now be sold for export free of excise tax. Presently subsection (b) of section 6416 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 requires that the excise tax be refunded to the tire manufacturer, if he wishes to export the tires. If a dealer buys from the manufacturer and then wishes to export the tires, he can obtain a rebate of the excise tax paid by the manufacturer if the manufacturer waives the right to a rebate. The waiver is necessary so that the excise tax is not rebated twice: once to the exporter and once to the manufacturer.

Thus, under the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, a tire manufacturer can sell for export tax free to its own subsidiary or affiliate which has a market in a foreign country. The manufacturer can impede the competitive position of any independent exporter by refusing to waive its right to a refund, thereby requiring the independent exporter to either absorb the tax in his own costs or to try to sell in the foreign market at a price which includes the tire tax. The independent exporter is thus forced to compete abroad with the subsidiaries or affiliates of the tire manufacturers, who can sell their product minus the cost of the tax.

The bill I am introducing today will permit the exporter or shipper of U.S. tires and tubes to obtain a refund of the manufacturers' excise tax imposed upon those tires, without requiring him to obtain a waiver of the manufacturer's right to claim a refund of that tax.

The bill contains safeguards to avoid two refunds of a single tax. It provides that the exporter will take the place of the original manufacturer if the tires again become subject to tax. In order to avoid abuse of this relief provision, refunds and credits may be made only under Internal Revenue Service regulations.

This bill may serve to promote U.S. exports by smoothing out the excise tax rebating mechanism for independent exporters, and at the same time by promoting competition in international markets. U.S. exports of tires and tubes and related products amounted, according to the Tariff Commission, to \$79,615,811 in 1966, a sizable figure which we should of course continue to try to maximize. I hope that this bill would have that effect.

AMENDMENT TO 1968 NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in recent discussions of an amendment I offered to the 1968 NASA authorization bill, to provide that the NASA Administrator keep Congress "fully and currently informed" as to NASA activities, some have put forth the view that this provision is unnecessary because the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2454) already contains such language. I believe this view is a mistaken one. Nowhere in the act is there any requirement that the NASA Administrator assume an affirmative responsibility to keep Congress informed.

The "fully and currently informed" amendment is contained in section 6 of S. 1296 as amended by the House of Representatives. The amendment simply places the positive duty upon NASA to keep the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences informed of all of its activities.

The language of the 1958 Space Act does not cover the matter of NASA voluntarily providing information to Congress. Rather, the act—section 303—deals with a public information provision which provides that the NASA Administrator may not withhold information if it is requested by the duly authorized committees of Congress. There is a great deal of difference between a prohibition against withholding information and an affirmative requirement that information be voluntarily supplied.

It was evident during the hearings on the Apollo 204 accident that the space-

flight program had been undergoing serious difficulties for many months. Yet, the Congress was not advised of these difficulties until after the Apollo tragedy—when it was too late to take corrective measures. Since the NASA Administrator was not under any obligation to report these difficulties to Congress, he did not report them. The "information" amendment is intended to provide for improved communications between NASA and Congress. It makes it obligatory for the NASA Administrator to report to the appropriate committees on all matters of importance to NASA's operations.

As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I feel a responsibility to keep informed about NASA's programs. I cannot operate in the dark; I cannot be an effective member of the committee unless I have sufficient information upon which to base judgments and votes. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask for adequate information. Indeed, I believe it is my duty to keep myself fully and currently informed not only about matters directly related to my committee responsibilities, but also about all other matters upon which I will have to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the counsel for the Committee on Science and Astronautics to prepare a comparison of the information provisions in the Space Act and in the 1968 NASA authorization bill as passed by the House. I offer this comparison for the RECORD.

COMPARISON OF INFORMATION PROVISIONS IN AUTHORIZATION BILL AND THE SPACE ACT (By Joseph M. Felton, counsel)

SUMMARY

1. The fully and currently informed provision as contained in Section 6 of S. 1296 with House amendment places the positive duty upon NASA to keep the House and Senate Space Committees fully and currently informed of all of its activities.

2. Section 303 of the Space Act dealing with access to information is essentially a public information provision which provides, in addition, that the Administrator may not withhold information from the duly authorized committees of Congress.

3. The difference is one of emphasis. The former places a positive duty upon NASA. The latter provides that if the Committee requests information, it may not be withheld by NASA. The two provisions are complementary and not in lieu of each other.

4. Furthermore, the fact that the Senate Committee reads "fully and currently informed" into the Section 303 provision, does not, as a matter of law, expand the meaning of that section.

Background on the legislation

In 1958 when Congress was drafting the Space Act, both the House bill (H.R. 12575) and the Senate bill (S. 3609) contained language which eventually became Section 303 of the Space Act.

The House Committee report on H.R. 12575 (Report No. 1770) states concerning the current Section 303:

"This section provides that all information concerning the new agency's activities shall be made available to the public, except information required or authorized by Federal statute to be withheld (such as trade secrets) and information classified to protect the national security. Nothing in this act, however, would prohibit the Administrator from furnishing information to the Senate and House

and the various committees of Congress. It was the desire of the select committee to include in the bill a positive affirmation of Congress' intent that the people be enabled to know what is going on in their Government, subject, of course, to national security restrictions."

The Senate report (Report No. 1701 of June 11, 1958) explained the section as follows:

"Information that is developed or obtained by the new Space Agency is to be made available for public inspection by the Director unless the information is classified by statute or otherwise to protect the national security. All information, however, is to be made available promptly to the duly authorized committees of the Congress."

Initially, both the House and Senate versions of the Space bill provided for the creation of a Joint Committee rather than separate legislative committees, and each bill contained a "fully and currently informed" provision.

The Senate bill (S. 3609) provided in section 304(c):

"The National Aeronautics and Space Agency shall keep the Joint Committee on Aeronautics and Space fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of such Agency; and all other agencies of the United States shall furnish any information requested by such Joint Committee with respect to the activities or responsibilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency or to the field of aeronautics and space."

Although the House bill as reported by the Select Committee provided for the creation of a Joint Committee, that section of the bill was deleted on the floor on an amendment offered by the Chairman of the Select Committee, Mr. McCormack. The Senate, however, did pass the bill with the Joint Committee section. In the House-Senate conference, the Senate receded to the position of the House, and the above provision, together with other provisions patterned after the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, were deleted.

The Conference Report (House Report No. 2166 of July 15, 1958) states concerning section 303:

"Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained similar provisions directing the Administrator to make public disclosure of information on what the Administration is doing. The Senate amendment was adopted."

The Conference report does not mention the "fully and currently informed" provision which was deleted in conference, and neither this provision nor section 303 was referred to during the subsequent floor debate in the House and Senate on passage of the conference report.

If it is assumed that the "fully and currently informed" provision as contained in the early House version and the Senate passed version of the NASA bill served some purpose in addition to the requirements of section 303 which was also in each of the bills, then it must also be assumed that, since section 303 was not changed, a void was left when the "fully and currently informed" provision was deleted in conference.

From reading the reports and from the phrasing of section 303, it would appear that the primary purpose of the section was to make information available to the public, provided it was not classified. The section also provides "that nothing in this Act shall authorize the withholding of information by the Administration from the duly authorized committees of Congress."

The key is the word "withholding", and it would appear that the Administrator must first be asked for the information.

What the "fully and currently informed" provision in the earlier version of the Space Bill would have done is require the Adminis-

trator to take the initiative to furnish relevant information before it is requested by the Congress. Congress can only request information after it knows of its existence, and the "fully and currently informed" provision would have required the Administrator to inform the Committees of relevant information relating to the management and operations of NASA.

Senate action in fiscal year 1968 authorization

In its report on the FY 1968 NASA Authorization request (Senate Report No. 353 of June 23, 1967), the Senate Space Committee indicates that it is the "express intent" of section 303 of the Space Act that the "Administrator of NASA shall keep the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

In arguing against the amendment offered by Senator Charles H. Percy to include a "fully and currently informed" provision in the Senate bill identical to that passed by the House, Senator Clinton P. Anderson stated:

"Mr. President, while there have been some instances in which the committees have not been promptly informed, the language in section 303 is still sufficient to carry out this purpose. There is no need for additional legislative language at this time. The Administrator of NASA should be made aware of the fact that the Congress expects prompt compliance of section 303 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act. This the committee has done by the insertion of strong language in its report."

While it may be true as a practical matter that the Administrator will now keep the committees fully and currently informed, there is nothing in the legislative history of the Act to indicate that this was the intent of those who drafted section 303 of the Space Act. Section 303 deals with the withholding of information, and there is nothing in the House or Senate reports, or in the floor debate, to indicate that when the "fully and currently informed" provision was deleted in conference, the conferees meant to place the positive duty upon the Administrator to require him to keep the committees informed of all of the activities of NASA.

Regarding the action of the Senate Committee to expand the legislative history of the Act by reading "fully and currently informed" into the meaning of section 303, it should be pointed out that it is a standard principle of judicial construction that the courts will not look beyond the plain meaning of a statute on its face unless there is an ambiguity in the statute. Where there is an ambiguity, the courts will seek the intent of Congress by reference to the legislative reports, statements of floor managers and debate on the floor, and the hearings on the bill.

In my opinion, speaking as a matter of law, courts would not look beyond the "withholding of information" phrase in section 303 and would not turn it into a positive duty to furnish unsolicited information.

Again, however, as a practical matter, it would not be unreasonable to expect that the Administrator of NASA will now, based upon the intent of Congress as expressed during the authorization process, seek to keep the committees fully and currently informed, but he would be under no legal obligation to do so.

Arizona [Mr. STEIGER] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, insidious inflation attacks hardest those on a fixed income. It is for that reason I urge consideration and passage of the bill I am cosponsoring today to increase social security benefits.

The merits of this approach to social security increases, the necessity of which is generally acknowledged, are that the increase would be retroactive to January 1, 1967, would provide for the greatest increase possible without a tax increase, and would not impair the actuarial soundness of the fund as it exists.

At this same time, Mr. Speaker, I would also urge that any contemplated taxation of social security payments be abandoned. Taxation of social security benefits or increased withholding to provide benefits would defeat the very purpose of this legislation, which is to help fixed income people meet the continuing rise in the cost of living.

USDA PARITY STUDY—A SIMPLE EXPLANATION

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, last week the U.S. Department of Agriculture released its long-delayed "parity study."

Without commenting on the merits of the Department's recommendations for changing the parity formula, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a provision which I believe may need a little more explanation before we have a full understanding of the basis for the proposed changes.

TABLE 3.—Median age, educational attainment, and proportion of males, farm operators by economic class of farm, and hired farmworkers

Group	Level of gross sales	Median age (years)	Median educational attainment (years)	Proportion of males
Farm operators by economic class of farm:				
Class I ¹	\$40,000 and over	46.8	11.8	.982
Class II ¹	\$20,000 to \$39,999	46.4	11.6	.982
Class III ¹	\$10,000 to \$19,999	48.1	10.4	.982
Class I, II, III ²	\$10,000 and over	46.5	10.5	.982
Class IV ²	\$5,000 to \$9,999	48.8	8.0	.984
Class V ²	\$2,500 to \$4,999	52.4	7.5	.965
Class VI ²	Under \$2,500	53.8	7.0	.939
Part time and abnormal ³	do	49.0	8.0	.956
Part retirement ³	do	70.5	7.2	.917
All farms ⁴		51.0	7.8	.963
Hired farmworkers ³		30.0	8.0	.790
Unpaid family workers ⁴		40.0	7.8	.405

¹ Age and educational attainment medians derived from preliminary data from the 1964 Census of Agriculture. Proportion of males assumed to be equal to the 1960 ratio shown for classes I, II, and III combined.

² Unpublished estimates from a cooperative study conducted by the Economic Development Division, ERS, USDA, and Bureau of Census. In the study, some 9,000 enumeration schedules from both the 1960 Population Census and 1959 Agriculture Census were matched. Combined medians for economic classes I, II, and III are used for 1960 because of the relatively small number of observations obtained for each of these classes in the 1960 study.

³ Hired workers who worked more than 25 days on farms in 1959. From ERS series on hired farmworkers.

⁴ Estimates developed in ERS. The median age is a rough approximation. The education and sex data are firm estimates.

Included at page 55 of the report is the following explanation of certain calculations relative to parity rates of return to farm operator labor and management and unpaid family labor.

In an apparent effort to make these calculations clear to farmers, the general public, and Congress, the report offers the following explanation:

The details of these calculations and their underlying assumptions are discussed below.

(1) The multiple regression equation was calculated showing income as a quadratic function of age, education, and sex. Observations were obtained from 1960 Population Census data for central cities of urbanized areas. The income observations (Y) were the 1959 median incomes of persons in the various age-education-sex cells tabulated in the Census report. The age (X₁) and education (X₂) observations were taken as the mid-range of the age class or education interval, respectively. Sex (X₃) was coded as 1.0 for males and 0 for females. This allowed a literal interpretation of this variable in the equation as the proportion of males in each group, as shown in table 3. A total of 148 observations were obtained in this way from the tabulated Census data. The resulting equation is as follows:

$$Y = -3471.3235 + 226.60418 * X_1 - 51.64458 * X_2 + 2.094.5807 * X_3 - 2.44571 * X_1^2 + 14.94676 * X_2^2$$

* The coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.80 level of probability.

** The coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.999 level of probability.

There, is that not clear now?

Under unanimous consent I include the full text from pages 54 through 56 of the report at this point in the RECORD:

PART 2: PARITY RATES OF RETURN TO FARM OPERATOR AND MANAGEMENT AND UNPAID FAMILY LABOR

The return to labor and management included in the parity return standard should indicate what comparable resources could earn in alternative employment. A person's income-earning capacity depends at least in part on such personal characteristics as age, educational attainment, and sex. Operators of farms in the different economic classes vary widely with regard to these characteristics, as shown in table 3. Data are also shown for hired farm workers who worked 25 days or more on farms, and for unpaid family labor.

INCREASING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

To ascertain how much was earned in nonfarm employment by people in different age, education, and sex groups, five steps were followed:

(1) A multiple regression equation was calculated showing 1959 income as a function of age, education, and sex of people in central cities of urbanized areas.

(2) For each of the groups shown in table 3, the typical or median attributes (age, education, and sex) were substituted into the regression equation. The resulting income levels reflected the total income that people having these age, education, and sex attributes would have earned on the average in central cities of urbanized areas during 1959.

(3) These 1959 annual income data were adjusted downward to reflect income from wages and salaries only.

(4) The annual wage and salary incomes for 1959 were converted to hourly rates using estimates of the number of hours worked per year.

(5) Comparable hourly income estimates were calculated, for 1964 and 1966 using the U.S. average manufacturing wage rates for these years as a base.

The details of these calculations and their underlying assumptions are discussed below.

(1) The multiple regression equation was calculated showing income as a quadratic function of age, education, and sex. Observations were obtained from 1960 Population Census data for central cities of urbanized areas.¹ The income observations (Y) were the 1959 median incomes of persons in the various age-education-sex cells tabulated in the Census report. The age (X_1) and education (X_2) observations were taken as the mid-range of the age class or education interval, respectively. Sex (X_3) was coded as 1.0 for males and 0 for females. This allowed a literal interpretation of this variable in the equation as the proportion of males in each group, as shown in table 3. A total of 148 observations were obtained in this way from the tabulated Census data. The resulting equation is as follows:

$$Y = -3471.3235 + 226.60418^{**} X_1 \\ - 51.64458^{**} X_2 \\ + 2.094.5807^{**} X_3 - 2.44571^{**} X_1^2 \\ + 14.94676^{**} X_2^2$$

* The coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.80 level of probability.

** The coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.999 level of probability.

The multiple R^2 for this equation is 0.89. All the coefficients were statistically significant at an acceptable level of probability. Other equations were also evaluated, including some equations having interaction terms. These interaction terms were not significantly different from zero, and the R^2 was not materially increased. Consequently, these alternative equations were rejected in favor of the one shown above.

(2) For each group shown in table 3, the typical or median age, education, and sex attributes were substituted into the regression equation to determine the total money income that persons having these attributes would have earned in 1959 in cen-

tral cities of urbanized areas. Results of these calculations are shown in column 1, table 4.

(3) These 1959 annual income data were then adjusted downward to reflect income derived from wages and salaries only. The estimated proportion of income derived from wages and salaries in 1959 was used in making this adjustment (column 2, table 4). For persons over age 65 (corresponding to the part-retirement class of farms) the proportion of total income derived from wages and salaries was estimated as 32 percent. This estimate was obtained by interpolating data for unrelated individuals over age 65.² In attempting to obtain a similar ratio for the other groups, we examined Census data indicating the wage and salary incomes of families in urban areas, and the total income of these people.³ These data suggested that in the \$4,000 to \$5,000 income interval, roughly 85 percent of total income was wage or salary earnings.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE CITIES

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I deplore lawlessness and violence and the actions of looters and snipers who breed anarchy in our cities. Congress bears the responsibility to deal swiftly and effectively with the root causes of such violent acts. But, in my judgment, H.R. 421, the bill offered yesterday was not only unnecessary—in light of adequate State and local laws which have been vigorously enforced—but of doubtful constitutionality—in light of our first and fifth amendment constitutional guarantees. Suppression of free speech may well heighten rather than diminish the tensions which smolder in our cities.

The Attorney General of the United States declared his opposition to the bill. Governor Hughes of New Jersey rejected Federal marshals and stated that he found no evidence of outside agitators in Newark. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration has concluded that the outbreak of riots is "unplanned, undisciplined, unled, and incoherent." The Federal Bureau of Investigation, in its study of the 1964 riots, determined that "Aside from the actions of minor organizations or irresponsible individuals there was no systematic planning or organization of any of the city riots."

What we need to break the cycle of hopelessness and despair which permeates the ghettos of America are equal education of quality, employment opportunities of permanence and substance, and decent housing to replace conditions of squalor and disrepair. And it is of particular importance that the Congress enact the fundamental ele-

¹ U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Educational Attainment. Final Report PC (2)-5B. U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963. Table 6, pp. 92-93; table 7, pp. 116-117. For the 21 to 24-year age groups, observations showing more than 12 years of educational attainment were deleted. Likewise for the 25 to 29-year age group, observations showing more than 16 years of education were deleted. These observations were deleted because they were thought to be unduly influenced by the low earnings of college students prior to graduation.

² U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports Sources and Structure of Family Income. Final Report PC (2)-4C. U.S. Govt. Printing Off., Washington, D.C. 1964, table 6.

³ Ibid., table 4.

ments of the President's "Safe Streets" legislation which would authorize Federal funds for training and facilities for State and local enforcement agencies. We must also take immediate action to curb the interstate traffic, largely by mail-order, in firearms. This is the necessary and appropriate role for Federal intervention; the safety of our citizens and their property, in the first instance, must lie with the States and cities, themselves.

HAZARDS ENCOUNTERED BY OEO'S VISTA WORKERS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has tried several interesting new approaches in its work against poverty. One of the OEO programs that is of particular significance is VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

An article from the New York Post, of July 12, illustrates rather well some of the hazards and opportunities that VISTA service presents to its volunteers.

I would like to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Post for the benefit of my colleagues who would like to know more about the day-to-day operations in the VISTA program:

GAMBLERS HARASS VISTA—ROCKY'S NEPHEW STAYS ON JOB (By Mike Pearl)

A young nephew of Gov. Rockefeller is working as a volunteer social worker in the midst of a campaign of terror waged by East Harlem gambling racketeers.

He is Laurance Rockefeller Jr., 22, son of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's brother who is one of the nation's leading conservationists.

In an attempt to force the block community programs of Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) to move out of East Harlem, one volunteer worker's automobile was burned and 14 shots were fired into a meeting hall used by the group.

While Rockefeller himself has not been bothered, many of his co-workers have been threatened and harassed and several have moved out of the neighborhood.

The terror tactics began two months ago when a policy runner was arrested on 119th St. near First Ave.

"The guy who runs the book blamed the arrest on the 'do-gooders'. He felt their being in the neighborhood had activated more than normal police attention," and one police official close to the investigation.

TOO MUCH BLUE

"The word went out," the official said. "There's too much blue (policemen) around here. Get those ——— do-gooders out of here."

VISTA workers began receiving threatening phone calls. On June 9 an automobile belonging to Stefan Larkin, 23, a VISTA block worker, was set on fire and destroyed.

A 16-year-old neighborhood boy was arrested for arson.

"He is only a tool," said Capt. William J. O'Rourke of the E. 126th St. Station House. O'Rourke said the youth was quickly

bailed out for \$1,500 by a man with "a long record" of policy arrests.

"This man who provided the ball has a personal dislike for VISTA workers," O'Rourke said.

Last Thursday, the night before the arson suspect was due to appear at a hearing in Criminal Court, 14 shots were fired into the front door of 336 E. 119th St., a meeting hall used by VISTA and other community action groups.

"This was an attempt to scare witnesses from testifying," the police official said.

NO ARRESTS

The hearing was postponed until Aug. 3. Police investigation found the remains of several bullets they believe came from a .30 cal. rifle. Although several persons have been questioned in the shooting, no arrests have been made.

According to David Borden, the 31-year-old director of Block Communities, Inc., 2109 First Ave., Larkin was forced to move away from East Harlem because of numerous threats on his life.

"But he still comes back to work with the residents," Borden said. "Whenever he comes back to 119th St. a couple of detectives are not too far away. The police have the block under heavy surveillance."

Borden said that Larkin's life had been threatened because "the racketeers don't want police on the block."

Larkin's car was set afire after a meeting of local citizens at which 130 signatures were collected asking for more police protection.

The Block Communities, Inc. is part of a program which calls for volunteers to live in the block where they work to encourage residents to work in community activities and help them take advantage of city services.

Young Rockefeller, like Larkin, is a VISTA volunteer, working for Block Communities, Inc., for \$50 a month.

Despite trouble and violence going on around him and other block workers, Rockefeller said he enjoyed helping the tenants help themselves at E. 121st St. where he lives and works.

Borden himself, after receiving several threats, moved his wife and children out of the city.

A neighbor of young Rockefeller, block worker Charles Lucas has received many threats from racketeers, Borden said, "but he stayed on the block."

"This is a pretty classic situation," said a police official.

"This is the type of thing that happens the moment anyone tries to do something good in an area where racketeers are active."

The police official said that many of the people in the numbers racket couldn't understand why what they were doing was illegal.

"They want to know how this kid's uncle (the Governor) can run a lottery and they can't," he said.

IN 1966 THE WASHINGTON POST STRONGLY SUPPORTED THE CRAMER ANTIRIOT AMENDMENT

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read in recent days the ill-considered switch of position by the Washington Post on my antiriot bill. In order that the record be made complete,

I think it would be well to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Washington Post editorial of August 15, 1966, on my amendment, which I think more accurately reflects the true situation.

Everything that has happened since this editorial was published would seem to strengthen support for it, including the increased number of riots, the increased number of killings, lootings, and bombings, as well as the redraft of the legislation itself largely consistent with the Attorney General's recommendations which eliminated many of the criticisms relating to the very subject matter covered in the most recent Washington Post editorials.

I include the Washington Post editorial of August 15, 1966, for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 15, 1966]

RESPONSE TO VIOLENCE

The action of the House adding an antiriot amendment to its civil rights bill was a direct result of the recent violence in several northern cities. While the amendment drew support from many foes of the civil rights bill, it also won support from many liberals who were working for the bill. As thus amended, the bill became an emphatic protest against violence whether it comes from rednecks against Negroes and civil rights workers in the South or from black hoodlums using interstate commerce to start riots in the North.

We do not think there is any racism in the Cramer amendment. It can be used against Ku Klux Klan atrocities involving interstate operations as well as against the fomenting of lawlessness and violence by any other group. In view of the arson, lootings, vandalism and slayings that have marked the recent outbursts of violence in several cities it would be illogical for Congress to ignore this side of the coin while strengthening the protection of civil rights workers and peaceful demonstrators.

Of course, the chief responsibility for keeping the peace and for law enforcement in local communities would remain with city and state governments. Federal authority would come into the picture under this amendment only when and if it could be shown that persons had moved in interstate commerce or had sent instructions across state lines with the intent of inciting riots or of encouraging crimes of violence. It seems unlikely at this time that the provision, if enacted, would be widely used. But it might prove useful in curbing any especially flagrant operations designed to foment violence in different parts of the country.

President Johnson recently reminded the impatient protesting groups who take the law into their own hands that

Riots in the streets do not bring about lasting reforms. They tear at the very fabric of the community. . . . They make reform more difficult by turning away the very people who can and must support reform. They start a chain reaction, the consequences of which always fall most heavily on those who begin them.

The country will not tolerate attempts of any group or individuals to bludgeon or burn their way to a better status. Terror and injustice can never lead to freedom or good community relations. This seems to be what Congress is trying to say, and if this particular amendment does not say it effectively other legislation will certainly follow should the recent epidemic of violence continue.

A NEW NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY

Mr. ASHLEY. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, testified this morning before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and outlined a new national maritime policy.

I will have more to say with respect to my own appraisal of the Boyd proposal in a floor speech which I plan for next week. My purpose this afternoon is to insert Secretary Boyd's testimony into the RECORD so that Members of this body can familiarize themselves with a proposal which is obviously of great importance and of far-reaching consequences.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE, JULY 20, 1967

I have been asked to appear before this Committee to comment on a number of bills which would set up the Maritime Administration as an independent agency.

First of all, I would like to say that the paramount maritime need today is for a progressive program and not so much for an administrative home. Considering the question of where to lodge the Maritime Administration now, I fear, is raising the old question of the juxtaposition of horse and cart. The opposition of the Administration to the substance of these bills is well known. My opposition to them is also well known. I am happy to reiterate that opposition at this time and to expand on the reasons for it. However, I would like to do so in the context of what the real maritime problem is.

On May 1 of this year I testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the status of the U.S. Merchant Marine. I detailed at that time a new maritime program which had been developed in conjunction with all segments of the maritime industry. As I said at that time, that program was not being offered as an Administration program because a small number of holdouts prevented us from obtaining the kind of agreement that would make that program a reality.

As I said in May, and as I probably will still be saying in December . . .

The basic problem borders on paradox. We are faced with an industry which many describe as dying because of a lack of adequate Federal support. We are told that the death of this industry, or its continued decline, would be a tragic blow to our military and economic strength as well as to our national prestige. I have been told that, unlike most other similar problems we face, the only solution to our maritime problem is one that will fully protect every single interest and meet the demands of every single group. Acceptance and agreement is eternally conditioned on meeting these requirements.

The truly tragic realization is that the demands confronting us will produce the very thing that everyone fears the most—continuation of the present financial and administrative patchwork—fewer maritime jobs—a shrinking fleet—less work for American shipyards—continuing deterioration of our competitive position.

It is clear that two things must not happen: the maritime industry must not be allowed to die and it must not be in effect nationalized. To do nothing would assure the former and to meet everyone's demands would require the latter.

You do not revitalize an industry by flooding it with Federal dollars and imprisoning it within a wall of protection. What is needed

is the provision of incentives so that the inherent energy of free private enterprise is able to do the job.

A productive and revitalized merchant marine obviously makes good sense and can benefit every American and every industry. There is, however, a level of Federal subsidy beyond which the public interest is not served. The maritime program which I outlined two months ago approached that level.

Basically it contains the following elements:

Expand support for U.S. ship construction industry: Construction subsidies would be substantially increased over present levels. This proposed level would subsidize construction of about 30 ships annually (depending on the mix of types) as contrasted to recent subsidy support for an average of 13 ships annually. This program level would be maintained for 5 years and thereafter continued at a slightly lower level (about 25 ships per year). Subsidy would be paid directly to shipyards to help them compete for customers on world market. While the present subsidy principle of reducing U.S. cost-differential with foreign competitors to parity would be continued, the computation would involve types of ships rather than individual ships and would be constant for a fixed period of years.

Increase Federal support to sustain expanded U.S. flag fleet operation: Extend operation subsidies to all U.S. flag ships (liners and bulk carriers) in foreign trade (except proprietary carriers). The cost parity principle would be retained but a more flexible system of administration with less Government involvement in management decisions would be introduced. The subsidy is anticipated to cover about 490 ships in 1979 and 560 ships by 1986. To the extent that ship operators are unable to purchase vessels at world prices under expanded construction program in U.S. yards they would be permitted to purchase foreign-built vessels and register them under U.S. flag to be manned by U.S. crews. These vessels would be eligible for both operating subsidy and cargo preference privileges.

Provide promotional incentives to expand waterborne domestic trades: Domestic ship operators (including Great Lakes) would be permitted to purchase ships at world market prices (U.S. or foreign shipyards) under a licensing procedure, involving public hearings, to protect the competitive operation of vessels which represent unamortized investments that were constructed or substantially converted at U.S. prices. Such ships would be admitted on a trade-by-trade basis without freedom of changing trades. (For example, permission to operate world-market price ships in the Hawaiian trade would not give operators the privilege of extending such operations to coast-wise or other non-contiguous trades.)

Retain cargo preference as established in existing law: Cargo preference would be retained but rate differential would gradually disappear as new and more efficient bulk carriers are brought into trade. New bulk carriers could carry commercial cargoes on return trips and would receive appropriate operating subsidies. Most consolidation of cargo preference administration under the Department of Transportation is being considered. A declining portion of preference cargoes would be reserved for older ships dependent upon this carriage until they are phased out and new tonnage is available.

Guarantee availability of ships for Defense needs: Agreements will be executed with ship operators to assure ship availability keyed to particular levels of Defense activity. On a selective basis vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet would be renovated and upgraded (cost of \$60 million per year) to provide "surge capability" for peak emergency needs. Defense experience clearly demonstrates that maintenance of

the reserve fleet in the manner proposed can be a least-cost approach to support emergency requirements.

Promote nuclear powered merchant marine: Research would be extended in the technology and economics of advanced nuclear ships looking to the possible construction of one or more vessels and the continued operation of the *Savannah*.

Expand maritime research and development program: Maritime research support in shipbuilding, ship operations, port development and other maritime areas would be increased to level of \$25 million annually as part of the Department of Transportation research program.

Transfer Maritime Administration to Department of Transportation: Maritime-related transportation programs would be transferred to the Department of Transportation thus assuring that ocean shipping receive similar promotional support as presently provided to other transportation modes in top policy councils of the Executive Branch. Maritime Subsidy Board would be reconstituted to exercise greater degree of independence than presently afforded in Maritime Administration.

The proposed program approximately doubles the level of Federal support to U.S. merchant marine for period 1969-1973 which means earmarking approximately \$3 billion for maritime programs during that period. Domestic shipbuilding jobs supported by subsidy would build up to level of 20,000 annually by 1972 as opposed to present level of 10,500 under projected present program levels. Industry would be placed in stronger competitive position in our foreign trade.

Both Government and industry will benefit from higher ship construction levels in U.S. shipyards, expanded U.S. flag fleet, and assured and stable employment levels. Combined, these will improve substantially the economic position of the industry and promote U.S. prestige abroad through a more efficient and diversified U.S. merchant marine, with improved economic strength to compete in the carriage of our foreign commerce.

I firmly believe that this is the best possible maritime program. The reason I believe this is that it achieves all of the major objectives which any maritime program must achieve. First the opportunity for American shipowners to purchase their ships at world market prices, without restraint imposed by the need for Government appropriations.

Second, an operating subsidy system that would have built-in incentives toward more productive, competitive and efficient operations; and with less Government involvement in industry management decisions.

Third, rationalization of the cargo preference system to minimize costs while retaining "routing preference."

Fourth, availability of active commercial shipping for use by the Department of Defense in situations of less than full-scale emergencies, where use of requisitioning authority is not desirable.

Such a long-range program would permit a magnitude and a stability of effort that would bring about great savings in American ship construction. Under a block construction program, the cost of the tenth ship of an order is roughly 80 percent of the first ship.

But we do not want to so over-stimulate the capacity of American shipyards that at the end of our replacement program—when we have added the comparable tonnage of approximately 600 vessels which the American fleet requires—we would see a depression in the ship construction industry. We can avoid that if we permit a reasonable amount of ship construction abroad.

There has been a lot of fear raised about all construction going abroad once the door has been opened to any foreign construction. This argument deliberately distorts

what I have said to every member of the industry.

First of all we would permit construction abroad only to an extent related to but less than subsidy funds for U.S. construction for a given period. Second, I would consider the establishment of a ratio which would tie the overall volumes of foreign construction to U.S. construction. Such a relationship would obviously limit the total volume of foreign construction.

It is clear that American ship operators would, provided shipyard subsidy dollars are available, prefer to buy ships here in the U.S. where they can be much more closely involved in construction planning and scheduling and where the ease of repairs or re-fitting is obvious.

The disagreement that arose over this proposed maritime program centered on only three elements: the projected level of construction—whether to try and build 25 or 30 ships a year, 50 ships or some other escalation; the provision for construction of some U.S. ships in foreign shipyards; and the administrative disposition of the Maritime Administration. This last, while the least important of the three issues, engenders arguments which are basic to the whole maritime problem and any solution to it.

An example of limited foreign building which I am proposing combined with building 30 ships per year in U.S. shipyards for at least 5 years. Foreign building vs. U.S. building on a ratio of 2.5 to 1! During first four months of each year contract for a "unit" of ten ships to be constructed in the U.S. shipyards—and then—authorize up to four ships to be constructed in foreign yards—repeat same during the second and third "four" months period during each of five years.

I regard the maritime industry as a vital, but not exclusive element in this nation's transportation system. The progression of transportation policy in this country, which logically led to the creation of the new Department last year, has been toward integration and inter-relation of the various modes. The overwhelming tendency in the transport of goods in the world today is away from single mode shipment—the transport of raw material through the manufacturing process to product in the hands of the consumer involves all modes.

Planning, research and involvement of government funds must consider this inter-relationship and must be influenced by it. The fact that the U.S. maritime industry is the weakest link in this chain demands that water-borne transportation be part of the overall effort—not isolated and separated from it.

The "containerization revolution" is the best example of what I am talking about. This revolution is characterized by the sound concept of our transportation services operating as a total system. A random reading of current news items that are daily reported on activities of the transportation service industry clearly portray the trend towards integration of all transport modes whether by ship, rail, air, truck or barge, and the benefits of improved and efficient service to the American shipper which result from this approach.

The promotional responsibilities of Federal programs make it incumbent that parallel support at the Government level be carried out in harmony with this approach by industry.

Allow me to recite briefly for you a number of items from the transportation pages of our major news media. These quotes taken at random span approximately one month.

Journal of Commerce, June 30, 1967: "An expert of the South Carolina Farm Bureau Marketing Association stated that 'As everyone knows who ships perishables for sale on the foreign markets speed in delivery is vital. It has become a split second business with

us because if the trucks miss the ships our fruit shippers are in trouble. . . . Now the container has just about solved all the problems. . . . Many of the early problems such as handling procedures, coordination and timing of shipments have been overcome."

Journal of Commerce, June 29, 1967: "The Pacific Coast European Conference—a shipping group linking ports here (San Francisco) with Europe by way of the Panama Canal—are now moving to counter a serious trade threat from transcontinental railroads moving containers cross country to ships on the East Coast. In recent weeks Holland American Line has tendered space from Europe to Houston, with the movement of containerized cargo onward to California by rail.

"Equally disconcerting is the growth in overland rail shipments of fresh fruit from the Pacific Northwest or citrus from the Southwest, with the movements generally going to Halifax for loading on ships to the Continent. The use of refrigerated containers and two-day faster rail routing has begun to lure significant portions of Northwest apples and pears trade away from the longer voyage through the Panama Canal. At least three member lines have told the Conference they are holding up their own container system developments to determine the nature of future intermodal shipping and the ultimate effects on regular berth line operations."

The News American, June 26, 1967: "Railroads to get Panama Traffic—Containerized cargo from Europe to the Pacific Coast—even to the Far East—will be landed at Atlantic Coast ports and carried by unit train across the U.S. rather than through the Panama Canal by ship. According to a prediction by a study, "Containerization: The Key to Low-Cost Transportation," prepared for the British Transport Docks Board to McKinsey & Company, Inc.

"According to the *Journal of Commerce*, one non-vessel operator already has announced a London to Yokohama services via U.S. overland by rail rather than through the Suez Canal. Transit time is 24 days against 44 days via Suez Canal."

New York Times, June 25, 1967: "Administrative and possibly legislative changes are necessary before consolidation and door-to-door delivery of containers moving in international trade can become a meaningful reality in the United States. Container Transport International, Inc. has filed an application with the ICC for authority to become a freight forwarder and engage in consolidating at several inland points. Steamship companies and conferences are trying to solve a number of problems in the container field. Among these are how far steamship lines should go toward becoming active over-the-road truck operators."

Journal of Commerce, June 21, 1967: "Five steamship conferences have asked the Federal Maritime Commission to limit the agreements proposed by two groups of foreign freight forwarders in the New York area. The freight forwarders would like to set up an international container conference and an intermodal container conference to let them cooperatively engage in consolidating, unitizing and transporting shipments in the export and import commerce of the United States."

My own conclusion is that there are no unique and specialized problems of ocean shipping which require independent and specialized handling at the Government level. On the contrary, the problems of ocean shipping dramatically portray the need for viewing ocean transportation services as an integral part of the total transportation picture. The attempt to turn back the clock by immunizing the ocean shipping industry from the progress that is being experienced in exploiting the best characteristics of each

mode to the benefit of all, is a retrogression which will be looked upon with great dismay by the users of such services.

The emphasis on development research, and promotion is required to stimulate the changes in transportation which are necessary to meet the increasing demands of our economy for safe, efficient, and responsive service. All modes and all functions of transport are equally important in this development of an effective transportation system to meet the Nation's needs. Efficiency in transportation is dependent upon cooperation among the different modes, and upon the different modes being developed in relation to each other and being operated under common policies. Cooperation in this kind of integration cannot be fully realized by the Department of Transportation if such an essential element as the Maritime Administration's functions are excluded from the Department.

It is a governmental fact of life that an independent agency, such as the one envisaged here for the Maritime Administration, cannot compete successfully with the cabinet level departments in the essential budgeting and appropriations process. If the Maritime Administration is removed from that level of consideration, it is entirely logical to reason that there will be less chance and not more of proper Federal dollar involvement in the maritime industry. That is a prospect that none of the proponents of these bills want.

It has been said on many occasions that a Maritime Administration would be lost in the Department of Transportation. We have lost a letter or two and occasionally lose track of an Assistant Secretary, but we haven't yet lost an administration. As a matter of fact, there has been press speculation that it is far more likely that the Department of Transportation will be lost in the FAA building.

Another argument which has been advanced in Congressional testimony, is that the maritime industry was doing just fine until it was administratively pigeon-holed in the Department of Commerce in 1950 and that ever since its troubles stemmed from decisions made in the panelled office on the fifth floor at the corner of 15th and E Streets, N.W. Here, I think the historical perspective is a bit off—maritime troubles or successes were due more to the tenor of the times and not to the bureaucratic roof over their heads. I would also note that as far back as 1887, Frederick Engels in a preface to one of Karl Marx's essays cited the U.S. maritime industry as the perfect example of why Capitalism would die.

An independent Maritime Administration is not the answer to the industry's problems. A separate chapter in the Government Organization Manual is not going to be any magic elixir for the maritime industry. I believe that the industry has probably been hobbled by over-protection, by too much government involvement in management decisions, and by lack of proper incentives and competition. You don't cure a cripple by trading in his crutches for a wheelchair. It is not reasonable to suppose that the primary step toward getting the maritime industry back on its feet is to make the maritime administration an independent agency.

I believe that the program which I outlined in my Congressional testimony last May is a sound beginning for the maritime industry to regain its once competitive and productive position. A key ingredient of that program was the inclusion of the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation. I think there is no question but that the maritime industry can benefit from the Department's responsibility to advise the President and the Congress on the allocation of national resources to the transportation industry.

The President has said that he expects

the Secretary of Transportation to be his principal advisor on all transportation matters. This Secretary of Transportation operates under only one definition of the word "all." The advice that I intend to give will be based on my firm belief that this Nation's transportation is and must be a system—integrated, interrelated and interdependent. The advice that I give will be given with vigor whether it involves allocation of Federal funds, legislative proposals or suggestions as to use of a Presidential veto. This is what I see as the duty and responsibility of a member of the Cabinet. I believe that a Maritime Administration within the Department of Transportation would greatly benefit from this procedure, and conversely would suffer by not being part of it.

The months and years ahead are going to be crucial for the transportation system of this Nation. The impetus and effect of the decisions that must be made will touch many aspects of American life and its attendant problems. It does not take a particularly talented seer to predict that if the maritime industry is not an integrated part of this transportation effort, it will not share in the economic benefits that will follow.

I strongly urge that the Congress put aside consideration of making the Maritime Administration independent and turn its full attention and talents towards initiating a sound and sorely needed new program for the U.S. maritime industry. We are very close to agreeing on the beginning that must be made. It would be tragic if that vital effort were extinguished by what is proposed in the bills now before this Committee.

It seems to me that in many ways what we are trying to do for the maritime industry is like the fairy godmother offering to make Pinocchio a real boy instead of a puppet. The only difference is that we didn't expect an argument out of Pinocchio.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN POWER PROJECT

Mr. GIAIMO. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the many Members who have expressed their position to the Dickey-Lincoln power project, I should like to announce that when the public works appropriation bill is brought to the floor next week, I shall offer and press for the adoption of a motion to strike all funds for the preconstruction planning of this demonstrably inefficient power project from the bill.

As the membership will recall, authorization of this enormously expensive project was expressly rejected by this body less than 2 years ago. The folly of constructing this project—which the Department of the Interior now admits is a demonstrably inefficient means of producing power, and which is now estimated to cost in excess of 1/3 billion dollars—is even more evident now.

The failure of the Appropriations Committee this morning to delete all funds for this project from the public works appropriation bill, should in no way deter this body from again rejecting this enormously expensive power project when the question of its financing comes before it next week.

ANTI-RIOTING BILL WILL NOT CURE CAUSES OF DISCONTENT

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the so-called anti-rioting bill which the House passed yesterday is a misnomer and a hoax. It will not prevent the type of rioting that occurred in Newark, N.J., Boston, Mass., Buffalo, N.Y., and Tampa, Fla. If this bill is enacted into law and tested in the courts it may be found to be unconstitutional.

The bill would prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance. Yet there is no substantial evidence of outside inciters being responsible for the destructive riots that have occurred in American cities over the last few years.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, in its final report, found no evidence in advance planning, outside leadership, conspiratorial organization or outside incitement to cause these riots. The Commission also referred to the FBI study of the 1964 riots—"Report of the 1964 Riots," which stated as follows:

Aside from the actions of minor organizations or irresponsible individuals there was no systematic planning or organization of any of the city riots.

Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey, was quoted by the New York Times as saying he had no evidence of "outside agitators" in the recent Newark rioting.

Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Ramsey Clark has said he is absolutely opposed to the anti-rioting bill. The AFL-CIO is opposed to the bill because of its rightful fear of Federal interference in legal interstate labor organizing activities.

There are enough laws on the statute books now so that the States can effectively deal with riots. There is not a State in the Union that does not have anti-rioting laws. We would be better off beefing up our local and State law enforcement agencies to cope with the problems of riots rather than enacting the Federal anti-rioting legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we all deplore the rioting that has taken place in American cities. But the only way to prevent such destructive riots is through the replacement of rat-infested slums with better neighborhoods and housing, better education and jobs, improved medical care and equal opportunity for the minority groups.

FACILITIES FOR DEAF-BLIND AMERICANS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there are several million Americans who are unable, because of crippling disabilities, to share in the unprecedented prosperity that our society enjoys today. These are people who are disabled but who are still able to learn—or to be retrained in—a job which would enable them to become contributing citizens of this Nation.

Unfortunately, there are not enough facilities nor funds to strengthen our resources for training the disabled to lead self-supporting lives. For example, as Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine in New York points out, there are facilities in this country for only 250 out of an estimated 5,000 deaf-blind Americans.

H.R. 8981, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967, would support establishment of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults; provide a special service program for disabled migrant workers; remove the residence requirement in providing rehabilitation services through State agencies; and extend for 1 year the current effort for statewide planning throughout the country.

I include at this point in the RECORD the testimony of Dr. Rusk before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor in support of this legislation. Dr. Rusk is a physician who is eminently qualified in his field of vocational rehabilitation.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HOWARD A. RUSK, M.D., BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ON H.R. 8981, JULY 19, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am Dr. Howard A. Rusk of New York City. I am Chairman of the Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, New York University Medical Center, and Director of the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine. I have also been, for the past several years, Chief Medical Consultant to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and Chairman of its Medical Advisory Committee. At present I also am serving as Chairman of the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation, which is engaged in a national study of rehabilitation programs.

As a physician, I have been concerned with and working with the problems of disabled people for twenty-five years. At our Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, we daily see large numbers of severely disabled individuals representing some of the most catastrophic disabilities that occur to human beings.

Out of this experience, one learns to appreciate the infinite capacity of people to absorb the shattering experience of sudden disability—and then become active, interested, useful human beings all over again. It is a daily exercise in inspiration to be associated with these magnificent people.

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before your committee in support of H.R. 8981. Each proposal in this bill will help solve a special problem that now faces rehabilitation workers across the country. While the proposals appear at first glance to be a primary concern to the public program of vocational rehabilitation, I wish to make clear to the committee that the bill has importance also for the many voluntary and private groups in our national rehabilitation system.

It has been my privilege to work coopera-

tively with many state vocational rehabilitation agencies. We not only serve disabled people referred to us by the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation; we also have many patients that come to us through the vocational rehabilitation programs in other states.

Thus, when you strengthen the capacity of the state rehabilitation agencies to serve more disabled people, you thereby are calling upon the voluntary and private organizations and facilities for more and better services.

I hope, therefore, that the committee will act to extend the funding authority for the federal-state program. I know that, in our state of New York, the state officials very much need to have this kind of advance indication of the intent of Congress for future financing of the public program.

I join President Johnson, Secretary Gardner and Commissioner Switzer in urging enactment of the proposal for a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults. Of all the gaps in our present resources for severely disabled people, this probably represents the greatest one. There simply are no places to send the vast majority of the deaf-blind adults today. One of the pioneers and true experts in this field is Mr. Peter Salmon, Director of the Industrial Home for the Blind in Brooklyn, and the guiding spirit in the Ann Sullivan Macy Service for the Deaf-Blind. If it were not for Mr. Salmon and the service he has developed, we would be virtually without any resource in this country to offer constructive help to deaf-blind adults. As things stand today, this country is capable of serving no more than 250 deaf-blind adults out of an estimated deaf-blind population of 5,000.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, I endorse the proposal for providing a special service program for disabled migrant workers. Here again, we are giving our attention to one of the most neglected groups of people in the country. The nature of their work and their existence makes them virtual nomads in our land, with the result that they usually are left outside the entire picture of community and state services. This is a disgraceful situation for migrant workers generally; it is doubly so in the case of those workers who become disabled, usually far from home when the disability strikes. I hope the committee will give its prompt and firm support to this measure.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I express my support for the other two provisions—namely, the removal of residence requirement in providing rehabilitation services through the state agencies, and an extension of one year for the current effort in statewide planning throughout the country. On the latter point let me say that we are in the initial stages of his kind of state planning in New York and I feel that it is crucially important that the job be done. How well and how efficiently we use our funds, facilities, and other resources in New York State and throughout the country during the next decade will be profoundly affected by the quality and completeness of this state planning.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the members of the committee for the privilege of appearing here today. You are dealing with a subject which vitally affects several million Americans. I thank you for the many ways in which this committee has helped strengthen rehabilitation work over the years and I offer you my help in any way that will assist the committee.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, is the Chair recognizing Members for 1 minute speeches?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

RAT EXTERMINATION BILL

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it was not my intention to speak on the rat extermination measure but in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York a few minutes ago, as one who voted against the rule providing for an appropriation of \$40 million for the elimination of rats throughout the Nation, I feel I should say a few words in defense of my position.

I did not vote against the rule because I am for rats. I think I and the other Members who voted against the proposed legislation are just as much against rats as the gentleman from New York. Most of the Members, I would surmise, voted against the legislation for the same reason that I cast my vote in opposition. We do not feel that a nation with a national debt approaching \$350 billion can afford to assume the responsibility of being rat exterminator, essentially a local function. Certainly if it is not a problem to be cured by the city councils, it should be met by the State governments. The gentleman from New York should more properly be damning the failure of Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Lindsay, and the borough system of government in New York rather than castigating his colleagues. May I remind the Members of this House, we still have a federal system of government, and if we are going to assume such local functions we may as well abolish the office of Mr. Lindsay, Governor Rockefeller, and New York's equivalent of city councils.

I think the gentleman would serve his cause better by going home and talking to Mayor Lindsay and to the Governor of New York, Governor Rockefeller.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Did the gentleman vote for the antiriot bill yesterday as I did?

Mr. ICHORD. I also voted for it.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. May I ask you: How do you justify that?

Mr. ICHORD. I will justify it very easily for the gentleman from New York. I do not happen to be one of those Members of Congress who believes, as apparently the gentleman from New York believes, that the causes of the riots in Newark, Cleveland, and others throughout the Nation lie solely in the failure of the Federal Government to cure the social and economic ills that may exist in this country. Most of the riots that have recently occurred in the Nation have been staged by Negro people, and I do not believe you can explain the riots by saying, as I heard so often yesterday, that society has too long denied these Negroes their rightful share. Such an explanation is sheer poppycock and purely fallacious reasoning with absolute

disregard for the facts. The Negro people are better off today, both socially and economically, than at any other time in the history of the United States. I could also state, by way of paradox again, that the Negro people are better off, both economically and socially, than they have ever been at any time or any place on the globe. Certainly we should continue our efforts to solve all of our social and economic ills, but let us not burn down the barn to kill the rats.

Granted, our system of Government is not perfect, but it is more perfect than any other system in the world and we have done more for our people, both Negro and white, than any other system of government. Certainly we cannot improve our living conditions in an atmosphere which seeks to tear at the very fabric of law and order and our system of government. This has been the primary cause of the riots: a prevailing atmosphere of disrespect for any form of law and order that spells disaster for this country if such riotous anarchy is not immediately and effectively curtailed. I should also point out that those staging the riots constitute only a small portion of the Negro people. The overwhelming majority of the Negro people deplore the riots just as much as the Members of this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Eckhardt). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened by the refusal of the House today to vote a rule to even consider the merits of the Rat Extermination Act.

Just last evening this body passed an antiriot bill which, aside from its constitutional infirmities, was little more than a political scapegoat which might well divert attention from the critical and urgent problems which have alienated the disadvantaged residents of the urban ghetto.

Yesterday, the House attacked the symptoms of their discontent; today we have failed even to allow discussion of a treatment for the disease itself. The real problems of low employment, poor housing, insufficient education, and inadequate health care have been ignored. The way to stop these tragic riots is to alleviate misery, not to pass unenforceable laws.

The United States is engaged in an international competition to prove the superiority of our system over communism. I am confident that we can succeed, but the test will be in the quality of the life of each individual citizen.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MARCH FORWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century is a time of almost unbelievable change. Of no age in history is it more fitting to say, "this is a time of progress."

Most Americans will also agree wholeheartedly that the country in which we live is one that has led, to a remarkable degree, in mankind's march of progress during this century.

The United States of America is a Nation of progress, and that progress is evident on every hand.

It is generally recognized that the American people enjoy the highest standard of living the world has ever known. We have better food, better clothing, better homes. We have better working conditions, better products, and better services. We have better educational facilities and greater opportunities for widening our horizons. We have much to be thankful for.

But it is popular today, in discussions about this Nation, to concentrate upon faults and unfinished business, to overlook accomplishments, to talk of failures.

Almost every newscast and every front page of our metropolitan newspapers prove this point with a vengeance.

The bad news is always column 1, headline material. Disaster, failure, betrayal of trust, and corruption are featured by television, radio, and other news media. From morning to night, our people are bombarded by bad news about themselves, their communities, and their country.

There is nothing new about this human tendency to stress the tragic and the shocking side of the news. Americans have been doing it since the days of the town crier, and we have survived and continued to grow as a nation.

Today, however, modern technological advances in communication have brought into every living room the news of the day—within a matter of hours or even minutes after the event takes place that is being reported. In fact, the miracle of television has made almost every American the actual witness of the events that make news each day.

Within minutes, or often simultaneously, we observe and practically experience the terror and destruction of a riot or outbreak of violence in a northern city, the horror and the waste of a brutal crime on the west coast, the shame and the scandal revealed by a grand jury reporting in a southwestern city.

From morning to night, every hour on the hour or even continuously on some specialized stations, the bombardment of bad news continues—with a new barrage in every edition of the daily papers.

In this stormy and hectic atmosphere of shocking and often depressing news, it is imperative—in my judgment—that the American people maintain their awareness of the big picture; a true perspective on what is happening to our country.

It is imperative that we know, in the final analysis, the kind of road on which we are traveling as a nation—whether that road is one that leads downward in national retreat to destruction and oblivion as a great people—as the pessimists believe and daily declare—or whether it is a road—however rocky and uneven

on occasion—that continues to lead upward to greatness and a better life for the American people.

Without any apology or reservation, I am convinced that the road we travel as a nation is a road that leads upward.

I believe it is a road, especially in this decade of the 1960's, in which the American people have made almost unbelievable progress in some of the fields that have troubled us, and delayed us in our progress, for half a century.

I believe it is a road, despite the occasional rugged detours, and dangerous shoulders and hairpin turns, that we as Americans can proudly claim is the finest highway to progress in the entire world today.

Let us pause just for a few minutes and take stock of ourselves, where we are, how far we have come, where we are headed.

Let us take a break from the avalanche of bad news on the morning newscast, the criticism and the talk about what is wrong with this country, and consider some of the things that are right.

Someone said recently, "I am for the future. I expect to live the rest of my life there."

Just what sort of future can we expect—as Americans living in the 1960's and succeeding decades of the 20th century?

The 1967 economic report to Congress by the President of the United States begins with these words:

A healthy and productive economy is a bulwark of freedom. Around the world and here at home, our trials of strength, our works of peace, our quest for justice, our search for knowledge and understanding, our efforts to enrich our environment are buttressed by an amazing productive power.

Let us analyze that amazing productive power which is our most powerful weapon in the arsenal of the world's most powerful nation, in terms of its simplest elements.

THE UNITED STATES

Seventy-four million persons were at work in the United States in 1966, 2 million more than in the year before.

The number of Americans on nonfarm payrolls totaled 64 million, a gain of 3 million over the previous year. On the whole, these jobs were better paying than ever, and more regular and more secure than most workers can remember.

In the agricultural sector, net income per farm—corrected for the rise in prices farmers have to pay—has increased 23 percent since 1963.

The value of our total production of goods and services in 1966 was \$740 billion, \$58 billion higher than in 1965. Labor, business, and the farmer all contributed to this outstanding gain in production, and they rightly shared the benefits.

The single most meaningful measure of economic well-being is real disposable income per person—the after-tax purchasing power in stable dollars, available on the average to every individual. This rose 3½ percent or \$89 per person in 1966, three times as large an increase as the average yearly gain in the 1950's.

THE 6-YEAR STORY

January 1961 marked the beginning of the Presidency of John F. Kennedy. February 1961 launched the strongest and most durable economic expansion in our economic history, and it still continues.

Almost 9 million jobs have added in the last 6 years.

The rate of unemployment has fallen from 7 percent in early 1961 to under 4 percent today—the lowest in 13 years.

Early in 1961, more than two-thirds of our major labor markets were "areas of substantial unemployment"; today only eight of the 150 are so classified.

While total population rose 11 million between 1961 and 1965, the number of Americans in poverty actually declined 5½ million, and fell over another million in 1966.

Our gross national product has grown 50 percent in 6 years.

The physical output of our factories and mines is up over 50 percent.

American families have added \$470 billion to their accumulated financial assets. They have added \$150 billion to their debts. So their net financial position is \$320 billion stronger than 6 years ago.

Since the end of 1963 our Nation, under the administration of President Lyndon Johnson, has experienced the most remarkable period of economic and social progress in its lifetime. These are the realities of the Johnson administration. This is the progress that has been made.

OKLAHOMA

As Oklahomans, we can be justifiably proud of the record of the past 6 years, for as the United States has grown, so has the State of Oklahoma.

We have come a long way since the rugged times of April 1894, when a solitary covered wagon, loaded with household goods and equipped with a water barrel, began the long, hard journey from north central Texas to Indian territory.

Three miles southeast of Ada, Okla., on an Indian lease, Sam Kerr and his family unloaded their belongings and set up housekeeping in a boarded tent. Their homesite was determined by a spring of sweet sparkling water which gushed from a crack in the rock. Before winter, Sam Kerr had cut the timber and built a windowless one-room log cabin, still standing today, in which Governor and U.S. Senator Robert S. Kerr was born 2 years later.

This is Oklahoma's background—the heritage of the pioneer.

In the spirit of that heritage, we have grown in the decades that followed.

The great land rushes gave our State a population of almost a million and a half by statehood. Since then another million has been added.

Between 1960 and 1964, while 32 other States were losing population, 16,000 out-of-staters made homes in Oklahoma. From 1960 to 1966, Oklahoma's population grew over 6 percent; and while only 13 counties showed gains in 1960, 52 showed gains in 1966. The depressing trends of the 1930's and 1940's, when we steadily lost ground in the Nation's pop-

ulation picture, and lost three seats in Congress, has been reversed.

We have gone to work, and worked hard.

In 1960, 582,000 Oklahomans were employed in Oklahoma industries. In 1965, total industrial employment was 649,000—an increase of over 10 percent, substantially above the national increase.

Personal income increased 63 percent from 1950 to 1960 while the national increase was 48 percent. The median money income of families increased over 90 percent from 1949 to 1959—a greater increase than in 34 other States.

Our population has grown. Employment opportunity has expanded. Our businesses have prospered. Our earnings have increased.

Perhaps most important, we have come a long way toward guaranteeing all Oklahoma children an education.

In 1940, almost 30,000 Oklahomans were without formal education. By 1960 this number had been reduced over 30 percent to less than 20,000.

In 1964, Oklahoma had 1,679 public elementary schools—more than 29 other States; 926 public secondary schools—more than 41 other States; and 23 public colleges and universities—more than 40 other States.

In 1965, Oklahoma matched funds with the Federal Government for over \$19 million for education—an increase of nearly \$8 million over the 1962 amount. In 1964, over \$7 million went to federally aided vocational programs in Oklahoma—more than in 32 other States—to benefit over 73,000 young men and women.

Where Oklahoma's higher education is concerned, the great majority of courses offered result in an academic degree. In 1964, Oklahoma colleges and universities awarded 7,811 bachelor's degrees—more than 29 other States; 1,699 master's degrees—more than 32 other States; and 206 doctorates—more than 31 other States.

This is only a portion of an outstanding record.

Oklahoma has done all these things—and more.

THE FUTURE OF OUR STATE

What is the outlook for the future? What can we expect? Certainly there are countless opportunities, and there are serious challenges as well. You and I know there are sick people and poor people, uneducated people and old people—all needing our care and our quick attention. There are lands to be developed, resources to be tapped, houses and hospitals and schools to be built, highways to be paved, cities to be expanded, farms to be saved, polluted air and water to be cleaned up.

My purpose is not to deny or conceal these challenges, or to diminish their urgency. I do say that the record of our State and the outlook for its future indicate that these problems, like problems in the past, can be dealt with and ultimately can be licked.

A major contribution will be made by the Ozarks Regional Commission. Portions of three States are included in this effort—Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas. Thirty-seven Oklahoma counties stand to benefit directly from the pro-

gram—practically the entire eastern half of the State.

In the United States there are five such commissions. In addition to the Ozarks Commission, there is an Upper Great Lakes Commission, a New England Commission, a Coastal Plains Commission, and a Four Corners Commission which includes Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

The Ozarks area is far ahead—first to establish a regional office, first to complete staffing, first to gather its own research, first to prepare its tentative regional program, and first to prepare State investment plans. These are only the first of many great forward steps in the Ozarks region.

For another major contribution, we can look ahead with confidence to future dividends from Oklahoma's gigantic water assets.

Many Americans were stunned in late May of 1965 when authorities in New York City, our greatest metropolis, prohibited restaurants and cafes, under pain of severe fine, from serving a glass of water to a customer unless he specifically requested it. As the gentleman from Texas, Congressman JIM WRIGHT, said in his book, "The Coming Water Famine," a drought of nearly 4 years duration had reached disastrous proportions, forcing New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania—an area containing one-fifth of our total population—to face the very real possibility of water starvation.

At the same time, the State of Oklahoma, not too long ago considered the center of America's Dust Bowl, shipped 5,500 gallons of water into New York to replenish a pond in its exhibit at the New York World's Fair. We could easily spare 5,500 gallons from the more than 12 million acre-feet of water in Oklahoma lakes.

Water is a vital key to Oklahoma's success story—a story which has only begun to be written. Considering the shape of progress along the Arkansas River, Bob Kerr wrote prophetically that an industrial development which already has begun to fringe its banks will grow explosively when this sleeping giant of a river is harnessed and put to work.

The historic Arkansas basin plan is for a navigation channel 450 miles long to enable big barges to travel from the Verdigris and Arkansas Rivers to the Mississippi River, to the Great Lakes, to the Gulf of Mexico, and to the seven seas. Next year the Arkansas will be navigable to Little Rock; by 1969 navigation will be extended to Fort Smith, just across the Oklahoma border; and by 1970 the project will be complete—navigation to Catoosa, on the right hand of Tulsa.

The project is invaluable to Oklahoma's future in any terms of description—water supply, hydroelectric power, irrigation, navigation, recreation, flood and drought control, industrial opportunities, and employment increases.

New development along the Ohio River is being made at a rate of more than \$1 billion a year, and that rate has been true for more than 10 years. This is the destiny of the Arkansas River—a destiny to be shared by our State.

Water is truly the "white gold" of Oklahoma's future.

PRIDE IN OKLAHOMA

The pride and confidence that we all share in our State is a mixture of many powerful ingredients—our heritage, our progress as a young State, the dynamic role we are playing as one of the United States, our capabilities for future greatness.

As we pause today and take stock of ourselves, of our progress as Oklahomans and as Americans, what we see is good. There are still problems to overcome, but none appears insurmountable. We have the spirit and the muscle to move ahead, to continue the forward flow from "arrows to atoms," from "tepees to towers."

But there is one American and Oklahoma characteristic that we must never part with, never lose. That is the pioneer determination, the pioneer heart, the pioneer grit to get things done. It is our most durable fiber as a people. And just as it brought Sam Kerr and his family and thousands like them to the clear waters of Indian Territory, and through them and other pioneers led to a great State, it has brought us within reaching distance today of our greatest dreams.

With the help of divine providence we shall continue on the road to progress as a great nation and a great people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for taking this time today to point out the remarkable progress our Nation and our great State of Oklahoma have made in recent years. I desire to associate myself with the remarks he has made and I join with him in saluting the progress and prosperity of our great Republic and of our great State of Oklahoma.

My friend from Oklahoma has performed an important and valuable service by pointing out to the House the amazing advances of our country since January 1961, when John F. Kennedy became President of the United States. As he has said, the early days of the Kennedy administration launched the strongest and most durable economic expansion in the history of this country. That expansion continues today under the administration of President Johnson.

The gentleman has performed an equally important service by telling us of the progress made in Oklahoma during that same period of time. I am proud that Members of this House had the opportunity to hear of the progress we have made in Oklahoma and I know all Oklahomans are proud of the record they have compiled. We are proud of our past and we are confident of our future. We know, with our great educational institutions, with our abundant water and other natural resources, and with the indomitable spirit of our people that we will indeed, as my friend and colleague has pointed out, continue on the road to progress as a great nation and a great people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that, together with 44 of my Republican colleagues, I am cosponsoring a bill to provide for the immediate enactment of legislation to increase the social security benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967, as much as possible without an increase in taxes or impairment of the actuarial soundness of the social security fund.

I will speak later on the need for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes of my time to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER].

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleague from Michigan and my other colleagues in the freshman class of Republican Congressmen in introducing legislation which would accomplish to some limited extent what we call Operation Catchup. We wish we were talking about Operation Keep Pace but the time has passed when that was possible. We are now concerned simply with providing the means by which those who have every right to expect that the needs of their lives may be better provided for under the social security program can realize that expectation.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 22 million Americans depend in large part for all the needs of their lives on social security benefits. Every month they watch the cost of living go up and up. Every month the needs of these millions of Americans remain unchanged or grow larger, and every month the buying power of their social security benefits sags under the impact of continuing inflation.

This process has produced what can only be called a need gap, an ever-widening gap between the needs of these people and their financial ability to provide for those needs through their social security benefits.

While Congress grapples with the complexity of writing new social security legislation with increased benefits, older Americans have waited—and they have waited—and they are waiting today for action and not promises. They know that relief postponed is relief denied.

They have been told for months that they may expect an increase. I have received letters virtually every week from senior citizens inquiring. "When, oh,

when are we going to receive the increases that were called for last October and last September?" And called for this January.

Our bills, Mr. Speaker, are designed to achieve a very limited purpose but a very significant one. What we seek to do is to use the money which is presently available for increased benefits, for the benefit of those who have waited for these many months for some aid in meeting the impact of inflation.

I do not know precisely the amount which these increases may reach, but I do know they should be limited by whatever is actuarially sound but they should be the largest feasible within that limitation. I do know that they should be retroactive. I do know that they should be substantial.

I do know that they will enable those receiving social security at least to catch up to where they were when inflation began to sap the increases they received most recently.

Many older Americans cannot go to the "boss" for a raise; they cannot go out on strike for higher income. The only people to whom they can turn for relief are the Members of the Congress of the United States. They have turned to us for relief, and we have promised them an increase. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time that we did something to deliver on that promise, while we go through our process of arriving at a new social security bill.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PETTIS].

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues in an effort to bring immediate relief to a segment of our national community that has, in recent years, been subjected to a kind of neglect that is at once both cruel and unintentional. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the men and women who worked their way through and out of the great depression—who, with aching backs and calloused hands achieved and sustained a way of life that is known throughout the world—a generation of patient Americans who, through the years laid the economic base for our Nation's vast social security program through regular deductions and payments. I refer to men and women who were too proud to accept relief, but who were glad to participate in a Government-managed insurance and retirement program that promised to take care of them through less productive years.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a rapidly shrinking dollar that converts what may once have seemed to be an adequate retirement benefit into what now is little more than pocket money. Increased taxation on property and an inexorable increase in the cost of living, and vastly changed living standards have imperceptively but relentlessly robbed those to whom we owe the most of both their sustenance and dignity. The unrealistic limitation on the earnings of able-bodied recipients has placed a straitjacket on experienced men and women who would rather work than accept welfare.

We have been so preoccupied with an alleged war on poverty that we have through default, been fighting a "war against the elderly." My files are full of letters from retired people who are now the defenseless victims of our rapidly changing economy. Five, ten, or twenty years of inflation and burgeoning taxation have eroded their benefits until they are now struggling to keep body and soul together.

An elderly lady writes:

Social Security is very social but not very secure!

Another says:

At present, our total income is from Social Security. We pay the six dollars into Medicare but we are not in good health. Our medicines alone amount to \$30 per month. Unless something changes, we will not be able to keep out of debt. We have already given up our home.

A man writes:

We economize, wear clothes given us by friends, live in a trailer, but simply cannot live on our Social Security income, though I paid into it since it's inception!

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that while the overall cost of living has gone up an average of 2 or 3 percent a year, certain basic commodities and services especially vital to the elderly have gone up at a fantastic rate: the price of a loaf of bread, a head of lettuce, or a tomato, a repairman's bill, auto insurance. Yet these are the things that the elderly must have if they are to just stay even financially.

In these strange days when our Government is spending with unrestrained prodigality on those who have not worked and, often, will not work; when we spend up to \$9,000 per year to train a youth for a job he will more than likely neither get nor hold; when we allow more for the care of one illegitimate child than for an aged couple who proudly try to make their own way, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we are indeed fighting a "war on the elderly."

It is my opinion that the social security fund is a trust fund managed for the benefit of those who put their money into it. Benefits from this fund have not even kept pace with the general cost of living, which, as I have already suggested, is misleading when applied to the special needs of the elderly. The 7-percent increase, in 1965 failed, even at that time, to bring the aged abreast of living costs. There has been no increase in basic benefits since that time. Benefits have certainly not kept pace with increased social security taxes. While plunging into costly new "give away" programs, we forget our obligation to the responsible elderly.

While the administration and Congress are grappling with fiscal problems of unprecedented magnitude the needs of those depending on social security benefits become more acute. The least we can do, Mr. Speaker, is to pass on to beneficiaries an amount of money which reflects general increases in the cost of living and is justified by increased social security taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative wheels turn slowly. It may be months before the social security system can be up-

dated equitably. In January of this year an 8-percent increase was adjudged by all to be economically feasible without raising taxes. While we are developing the right and final answer, let us do what we can now. Let us call on the administration to pass along the 8-percent increase—and let us make it retroactive to January 1, 1967. And let us stop the war on the elderly.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE].

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding this time to me and, Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to join with my other colleagues in sponsoring this legislation. I believe the gentleman from Michigan should be commended for getting this special order, and allowing us to be heard on this very important and very timely subject.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one issue upon which virtually all Americans agree, it is that increasing social security benefits are long overdue.

Retired people who must subsist on the shrinking buying power of their payments from month to month are understandably becoming deeply concerned over the discouraging delay in upgrading adjustments of benefits.

The month of May this year was designated as Senior Citizens' Month. During that month I was home in my district, and I held eight separate meetings of senior citizens in my district. This again gave me an opportunity to get closer to those people.

Throughout the years that I have been in North Dakota I have always tried to stay very close to elderly people and their problems, and most certainly this is one of very crucial importance to them at this time.

The feeling seems to be that since we are living in a day and age of inflation, continuous rise in the cost of living, and a decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar that we, as citizens of the United States, have a responsibility and, yes, an obligation to the senior citizens of our country as it pertains to social security benefits.

Much of the mail that I receive is on this subject.

Here is an excerpt from a letter from an elderly North Dakota woman who feels that more attention is given to pay raises for Government workers than to increases in social security benefits. I am going to quote these excerpts for you:

We would like for those folks to get along on \$60 per month and live in a little two room apartment and pay \$50 a month and have \$10 left to live on. They sure would make a big noise and loud. I believe in sending overseas but do a little at home in this United States, and first. Just stop and think what should and can be done here—we have to eat. Those that get big salaries are the ones against raising Social Security. Most of us do not get enough to live in an old folks home. Yes, it is sad and too bad for us, and in the United States. I am lucky I have a 5c stamp to mail this letter. We want and need more Social Security, so please push it.

I believe this reflects the sentiments of many retired people.

The proposed across-the-board increase is urgently needed now to offset

the continuing rise in living costs. It would provide the 22 million Americans who depend largely upon social security payments for their daily needs with additional income immediately.

The bill as I understand it would in no way interfere with the activities of Congress and the House Ways and Means Committee as it strives to enact comprehensive changes in social security legislation. It would, however, keep faith with those who were led to believe many months ago that they could expect early approval of increased benefits.

The bill provides for an interim, across-the-board increase in benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967. The percentage increase would be the maximum which could be provided without raising taxes and without impairing the actuarial soundness of the trust funds. This increase would remain in effect until supplanted by a more comprehensive program.

I can only say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe Congress should move swiftly to provide an interim increase because it certainly is necessary.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE].

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year now Republicans have been urging an immediate increase in social security benefits.

The Democrats do not dispute our contention that benefits could have been raised at least 8 percent long ago, without any increase in payroll taxes whatsoever.

Everyone seems to be in agreement that at least this much can be done and should be done.

Yet the Committee on Ways and Means of the House continues to sit on a social security bill while rising costs of living eat away the purchasing power of older Americans.

The President of the United States seems perfectly content to let this matter drag on and on while the plight of those on social security worsens.

My colleagues and I are again demanding today that the Committee on Ways and Means report a social security bill to the floor in time for House passage next week.

The immediate increase should be at least 8 percent, with increased payments retroactive to last January 1. The social security trust fund has now grown sufficiently so that increases of more than 8 percent may well be possible without any increases in payroll taxes.

Let the amount of any additional increase over 8 percent be the subject of further debate in the Committee on Ways and Means if the members of the committee feel after more than 6 months that they still need more time.

But let us get immediate action next week on the 8 percent which everyone agrees is the absolute minimum to be enacted.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER].

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr.

Speaker, as is very apparent today, many of the new Members of this Congress, joined by many of those who are veterans here, are concerned over the economic plight of our senior citizens. Today, those who are in the category of receiving social security aid have special privileges in life. They have special blessings by virtue of their experiences and by virtue of their free time and opportunities to enjoy leisure. But, they also have the special burdens of having to live on their fixed savings and pension benefits—the burdens of receiving payments which are far below the cost of goods they wish to purchase.

I have observed many older couples in our communities, who have lived long enough to reach the point in their lives where they can serenely review the past and yet they face the problems of today with new handicaps.

For example, last summer their handicaps were dramatically illustrated when the housewives throughout this country were marching in front of supermarkets in protest against rising food costs.

What did the older couple do? What did the widow do? How did those, who no longer have an earning capacity, face these inflationary problems?

Most of them faced these problems with dignity, but of the congressional candidates that they met they asked, "What revisions will you support in the social security law?"

I have observed many of our older citizens' problems. One couple that I know typifies these problems. This couple have given so much to the community in which I live. They are respected citizens, but it is quite embarrassing for me to see that their clothes are quite threadbare, that their home is not maintained quite up to the standards that they used to preserve. They now are living under handicaps. Yet this couple has paid taxes to this country for 40 years. They have sent sons to wars. They have lived up to the requirements of our society, and they have been great American citizens.

The dollars that they put into the social security fund were dollars worth 100 cents in 1939, what are they worth today? What are the dollars worth that they are receiving back to face the problems of today? For every dollar that they put in they, today, receive 42 cents. In respecting their dignity, I also realized their problems. I made a pledge based upon the position taken on this problem in this Congress and the 89th Congress by Republican Members, who have admitted and recognized the problems of our own senior citizens, feeling that they deserved an increase.

We have talked about this increase. We have raved about it. We have campaigned on it. But it seems that we have put the whole issue on the back burner of congressional action. In faith to those who gave us their support because we recognized their problems, and because they felt we would respect them in this Congress, the time has come to take the problem of the senior citizen from the back burner.

The revisions in the social security laws require comprehensive, complex and careful deliberation, and the committee which is considering these revisions has

held extensive hearings and has worked long and hard. I do not, today, criticize the operations of that committee. However, I do suggest that we take action now before this Congress considers complex revisions. It can take steps today to assure to the senior citizens that we are aware of their problems and that we will give them help now.

At the present time a surplus exists which should be given out to those who have contributed. This surplus can be given out retroactively to January 1, 1967. This should be done before Congress revises the whole social security law.

I am interested in many aspects of this revision, particularly the proposals which relate to the rights of women.

I have particular interest in that area of reform, but at the same time I think the general problem should be attended to right now and that solutions be taken today.

I suggest, in league with my colleagues, that the retroactive lump-sum payment be made to social security recipients, retroactive to January 1, 1967, so that in the inflationary spiral, which exists today, these people will not suffer by being forced into reduced circumstances which are not in the best interests of any concerned American.

In my memory, these people have not stood with their hands out—begging. They are standing with many years of accomplishment and of having been loyal and law-abiding Americans. They stand in a position of respect. If we would give them the opportunities that they have already purchased by virtue of their contributions to this fund, we will give them a retroactive payment before we go on with the further revisions of the law which will give them further benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to commend the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others who have taken this great interest in this social security matter.

I would like to state that the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, has worked diligently at this job of reporting out the social security bill. The Ways and Means Committee has met probably more than any other committee of the House. They are in session now, and they are meeting twice a day, and they have been doing this for 3 months on H.R. 5710, which was the administration's social security bill. So I hope that from the comments of my colleagues—in which I concur—nothing can be inferred as criticism of this committee, of its able chairman, or its able ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], because these two leaders, as well as the whole committee, I believe it is fair to say, have worked very diligently to get this complicated and important legislation to the floor.

At the same time, I am in total agreement with the position taken by my very able colleague from Michigan and my very able colleague from Pennsylvania

and the others who want to do something about social security benefits, particularly without any reference to a tax increase. So I have taken this time simply to try to set the record straight, lest there be any inference of criticism of the Ways and Means Committee, which has conducted itself, in my opinion, in a most forthright fashion.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER].

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is quite correct. No such inference has been intended or is intended in any of the remarks made here today nor in the offering of the legislation. We understand the problems of the committee. The full function of this legislation is to provide a little help during the time this careful legislation effort takes place, to our older citizens.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would say further to my colleague from Texas, the very point he raises is why we are here today, and that is due to the fact that it does take a long time to prepare comprehensive revisions in social security. Also, both bodies of Congress must consider these revisions. For this reason, many months have already gone by, and it is realistic to expect that additional months will go by—probably due to delays in the Senate. Yet as the months drag by our senior citizens fall further and further behind. It seems to me we can and must take an interim step to provide immediate relief of the greatest amount that is possible.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that very often important projects are undertaken without a great deal of fanfare. This is an important project today, as it would fall within that category. A long journey begins with a single step, and with the introduction of this bill, we begin the journey to provide a long overdue increase in social security benefits.

The people have waited, and the days have ticked by. Promises that were made to provide increases in social security have not been kept. Months have gone by. As I said a moment ago, I expect that further months will pass before we have an increase in social security benefits—unless a special effort is made at this time.

I want very strongly to object to any increase in social security that would be timed to coincide with an election year for purposes of political expediency. And it is sad to acknowledge that there is a history of increases in social security benefits that have, one might say, for unexplained reasons, happened to coincide with election years. I suspect that we may be in for that same timing with the increase being talked about at the present time, and I object to it. I hope we can overcome that sort of thing.

Our action ought to be action that takes place now, not 2 months from now, not 4 months from now, and not right on top of an election.

The need for increasing social security

benefits is a very pressing reality. The statistics point this out.

Some months ago I offered a bill in this House, H.R. 8218, which was called the Senior Americans Economic Freedom Program, which was designed to approach in a comprehensive way the problems which face our senior Americans in this country today. The most basic problem facing many senior Americans is that of economic privation.

Events and circumstances too long ignored are today shunting most of our elderly citizens out of the vital mainstream of American life onto the dead end side roads of poverty, of isolation, and of despair.

This is an urgent national problem. It cries out for immediate, efficient, and effective corrective action. We must launch an overall offensive against this problem. Many steps are needed, because the problems of our senior citizens in America are not exclusively those of our 19 million senior citizens over the age of 65. Rather, these problems belong to all of us. These problems must become a common concern.

What then is the extent of this problem today, facing senior Americans? Here are some of the discouraging statistics.

Today more than 7½ million senior Americans have assets of less than \$1,000.

Today more than 5 million senior Americans have incomes below \$1,600 a year.

Today we know that job discrimination based on age continues.

Today we know we have some 400,000 unemployed senior citizens on the sidewalks of our country looking for work, and they are not finding jobs. These problems exist.

I could go on and cite these grim statistics by the thousands, and in countless other ways, but the problem that they reflect is that our senior citizens in this country today are beset from many directions by problems they do not have the resources to overcome. Probably the most pressing single problem is economic. Many of our senior citizens depend entirely on their social security benefits to maintain their daily livelihood, and today the social security payments are inadequate. We know that inflation continues. We know the people on social security continue to fall further behind in the race against rising prices. And, Mr. Speaker, what have we done about it in terms of specific end action? We have not done anything yet.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the committees are meeting, but how long are these meetings going to go on? How many weeks and months will come and go before we get this action? We need it now, and we need it retroactive to the first of this year. And, Mr. Speaker, we can pay for it without an increase in taxes, because the funds already exist.

Now, are the funds being withheld for political reasons? Are they withheld because we cannot move the legislative machinery? I hope not.

I think it is fair to ask why have we bogged down? Why have we not been able to solve this problem of granting a rate increase? It is sound, and it is the

conscientious thing to do. It is what is right, and what this country wants to do in meeting its responsibilities to these older citizens.

But still there is delay. Yes, there is the political factor. Yes, the committee action takes a long time. But there is also another problem. That problem is that the present administration has not assigned a high priority to this problem. The administration has not offered a list of priorities. Each and every problem has been given the same priority, and, therefore, each problem has no priority at all. Therefore, problems drift, and important problems drift. This vital problem has been drifting too long.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our committees of the Congress of the United States are hard-working committees, and they need to be commended for this. But there is a portion of this problem that we can address and solve now. We do not need the great committee work to realize that we need an increase in benefits. There is money available, and it should be distributed in increased benefits, and it should be done now.

Mr. Speaker, this can be accomplished within a week or two. It does not take months. It does not take another half year. What we need is to have the administration, and the people in both bodies of this Congress, say that this is a top priority problem and requires the immediate attention of the Members of the Congress.

There cannot be any reasonable argument about that. So, it is time for action. It is time to cut through the legislative delay. It is time to show that Congress can act quickly when there is a critical need.

The social security fund is a trust fund. And the trust concept in that trust fund relates to our special responsibilities to administer in the fairest and soundest way. That is why 46 new Members of Congress are cosponsoring this bill today, to try to meet that responsibility.

Let us act now to provide for the maximum increase that can be afforded out of the present surplus, without an increase in taxes, and provide that it be retroactive to the first of this year.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this issue to the floor of the House at this time.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for the many, many hours of work that he has spent and for the many hours of research and time which the gentleman has given to this question in support of the older citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill which has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and I would like to ask the gentleman several questions.

Is it not true that this legislation, if enacted, would provide relief for these older citizens during the period in question?

Mr. RIEGLE. That is exactly right, and it is relief that is badly needed.

Mr. WINN. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that this 8-percent figure does not—I repeat, does not call for an increase in taxes?

Mr. RIEGLE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. WINN. And is it not true that the retroactive date to January 1, and the figures referred to earlier in the discussion come from actuaries now on hand?

Mr. RIEGLE. That is exactly right. That information is provided by those who administer the social security fund.

Mr. WINN. I appreciate the information from the gentleman from Michigan and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RIEGLE. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that any credit that is due for the work that has been done on this bill, is a shared credit. It belongs as much to any one Member who has cosponsored this legislation as it does to any other. Certainly it is an encouraging thing, and I believe a hopeful sign for our country, when as many as 46 freshmen legislators can get together on a very difficult problem that requires immediate action, and take the "action now" steps they think are sound.

I believe this demonstrates that our system still has some life and vitality in it. I hope that this will indicate also to our senior citizens that they are not forgotten, and that action is going to come. As 46 Members of Congress we pledge to push ahead on this, day in and day out, until we succeed in providing the benefits increase that is so badly needed.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join a number of my 90th Club Republican colleagues in sponsoring vitally needed increases in social security benefits.

My concern in this area was previously exhibited when I introduced H.R. 9036 which allowed an 8-percent increase and dealt with the same problem. However, this new bill, H.R. 11636, has an additional advantage that was not contained in my original bill. That advantage is that H.R. 11636 will provide for the largest increase that can be granted, without a tax increase, or impairment of the actuarial soundness of the social security fund. This bill, if passed, would remain in effect until replaced by a more comprehensive revision of the entire social security system. It would be retroactive until January 1 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, since Congress convened in January, almost every Member has talked about a social security benefit increase, but that talk has not yet been transmitted into action. Our senior citizens cannot afford to wait any longer. Talk will not buy groceries or pay the rent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take immediate action in enacting this worthwhile bill. Such action would not limit comprehensive social security revision, but it would allow us to keep faith with senior citizens who were led to believe that they could expect speedy approval of increases in their social security benefits.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

Congress, in its contemplation of changes in social security legislation, seems faced with the possibility of changing the concept of social security as a minimum living base below which Americans need not, and should not, be reduced, to a program guaranteeing much more than a basic minimum standard of living. Financing this change requires an increasing burden on the younger workers, as is often emphasized.

What is not emphasized so much is the crippling burden placed upon small, independent business which is weighted with this added burden each time we increase the tax and increase the base.

Big business in the main, seems capable of adjusting. The small man, on the other hand, whose ability to pay and whose ability to absorb losses is limited, goes unnoticed in this headlong plunge toward escalated taxes.

In my view, it is the responsibility of this Congress to keep faith with the recipients of social security payments which means that we must make adjustments commensurate with the increase in living costs. We do this by this legislation. But we must also keep faith with taxpayers whether they be employees or employers. It serves no good purpose to saddle small business with an excessive burden of taxes on one hand, then attempt to artificially retain life in the body of small business by artificial means including long-risk loans to high risk borrowers and other methods purely political in nature.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues today in support of legislation providing for a retroactive increase in social security benefits. I know that the Members of the House are as aware as I am of the very needy condition of thousands of our senior citizens. Twenty-two million Americans today depend largely upon their social security payments to provide for their daily needs. For most of them, these needs are simple; even so, inflation and a resultant high cost of living continues to diminish their purchasing power.

The paradox of harsh poverty amidst America's abundance is most clearly observable among the elderly. They constitute between one-fifth and one-fourth of the poor. The plight of aged widows is even more shameful. According to a recent Government report, 70 percent of them were living in poverty. In 1966, average social security payments to the 2.5 million aged widows receiving them were only \$74 a month. The Social Security Administration's definition of poverty is an unusually strict one—about \$1,500 per year for an individual aged 65 or over. Yet in 1966 2.5 million widows were receiving less than half this amount.

There is no question that this situation must be remedied; it is something not only that we should do, but that we must do. I receive letters every day from constituents who repeatedly confirm my belief in the need for immediate action. But they also feel strongly about a tax increase. And talks with many of my colleagues confirm this as a general feeling.

I think it is especially significant that the legislation we are discussing today points to the feasibility of a raise in

social security benefits without a subsequent increase in social security tax rates. Other proposed social security packages call for an accelerated tax plan. It is our contention that an increase in taxes is neither wise nor necessary at present.

However, it is imperative that our senior citizens are able to live out their retirement years in dignity and self-respect and not in poverty and despair. That is why I urge the immediate consideration by the Members of this House of the legislation we propose today.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in introducing legislation calling for a general increase in social security benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967, and I rise to strongly urge prompt passage by this body.

Tragically, abnormal increases in the cost of living in the last 2 years have adversely affected everyone. But particularly hard hit by these increases are the people who can least afford it—citizens on fixed incomes such as social security, who must live solely on these benefits, or on these benefits augmented by small fixed pensions or meager and dwindling savings.

Presently, there are over 47,000 people receiving social security benefits in Delaware. My mail is replete with letters telling of the hardships suffered by many of these people who are finding it increasingly difficult not only to make ends meet but even to provide the necessities of life.

Since the last general increase in social security benefits, the cost of living has risen sharply. Through January of this year it had risen more than 6 percent since the last increase. In that period, the Consumer Price Index rose from 107.1 to 114.7, up from 100 in the base 1957-59 period.

This proposal, Operation Catch Up, is an attempt to provide social security recipients with an increase sufficient to at least offset the inflation-eroded loss of purchasing power since 1965.

It is my understanding that the social security trust fund was large enough on January 1, 1967, to absorb an across-the-board increase of 8 percent without requiring any increase in payroll deductions.

It is my hope that we will soon see new, comprehensive and effective social security legislation. However, it may be some time before permanent legislation can be enacted. For that reason, and to provide immediate increases for those hardest hit by spiraling cost-of-living increases in the last 2 years, I urge prompt adoption of Operation Catch Up as an interim means of restoring lost purchasing power to the millions of Americans on social security.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues who, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], have today introduced legislation to provide a retroactive increase in social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse completely the concept and the reasoning behind the need for an immediate increase in social security benefits. I am introducing today a bill similar, but with some modifications, to the Riegle bill.

The bill which I am introducing will provide for an across-the-board increase of 8 percent retroactive to January 1, 1967, which would remain in effect until such time as a more comprehensive social security bill is passed by Congress and is signed into law. Such an increase will not require an increase in social security taxes.

The Ways and Means Committee has had under consideration H.R. 5710, the administration's social security bill, since the beginning days of the Congress. They have been holding executive sessions on this bill for weeks, yet we are no nearer enactment of this or other social security legislation than we were on the opening day of the 90th Congress.

It has been pointed out in the remarks made on the floor today that more than 22 million Americans depend largely upon social security payments to provide their daily needs.

Yet this administration has turned its back on these citizens. The President has failed to assign a priority to legislation which would permanently raise social security benefits. At the same time, the continuing inflation is robbing these Americans on fixed income of their purchasing power.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear in my mind that we must act to provide relief to these millions of Americans whose budgets have been undermined by inflation.

It is my understanding that the social security trust fund was large enough on January 1, 1967, to finance an across-the-board increase of 8 percent, without the necessity of an increase in taxes. I further understand that the fund has grown and can probably handle a 9- or 9½-percent increase under the same conditions.

I believe that the 8-percent increase is a reasonable and realistic figure, and that we should see the enactment of such an increase in benefits until the Congress acts upon a more comprehensive measure.

The Members who are introducing legislation in this area today have called this action, Operation Catch Up. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what it is—a proposal to catch up on what we owe to social security recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I have received dozens of letters from my constituents asking me when they can expect to see some sort of action on the part of Congress in enacting new social security legislation. One letter in particular points up the dilemma which many recipients are facing and I quote a portion of it. Mr. and Mrs. Charles Shea, of Aurora, Colo., wrote:

I am retired and on social security and we are wondering what in the world is holding up the committee report on social security improvements . . . Why don't they get it out on the floor so we can begin to suspect what might finally be written into law? . . . Inflation has been going on and we get less at the grocery counter than ever, and it has been going higher and higher all the time. We want to ask you to try to make it effective as soon as the President signs it.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to people like Mr. and Mrs. Shea to enact at least a temporary increase in benefits until the

Ways and Means Committee reports out a more comprehensive measure. There is nothing in this world which would give me more pleasure than to write to Mr. and Mrs. Shea and tell them, "Yes; the Congress is concerned about you. Yes, we will help you. Yes; we have enacted legislation which will give you a social security increase retroactive to January 1, 1967."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate enactment of an 8-percent increase in social security benefits.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that some relief be given to the 22 million Americans who are now dependent upon social security benefits to provide the essentials of life.

The cost of living continues to rise while Congress slowly deliberates comprehensive changes in the social security law. No one will deny the need for a permanent increase in social security benefits. We all know that such an increase will be incorporated in the amendments to the social security law which are now under consideration; but cries for relief are being heard today. Benefits must be increased now, if our senior citizens are to be able to provide for their daily needs from the fund into which they have paid.

I strongly urge the immediate passage of legislation which will provide interim relief, prior to enactment of a permanent raise in social security benefits.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with other 45 members of the Republican 90th Club in the introduction of legislation which would provide for an immediate and retroactive increase in social security benefits.

It is clear now that this legislation has no priority and the 22 million people of this country who rely on social security for their income have waited long enough. It is time for Congress to act now.

In the last 16 months alone, social security benefits have risen only 1 percent while the cost of living has gone up 4 percent. Social security benefits are continuing to fall further and further behind the rising costs of living.

The legislation being introduced today is sound. It would not increase social security taxes nor would it impair the actuarial soundness of the social security trust fund.

I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will promptly consider this interim measure which could stay in effect until permanent legislation is enacted.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill enthusiastically. I hope it will be adopted swiftly.

Some 22 million Americans depend on their social security payments to provide for their daily needs. Each day, inflation, caused by reckless Federal spending policies, lowers the buying power of persons on fixed incomes. This bill would grant immediate increases retroactive to January 1. The social security trust fund has a sufficient surplus at the present time to provide an increase of at least 8 percent with no need to raise payroll taxes.

This action should be taken at once so that our older citizens can have the relief they need immediately. They should not be asked to wait for the pas-

sage of the comprehensive social security bill which is still in committee. Prompt passage of my interim bill would keep faith with those who were given to believe months ago that they would be provided speedy increases in their social security benefits.

This bill is not a substitute for comprehensive reform. I have introduced legislation providing substantial increases in benefits and providing automatic increases, geared to increases in the cost of living. I am also sponsoring legislation to remove the present limitations on outside earnings of social security beneficiaries. This, too, should be made part of comprehensive reform. But until basic reform is enacted, we owe it to our elderly citizens who are on fixed incomes to grant them the immediate relief which they were promised.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 23 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASED SAFETY CONSIDERATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Eckhardt). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDONALD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, for myself and the gentleman from Ohio, FRANK T. BOW, the gentleman from California, DON H. CLAUSEN; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN H. DENT; the gentleman from Michigan, MARVIN L. ESCH; the gentleman from Maryland, GILBERT GUDE; the gentleman from New York, SEYMOUR HALPERN; the gentleman from Wyoming, WILLIAM H. HARRISON; the gentleman from New Jersey, JAMES J. HOWARD; the gentleman from Massachusetts, HASTINGS KEITH; the gentleman from Tennessee, DAN KUYKENDALL; the gentleman from Hawaii, SPARK MATSUNAGA; the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN T. MYERS; the gentleman from Michigan, PHILIP E. RUPPE; the gentleman from Michigan, GUY VANDER JAGT; the gentleman from Kansas, LARRY WINN, Jr.; and the gentleman from Indiana, ROGER H. ZION, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for increased safety consideration in the construction of certain highways.

The purpose of this legislation is to strengthen existing laws with respect to the enforcement of stricter standards of safety for the design, construction, and maintenance of the "off-road" portion of those roads and highways which are funded, in part, with Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, we have believed for years that the driver was the sole cause of accidents. Recently, we have learned that the auto itself can contribute to the cause of an accident. Now, we know that there is a third contributor to highway accidents—the off-road portion of the highway. In hearings currently underway before the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway program, we have heard experts testify that some 16,000 lives could be saved each year if the off-road portion of the highway was de-

signed and constructed with the same degree of safety as the roadway itself.

We have seen evidence which suggests that highway designers have paid little, if any, attention to off-road areas. In fact, studies indicate widespread disregard for the motorist who may leave the highway, whether through his own negligence or by some accident. We have seen evidence of guardrails that constitutes hazards because of improper location or installation; guardrails that protect the highway structures from damage rather than motorists from death; culverts and bridge piers so located as to kill people who may lose control of their cars and leave the roadway; ditches and cut and fill banks so steep and so close to the highway as to make it virtually impossible for a driver to avoid overturning; and unnecessary signs and trees which act as man-killers should an auto hit them head-on.

Some will say that such legislation is unnecessary in that the existing laws empower to the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate tighter standards. But, the evidence suggests that without a detailed law which specifies the precise intent of the Congress, there will be little action.

Over the years the Bureau of Public Roads has issued directives against the careless design of the off-road areas. Progressively, these directives have gotten tougher. In May of this year, for example, a most compelling directive was issued by the Bureau which insisted upon compliance with standards set forth in a bulletin issued last February. But, the fact that the existing law is subject to varying interpretation has left the door ajar for States to object to the point that the Bureau must back down. The May directive I refer to, as an illustration, was soft peddled and toned down in a subsequent directive as a result of the objection of certain State bureaus.

I do not suggest that the States should be ignored. In fact, my bill calls for the review of plans, specifications, and estimates by both Federal and State departments and agencies during all phases of their preparation. The States should be involved in the development of these standards. But, the intent of Congress must stand behind the immediate development of such standards in order to insure that the motoring public will have the safest possible highways to travel upon at the earliest date.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a comparison of the existing legislation with the changes that will occur if my bill is enacted, and a copy of the bill:

Before Federal-aid funds can be made available for a highway project, the plans, specifications and estimates for the project must be submitted to the Secretary of Transportation for his approval. Section 109(a) of title 23, United States Code, provides as follows:

"The Secretary shall not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects on any Federal-aid system if they fail to provide for a facility (1) that will adequately meet the existing and probable future traffic needs and conditions in a manner conducive to safety, durability, and economy of maintenance;

(2) that will be designed and constructed in accordance with standards best suited to accomplish the foregoing objectives and to conform to the particular needs of each locality." (Emphasis added.)

Section 116 of title 23, United States Code makes it the obligation of the States to properly maintain highways constructed with Federal-aid funds, and if a State fails to properly maintain such a highway, approval of further Federal-aid highway projects must be withheld. The term "maintenance" is defined as meaning "the preservation of the entire highway, including surface, shoulders, roadsides, structures, and such traffic-control devices as are necessary for its safe and efficient utilization." (Emphasis added.)

Section 114 of title 23, United States Code, provides that the construction of Federal-aid highway projects shall be subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary, but does not expressly require that safety considerations be taken into account during such inspections and approval.

Many features of highways such as guardrails, signs, etc., may not be shown on the plans and specifications for a project but may be added as construction proceeds or as a part of subsequent maintenance activity. It is essential, therefore, that all steps leading up to the construction, approval of completed projects, and operation of a highway be reviewed by both the State highway department and the Bureau of Public Roads with maximum safety of motorists as the objective.

The proposed legislation spells out clearly the intent of Congress that Federal-aid highways and highways constructed with other Federal funds will afford maximum safety, consistent with reasonable costs, for vehicles on the roadway and for vehicles which may leave the roadway out of control. The proposed legislation will require:

(1) that all features of a proposed highway project in which Federal funds are to participate be examined by the appropriate Federal and State officials during all phases of the preparation and review of the plans, specifications and estimates and also during the course of construction to insure that the highway will afford maximum safety consistent with reasonable costs;

(2) that the construction of Federal-aid highway projects shall not be approved by the Secretary unless, after inspection, he makes an affirmative determination that the constructed facility will afford maximum safety consistent with reasonable costs; and

(3) that in carrying out their duties to properly maintain highways, approved after the date of enactment of this act, for construction with Federal-aid funds, the States must see to it that the highways are maintained in such a condition as to afford maximum safety consistent with reasonable costs.

H.R. 11619

A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for increased safety consideration in the construction of certain highways

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In order to insure that all proposed projects on any Federal-aid system, forest highway, parkway, Indian reservation road, public lands highway, and defense access road will afford maximum safety, consistent with reasonable costs, for vehicles on the roadway and for vehicles which may leave the roadway out of control, the Secretary shall require that the highway location, design, traffic control, drainage, signing, light-

ing, beautification, roadside appurtenances and objects, and all other features of such project be examined by the appropriate Federal and State departments, agencies, and instrumentalities during all phases of the preparation and review of the plans, specifications, and estimates for, and during the construction of, all such proposed projects. The Secretary shall not approve (1) any plans, specifications, and estimates for, (2) the expenditure of funds for, or (3) the construction of, any project which does not accomplish the objectives set forth in the preceding sentence."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 114 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after the period at the end of the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No construction shall be approved by the Secretary unless, after inspection, he determines that it will accomplish the objectives set forth in subsection (h) of section 109 of this title."

Sec. 3. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 116 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "including, in the case of any project for which the plans, specifications, and estimates were approved by the Secretary after the date of enactment of subsection (h) of section 109 of this title, the continuing accomplishment of the objectives set forth in such subsection (h)."

RIOTS IN NEWARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of sorrow and a heart saddened by the tragic horror of what has occurred, I rise to report to you on the recent rioting in the city of Newark, N.J.'s largest city.

These were truly nights of terror and days of anguish.

I was an eyewitness to the shooting, the looting of shops and the pillaging of stores, the burning of buildings, the throwing of rocks, the shattering of glass.

I saw firsthand the madness of a city torn by violence, a city stripped bare of law and order.

The experience left me shocked and shaken, and I fervently hope that it shall never happen again in any city of this Nation.

What triggered this nightmare, what fueled its wildfire spread out of control, what deep-rooted ills contributed to the intensity and ferocity of the uprising must be examined for the clues they may provide as guides to future action.

In the meantime, there are immediate concerns to which we must address ourselves.

First of all, full and swift prosecution of those who have committed criminal acts is now in progress, for society must hold the lawless accountable and responsible for their criminal behavior. Essex County is meeting this task through the efforts of its county prosecutor and the round-the-clock cooperation of every available judge.

Second, the victims of this horrible holocaust must be protected and helped to get back on their feet—physically and economically.

Third, we must launch an immediate program to rebuild and restore the ravaged neighborhoods of Newark, a task

that will require the cooperation and resources of the Federal Government.

Last Saturday, in an effort to focus attention on Newark's plight, I issued the following statement:

I am absolutely sick about the tragic violence and rioting taking place in Newark. There is a deep and legitimate need to alleviate human deprivation and poverty in Newark, but this violence, lawlessness, hooliganism and wanton destruction are criminal actions that must be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

The first order of business, of course, is to restore the peace, and then begin to rebuild essential enterprises and services and reconstruct the progressive spirit of Newark.

In that light, I have today called upon the Office of Economic Opportunity to immediately send a high Federal official to Newark to assess the amount of personal injury and destruction, and to report to me and to the Congress upon what steps will be taken to assure that this will never happen again. I have also called upon the Department of Housing and Urban Development to immediately approve Newark's Model Cities proposal so that the city can quickly begin to build and reconstruct the impoverished areas that have been hardest hit. In addition, I have called upon the Small Business Administration to make every effort to grant economic opportunity loans, plus their regular loans, in order to enable businesses that have been burned and destroyed to get back on their feet as quickly as possible.

I am exploring every area in order to give aid where aid is needed most. However, it cannot be emphasized enough that criminality shall not be rewarded nor will the City of Newark, the State of New Jersey and the Congress of the United States act under such violence. Extortion won't work!

I have nothing but praise for dedicated, responsible civil rights leaders and poverty officials, but I deplore people who come into Newark for the purpose of demagoguery to incite and antagonize a situation that responsible people have been working so hard to alleviate.

On Monday, I met with the Attorney General and representatives of other Government agencies. That meeting was a first step in coordinating information and exploring ways in which the Federal Government can deal with riots and civil disturbances, and can aid the city and the State in restoring peace and stability to Newark.

Today, I can report that the Small Business Administration has established a special task force to deal exclusively with the overriding need to help restore those businesses that fell victim to mob destruction.

A special SBA office is now being established in the area, and SBA has alerted its Washington office to expedite the flow of loans that must be processed. In addition, SBA will need an expanded budget to meet the emergency demand for loans, and I sincerely hope that ways can be found quickly to finance this vital program to assist those who were victimized by the violence.

I can also report that the administrator for community action programs for the northeast region of OEO is in consultation with Newark's antipoverty agency, in an effort to utilize all available resources to build a new sense of community hope in the riot-ripped areas of Newark.

Last Saturday I also called upon the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment to give quick approval to Newark's model cities program, a proposal that was submitted last April. I have urged approval not to reward those who perpetrated the riots, but to renew hope and bolster confidence among the people of Newark who would otherwise suffer grievously for the wrongdoing of others. Newark's model cities program is designed to rehabilitate a section of the city in desperate need of rehabilitation, a development that would do much to remove the threat of future violence.

New urgency has also been given to the need for the Congress to pass the safe streets and crime control bill. The Judiciary Committee has filed a favorable report, and I urge swift and favorable floor action on this important measure. Modernization of police departments and improved training for police officers are essential if we are going to cope successfully with crime-related urban tensions.

The brutality and ugliness unleashed in Newark during the days of rioting are almost impossible to believe, even after seeing and experiencing it with one's own eyes and ears.

Human hatred gushed forth like a river out of control.

One of the most difficult tests of public fortitude and social sanity now confronts us in the challenging task of creating a climate of reasonableness and understanding to restrain the desire among some Negroes and whites to avenge, in one form or another, the hurt and the harm that exploded with such devastation.

What we need desperately in this hour of sorrow is an even-tempered, unwavering policy of enforcing the law, while moving to answer the legitimate cries of anguish from the troubled slums.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I would like to include in the RECORD at this time various editorials commenting on the many facets of the Newark riots:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, July 14, 1967]

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP

Even in retrospect, it is difficult to pin down the precise cause, the single element, the combination of events that trigger an incident of turbulence.

There is no simple, easy prognosis; the causes can be deeply rooted in a century of social and economic deprivation; there can be reasons more recent in vintage; it can be the cumulative effect of several factors that detonate an emotional, frenzied atmosphere involving a veritable handful of irresponsible persons in a community.

In the Newark outbreak one element stands out with a pristine chillness, the genesis of the incident was familiar: An erroneous report that seemed to inflame and incite.

The unfounded, baseless rumor mushroomed and magnified; there seemed to be cause for the arrest that touched off the incident; the police were doing their duty, upholding the law, protecting the community welfare. But for some still unexplained reasons, the arrest precipitated a wave of false reports and rumors; these heightened tensions, even though there was little or no relation to fact.

The incident serves to point up one pertinent aspect: The responsibility of community leaders to act with dispatch in putting to rest false reports that sometimes touch off violent transgressions. Violence, the use of

force, does not resolve human problems; it makes them more difficult.

There is an opportunity at hand for leaders in the community to act together in a collaborative spirit of public interest and welfare; the concern should be for all the people . . . their safety and the protection of their property.

None of this should be taken as a sign of community weakness; it isn't. Violence and force should not and will not be condoned. Citizens are equal in the eyes of the law; they are entitled to all the rights and privileges mandated by the Constitution and law; they also must be held fully accountable and responsible for transgressions.

The regrettable incident comes at a time when a genuine effort at constructive leadership and achievement has been launched in Newark. A representative group of community leaders has announced plans to undertake a program of housing for moderate and low-income groups.

It is this kind of community action that provides the most effective answer to negativism and destructiveness attendant in frightening dimension in the use of senseless force. Cities like Newark and East Orange can grow and develop on this type of constructive foundation; they can wither and shrivel in the heat and passion of lawless violence.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, July 14, 1967]

A CITY'S SHAME

What happened in Newark last night and early today was nothing less than criminality, initially disguised as protest. There is no need here to review in detail the violence, the looting and arson that have brought disgrace to the city.

The outbreak which began in darkness continued into the daylight hours. In consequence, businesses were closed, bus service was disrupted and the normal life of a peaceful community was shattered.

The first order of business in this situation is to restore peace in Newark and assure the safety of all its citizens.

After that it will be time enough to examine the causes which led to the most violent episode in Newark's history. How this outbreak can serve the cause of civil rights, including more jobs and better housing for Negroes, is impossible to understand.

But it will be the task of state, city and Negro leaders to work together to assess the causes of the outbreak and to take whatever measures are necessary to prevent its repetition in a city that up to now had been singularly free of violence in racial matters.

It is, of course, in the best interest of all citizens, Negro and white, that the spirit of cooperative, progressive enterprise which had flourished in Newark should be restored and strengthened. Only then can Newark once again become a city in which people can live and work harmoniously in a climate that will encourage, not repel, the expansion of the business and industry that provide jobs for all.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, July 15, 1967]

A WOUNDED CITY

Newark today is a gravely wounded city; the scars inflicted by a few have been critically hurtful to many.

The physical scars are numerous and painfully documented . . . the injured include police and innocent bystanders they sought to protect . . . the burned-out, looted stores stand as ghostly, skeletal reminders of a night of terror . . . the private homes that were invaded by rampaging gangs.

The mental scars sear even more deeply; it was a night that many will never be able to obliterate from their memory. How can one forget the angry spires that reddened the darkened skies, the smoke and flames

from 90 fires that frustrated the capacity and energies of firemen?

And the police who labored under orders of restraint from city officials concerned about heightening tension, spurring violence to an even more ominous degree. But instead of placating the few hundred purveyors of lawlessness and anarchy, it seemed to give them greater incentive to continue their pillaging and plundering, their attacks on helpless bystanders.

This was anarchy in its ugliest, grimmest dimension . . . raw naked and violent, the nerve ends exposed and grating; it was a city in agony, writhing under the senseless violence of hoodlums who flouted the law and taunted police.

There will be recriminations and bitterness in the backwash of this spate of violence in the night; there will be pious pronouncements from all sides and there will be angry denunciations, the finger of blame pointed pitilessly at the guilty and innocent alike.

This, in some ways, may be more destructive than the violent nightmare that enveloped the city in a sickening, frightening embrace.

There can be no equating, no commingling of such fundamental issues of law enforcement and justice with civil rights. The sole issue of relevance in the outbreak of violence that swept the Central Ward and other parts of the city is the unruly, criminal transgressions.

Plundering and looting, the violence of force on innocent people . . . these are criminal acts, pure and simple. They can be neither mitigated nor tolerated. Lawless acts cannot be condoned, no matter what the guise under which they are allegedly undertaken or inspired.

Civil rights, in an orderly, constructive form, represent social dissent and protest but criminality, the brute force of violence, is an entirely different matter.

It must be dealt with swiftly and surely under appropriate judicial canons of a constitutional authority; the transgressors who strike in the shadows of the night must be brought to justice. An orderly society cannot survive otherwise.

There is no question whatsoever in this tragic occurrence of the abrogation of valid protest, but the violence that spewed over the city can only be viewed in one context: Gross and criminal conduct, the flaunting of authority.

The vast majority of Newark residents have been exposed to a brutal show of lawless force, the hoodlums who callously plundered and pillaged private and public property, stoning a police precinct in an arrogant disregard of law and order.

There must be an accounting, the weight of the law must be balanced in proper proportion, meting out justice to the violent transgressors. And there will be the usual investigations, virtually a reflex action of public officials. Mayor Addonizio has announced the creation of a blue ribbon commission to probe the causes of the looting and violence; the causes are well documented; the actions of the looters and plunderers must be held strictly accountable under the law. The punishment should fit the crimes, precisely and without favor.

But the most urgent concern is the welfare and safety of the city's stunned and shocked populace, the protection of their life and limb as well as their property.

There can be no hesitation or procrastination in this area. Gov. Hughes has ordered the National Guard and State Police into the city on emergency duty, and they must remain until the lawless elements are ferreted out and dealt with by the courts.

The responsible, law-abiding citizens should expect no less; and they should get not less. There can be no moratorium in insuring the firm reestablishment of law and

order in Newark. This must be the joint concern and responsibility of the mayor and the governor. There must be no repetition of the nights of horror and terror inflicted on the state's largest city.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News,
July 16, 1967]

STRICKEN CITY

In the last few days and nights, marauding bands of criminals acting under the guise of protest have caused more than a dozen deaths, brought injury to hundreds, inflicted property losses in the millions and destroyed the normal life of another American city. This time, as predicted by Negro leaders, the target was indeed Newark.

Whole streets were left in ruins, shops destroyed and pillaged. Stores large and small were forced to close. Protest was the label under which shootings, arson and robbery were wantonly carried out.

And what was the basis for this rioting, or "protest"? We are told this venture into anarchy was precipitated in large part by a desire for jobs. Could anything be more senseless or illogical? How such mass criminality will encourage Newark business and industry to expand, or serve to attract new investment is something which the instigators have not explained, nor can they explain.

Of course, mobs never are logical. And the facile explanation that what happened in Newark was "spontaneous" must be taken with reservation. In spite of official denials, there is a strong suspicion that Newark's marauding was both inspired and to some extent organized.

Before the inevitable conferences between government and Negro leaders are called, the first order of business remains the restoration of peace to the city. Only when Newark's security is assured can the large task of restoration begin. Therefore, whatever force is required to protect the city—and its neighbors—must be employed.

At the outset, there was a tendency to restrain the police in the hopeful expectation the rioters would go away. Restrictions persisted long after it became evident restraint wouldn't work.

Similarly the callup of the National Guard was too long in coming. When troops finally were brought in the conflagration had spread from the Central Ward to the downtown business district. It became another case of too little too late. Not until yesterday was the National Guard brought to sufficient strength to show the state government was fully committed to securing the community against snipers, looters and arsonists.

One of the tragedies of Newark's violence is that so much of the burden of the city's shame is visited upon the majority of decent Negro citizens who took no part in the rioting and who must be depended upon to reestablish what had been a solid working relationship between the white and Negro communities.

RIOTS IN NEWARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the 11th District of New Jersey that includes part of Newark, the scene of the tragic riots of the past week, I stand before you with a heavy heart to urge that the lessons of this disturbance be heeded by all our officials and citizens throughout the Nation. What is happening in Newark can strike in any of our teeming metropolitan areas in this summer 1967. Newark, the

largest city of one of our most progressive States, has an able mayor and council, forward-looking business leaders, a highly active antipoverty organization, concerned church and civic groups, all dedicated to resolving the city's social and economic ills and raising the quality of life for all its residents.

Substantial progress has been made and the city has had reason to look forward with hope and confidence to a better future—yet, this tremendous expenditure of effort and time and funds over the past several years went up in the flames of this horrible conflagration that has brought indescribable ruin and chaos to the people of Newark, the vast majority of whom are hardworking, law-abiding citizens.

A clear assessment of the tragedy must await a calmer hour, but some factors are readily apparent. First of all, the tolls of death and destruction would have been far less if lethal weapons were not so readily accessible to any one who wants them with no questions asked. The vast arsenal of weapons available to the rioters, looters, and snipers made effective and immediate control of the situation by law enforcement officials virtually impossible. One contributing factor to the extent of the disaster was the lack of any effective Federal gun-control legislation. While the chief opponent of gun-control legislation, the National Rifle Association, conducts shooting tournaments at Government expense, Newark has been in a state of siege from armed rioters. From what I personally witnessed in Newark this past week, it is evident that the weekend duck hunter about whom the National Rifle Association shows such concern, is a negligible part of the flourishing gun trade. The times are too chaotic to permit this dangerous laxity in regulation of firearms. The State of New Jersey enacted a strong firearms-control bill in 1966 but the Newark events made clear that State laws alone are inadequate to deal with this menace. I urge all Members to join in the speedy enactment of the pending legislation that is before the House Judiciary Committee.

Redress of grievances is one thing; wanton violence or willful lawlessness is quite the opposite. For criminals and hoodlums to cloak their crimes in the guise of a civil rights protest is an insult to the good citizens of both races who have been involved in the cause of social justice. No sane person condones destruction of life and property by any one for any reason. A breakdown in the restraints of a civilized society cannot be tolerated. Swift and evenhanded justice must be imposed upon all guilty of criminal acts.

The wanton murder of Fire Captain Michael Moran as he climbed a ladder at the second floor level of a building in response to a fire alarm—that proved to be false—epitomizes the tragic waste, the senseless cruelty that mark riots. Captain Moran died in the performance of his duty, protecting the public safety and welfare. This good, brave man knew full well that fires that burn out of control harm the people living there, and so

he responded to a call for help from the riot area—and was shot to death.

The shootings, the looting, the violence, the senseless destruction for the sake of destruction have brought death and disaster to countless innocent victims of man's inhumanity to man. The deaths of children and other helpless persons are poignant testimony to the dreadful consequences of violence.

So many have been hurt—the young children who will bear the scars of the nightmare all their lives; the families trapped in circumstances beyond their control: the ambitious young people and their elders who have been striving to improve their individual and collective lot through job training and educational programs that bring the chance of escape to a better life; all the people who ask only the right to earn their livelihood, to walk their streets in safety, and to live in peace and harmony with their neighbors; the homeowners who have paid ever high taxes to meet the mounting costs of public services necessitated by the ever growing influx of poor migrants untrained for urban life; the merchants who have devoted long hours and long years to their businesses, only to see their lifetimes work smashed to bits or in ashes and they bankrupt.

Newark is truly a disaster area, struck not by act of God but by man's folly which compounds the tragedy. As such, it is deserving of Federal assistance similar to that given to communities plagued by upheavals of nature. Essential as is the restoration of law and order—and I commend Governor Hughes for his firm and decisive command—the problem does not end there. That is actually only the beginning of a massive reconstruction effort—reconstruction and rehabilitation of the city's physical, emotional, and spiritual resources that will demand the best of all its citizens.

The victims of violence in our streets are as much in need of aid as the victims of the destructive forces of nature. It is imperative that the life of the community be restored as swiftly as possible. We must prevent the loss of businesses and jobs to the city that would aggravate the very ills spotlighted by the disaster.

It is gratifying that the Small Business Administration has moved with admirable speed to deal with the problems falling within its purview. I have been assured of the full cooperation of all Federal agencies in working out ways of easing the economic plight of the victims of the riots, but it is clear that relief is needed more extensive than is possible under existing law. I am accordingly today introducing a bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. The measure is designed to alleviate the predicament in which individuals find themselves when their homes, businesses, and families undergo havoc wrought by a riot or other calamity. "Major disaster" in the bill will continue to be defined by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Governor of the affected State. Let me add, Mr. Speaker, that the

damage done by a riot can be equally as costly and as devastating as that caused by a flood, hurricane, or tornado.

Under the present law, assistance, in large part, is provided by the Office of Emergency Planning only when damages occur in the public sector. There are also provisions dealing with loan adjustments, disaster warnings, assistance to unincorporated communities, and aid to damaged higher educational facilities.

The relief envisioned in my bill would supplement existing law by enabling citizens to obtain low-interest loans up to \$100,000 whether or not they are forthcoming from private companies. Grants for repair and reconstruction up to \$250,000 with 50 percent of the cost borne by the Federal Government, and 25 percent by the homeowner or businessman would also be available. The remaining 25 percent would be assumed by either the local or State government. Provision is also included for shelter for disaster victims, and funds for the repair of highways and other public works which might be damaged and are not covered by present law. I hope that all Members will give this measure their full support.

I hope, too, that the Housing and Urban Development Administration will give prompt approval to the city's application for a model city grant. To those who believe there are easy solutions or simple formulas for rectifying the social and economic conditions of Newark, I suggest a reading of the detailed and illuminating analysis filed by the city in support of its model city application. It deals with all the overwhelming problems that beset the city and attests to the earnestness with which the local leaders, elected and private, have grappled with this monumental task.

There is keen personal grief on the part of all of us who have labored to achieve a brighter future for the people of Newark, but this is no time for recrimination or bitterness. The future must be faced resolutely, courageously, if the city is to survive. The people will be better served if all will forego the luxury of acrimony and criticism and unite to promote the common good. That is the test between those who are genuinely concerned and those who are eager to capitalize on this tragedy for their own ends.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that other cities will be spared the catastrophe that has befallen Newark, but it must be emphasized that the same conditions exist to a greater or lesser degree in all our cities in this time of vast social upheaval. The collapse of a city brings peril to all its people, irrespective of color or economic status, and leaves everything infinitely worse than before. Unless this Nation, the most affluent and powerful in the world, can resolve the troubled and tangled problems of our cities, the future indeed is dark for all of us. And, as Newark shows, time is running out even quicker than had been thought.

I should like to include at this point in the RECORD the following editorials from the Newark News, the Newark Star

Ledger, and the Washington Post on this disaster:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, July 15, 1967]

A WOUNDED CITY

Newark today is a gravely wounded city; the scars inflicted by a few have been critically hurtful to many.

The physical scars are numerous and painfully documented . . . the injured include police and innocent bystanders they sought to protect . . . the burned-out, looted stores stand as ghostly, skeletal reminders of a night of terror . . . the private homes that were invaded by rampaging gangs.

The mental scars sear even more deeply; it was a night that many will never be able to obliterate from their memory. How can one forget the angry spires that reddened the darkened skies, the smoke and flames from 90 fires that frustrated the capacity and energies of firemen?

And the police who labored under orders of restraint from city officials concerned about heightening tension, spurring violence to an even more ominous degree. But instead of placating the few hundred purveyors of lawlessness and anarchy, it seemed to give them greater incentive to continue their pillaging and plundering, their attacks on helpless bystanders.

This was anarchy in its ugliest, grimmest dimension . . . raw, naked and violent, the nerve ends exposed and grating; it was a city in agony, writhing under the senseless violence of hoodlums who flaunted the law and taunted police.

There will be recriminations and bitterness in the backwash of this spate of violence in the night; there will be pious pronouncements from all sides and there will be angry denunciations, the finger of blame pointed pitilessly at the guilty and innocent alike.

This, in some ways, may be more destructive than the violent nightmare that enveloped the city in a sickening, frightening embrace.

There can be no equating, no commingling of such fundamental issues of law enforcement and justice with civil rights. The sole issue of relevance in the outbreak of violence that swept the Central Ward and other parts of the city is the unruly, criminal transgressions.

Plundering and looting, the violence of force on innocent people . . . these are criminal acts, pure and simple. They can be neither mitigated nor tolerated. Lawless acts cannot be condoned, no matter what the guise under which they are allegedly undertaken or inspired.

Civil rights, in an orderly, constructive form, represent social dissent and protest but criminality, the brute force of violence, is an entirely different matter.

It must be dealt with swiftly and surely under appropriate judicial canons of a constitutional authority; the transgressors who strike in the shadows of the night must be brought to justice. An orderly society cannot survive otherwise.

There is no question whatsoever in this tragic occurrence of the abrogation of valid protest, but the violence that spewed over the city can only be viewed in one context: Gross and criminal conduct, the flaunting of authority.

The vast majority of Newark residents have been exposed to a brutal show of lawless force, the hoodlums who callously plundered and pillaged private and public property, stoning a police precinct in an arrogant disregard of law and order.

There must be an accounting, the weight of the law must be balanced in proper proportion meting out justice to the violent transgressors. And there will be the usual in-

vestigations, virtually a reflex action of public officials. Mayor Addonizio has announced the creation of a blue ribbon commission to probe the causes of the looting and violence; the causes are well documented; the actions of the looters and plunderers must be held strictly accountable under the law. The punishment should fit the crimes, precisely and without favor.

But the most urgent concern is the welfare and safety of the city's stunned and shocked populace, the protection of their life and limb as well as their property.

There can be no hesitation or procrastination in this area. Gov. Hughes has ordered the National Guard and State Police into the city on emergency duty, and they must remain until the lawless elements are ferreted out and dealt with by the courts.

The responsible, law-abiding citizens should expect no less; and they should get no less. There can be no moratorium in insuring the firm reestablishment of law and order in Newark. This must be the joint concern and responsibility of the mayor and the governor. There must be no repetition of the night of horror and terror inflicted on the state's largest city.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, July 16, 1967]

STRICKEN CITY

In the last few days and nights, marauding bands of criminals acting under the guise of protest have caused more than a dozen deaths, brought injury to hundreds, inflicted property losses in the millions and destroyed the normal life of another American city. This time, as predicted by Negro leaders, the target was indeed Newark.

Whole streets were left in ruins, shops destroyed and pillaged. Stores large and small were forced to close. Protest was the label under which shootings, arson and robbery were wantonly carried out.

And what was the basis for this rioting, or "protest?" We are told this venture into anarchy was precipitated in large part by a desire for jobs. Could anything be more senseless or illogical? How such mass criminality will encourage Newark business and industry to expand, or serve to attract new investment is something which the instigators have not explained, nor can they explain.

Of course, mobs never are logical, and the facile explanation that what happened in Newark was "spontaneous" must be taken with reservation. In spite of official denials, there is a strong suspicion that Newark's marauding was both inspired and to some extent organized.

Before the inevitable conferences between government and Negro leaders are called, the first order of business remains the restoration of peace to the city. Only when Newark's security is assured can the large task of restoration begin. Therefore, whatever force is required to protect the city—and its neighbors—must be employed.

At the outset, there was a tendency to restrain the police in the hopeful expectation the rioters would go away. Restrictions persisted long after it became evident restraint wouldn't work.

Similarly the callup of the National Guard was too long in coming. When troops finally were brought in the conflagration had spread from the Central Ward to the downtown business district. It became another case of too little too late. Not until yesterday was the National Guard brought to sufficient strength to show the state government was fully committed to securing the community against snipers, looters and arsonists.

One of the tragedies of Newark's violence is that so much of the burden of the city's

shame is visited upon the majority of decent Negro citizens who took no part in the rioting and who must be depended upon to reestablish what had been a solid working relationship between the white and Negro communities.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1967]

KEEPING PERSPECTIVE

It is easy to lose perspective when calamities such as those taking place in New Jersey deluge the Nation with reports of racial fury. It is tempting to generalize from stories of Negro cruelty toward white people and from stories of white cruelty toward Negroes.

Perhaps the worst consequences of violence like that in Newark and other riot-torn cities, is the fuel it heaps on the fires of racial prejudice, on the credibility it gives to racial stereotypes. Hate is a communicable and contagious passion. It begets repetition and imitation.

Notwithstanding Newark, and all its dreadful episodes, there remain in that strife-torn city, and in cities across the land, patient men and women of both races, who, without prejudice or bitterness, are trying to create an environment in which the races can live together in peace. It will help to keep perspective if citizens remember that, in this country, notwithstanding all the racial controversy, most Americans of both races, are struggling for a just society and working for peaceful relations. The small minority animated by hate and activated by violence claim a disproportionate share of national attention. But they do not speak for the overwhelming majority of Americans who deplore racism in either racial community.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, July 19, 1967]

SOCIETY CAN PROCEED

There is a symbolism in the shards of glass from broken store windows, the skeletal remains of burned and looted buildings, the dead and the injured, that should not be lost in the gray wake of the racial explosion that shattered Newark.

The city will never be the same: it lost a great deal in the crisis . . . but it may, conversely have learned much from the bitter, wracking experience. And it may have learned in an area that could in the end mean more than the brick and mortar that is the physical presence of the city.

The heart of a city is its people. Its survival, its growth are utterly dependent on human relationships; the interaction of the myriad groups that comprise an urban community can either be beneficial or grievously hurtful. The latter has come in a large, bitter dose to the state's largest city.

A city can learn from the past, but it cannot live in the shadows of what has transpired before; a city must live in the present and for the future.

For Newark, the present means a wholesale mending of the broken pieces; for the future it means a rebuilding and development in the areas that may have been neglected before because of severely limited resources and the failure of the state and federal governments to responsibly acknowledge the city's monumental problems.

This has been said many times before; it bears repeating because it could be the one, single compelling factor: Newark cannot survive in a socio-economic vacuum, an insularity that deepens and compounds the problems that beset it.

These problems cannot be resolved within the city proper; there must be meaningful help from the state and the federal governments. There must be programs to upgrade the standard of living for economically

deprived families: The city urgently needs more housing of moderate rentals. The school system, in quality and physical structure, must be sharply upgraded. Job training programs must be significantly expanded.

These are the causes for the high incidence of urban crime; these are the fundamental, root causes for the despair and anguish that grips the socially and economically deprived in large urban centers where racial strife has erupted in terrifying dimensions.

It serves little constructive purpose at this time to become embroiled in a negative maelstrom of recrimination and invective, the emotional backwash of a deeply unsettling experience. Already there are differences of opinion regarding official actions and conduct in the quelling of the lawless rioting, the plundering and killing of innocent persons.

There may be sincere differences of opinion in this regard: There are some who now, in retrospect, interpret firmness and resoluteness in dealing with ruthless snipers in the harsher connotation of toughness and over-zealousness.

The bravery and courage of law enforcement . . . National Guardsmen, state and local police . . . in restoring order to a shattered city should be noted. And warm commendation should go to the city's fire forces who braved sniper bullets and other acts of violence while performing their duties under trying, adverse conditions.

And there can only be high regard for Gov. Hughes, who realistically acknowledged that the initial official responsibility was to restore law and order in an anarchic atmosphere. The governor drew the only reasonable interpretation in characterizing the rioters and the snipers as criminal elements who sought to exploit a tragic human situation.

The marauding acts, the violence, the criminality were quite distinct and apart from social protest; they were no part of a genuine social movement, and civil rights leaders firmly disavowed these elements.

The right of a society to resist criminal disorder is fundamental to its survival. One civil rights leader, Roy Wilkins, made this amply clear. "Once a riot gets under way the prime business of everyone is to stop it," he said. "Violence has to be stopped before society can proceed."

Newark is now at this crucial juncture: Society can proceed. And it must determine, for its own future, how the urban society can best proceed for the common interests and welfare of all its citizens, without bitter racial and social confrontations that critically debilitate the vitality of the city and its people.

VIETNAM

Mr. WINN. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are faced in 1967 with the war in Vietnam as the overwhelming factor of our national life. We are seeking in that war to bring about a peaceful solution to the question: How can a small nation in Southeast Asia achieve its national well-being in the face of a vast threat from a neighboring Communist nation. All of us seek a peaceful solution to this question.

Last week, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] in the

company of seven other Members of this body, put forth a proposal to bring the fighting to an end. This proposal, which represents a gradual and step-by-step deescalation of the war on both sides, is new, is imaginative, and is responsible. I wish to associate myself with the proposal put forth by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts and with the remarks he and others made on the floor on Monday of this week. Even more than that, I hope that this voice is heard in every nation on earth which is interested in bringing this war to an end. Most particularly, I hope these proposals are studied in Hanoi so that a beginning can be made in bringing about the end of this costly war and in bringing peace to South Vietnam and to North Vietnam alike.

THE CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS FOR PEACE MAY WALK OUT ON THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon to bring to the attention of the House, and particularly the Members employing summer interns in their office, the activities of some of these interns, about which you may not be aware.

I am concerned because I have been very particular and selective in choosing the young people to serve as my own interns. I thought the real intent and purpose of the intern program was to give these young people a firsthand grasp of the activities of the Congress and the inner workings of Government. The young men I have brought here have been concentrating their efforts in this area, but they have also been asked to participate with all the other interns in some activities which I should like to expose to public light this afternoon.

There is, as a matter of fact, at this moment a group of inconspicuous interns organizing a group known as "The Congressional Interns for Peace." Their expressed purpose is to formulate opposition to the Vietnam war by gathering as many signatures as possible from interns on Capitol Hill on a petition to be presented to the President in person at some future scheduled seminar at the White House. It is my further understanding that there have been discussions over the possibility of walking out on the President at the time of the presentation as a possible means of getting additional press coverage of their position.

I should like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include the text of the "Dear Intern" letter being circulated to all of the interns. I understand this will be followed up by a personal contact Tuesday. The letter follows:

DEAR INTERN: We are seeking your support for the enclosed letter which we will present to President Johnson. Our aim is to obtain as large a percentage of hill interns as possible to sign this statement in order to convince the policymakers that some of the most respectable elements of our young society are concerned about our actions in Vietnam.

We believe the letter to be polite yet to the point. If you sign you do so as an individual and irrespective of office. The person for whom you work will not be implicated and will nowhere be mentioned.

We feel that on such an enormously important issue as Vietnam it is essential that those who are informed and interested commit their names rather than silently sit back and fear involvement. If you are in sympathy with our purpose and think our letter discriminating, we urge you to add your name . . . "as a matter of conscience to go on record before our nation that we can no longer condone this war through our silence."

"We Congressional Interns, selected and appointed by Senators and Representatives, have come to work in Washington because of our interest in Public Service; our presence here this summer evidences our desire to be the 'doers and builders' of whom you spoke. Yet although we are anxious to build a greater nation and a healthier world, we fear that our actions in Vietnam are detracting from the achievement of these goals. We therefore sign this statement as a matter of conscience to go on record before our nation that we can no longer condone this war through our silence.

"It seems to us that our efforts in Vietnam are self-defeating. Because our Government thinks it is so right, it has become self-righteous, and, as a result, it has turned a local struggle into an ideological war in which one million people have died. We are destroying the country we seek to liberate. Are we to repeat the triumph of the Roman General, Tacitus, who said, 'We made a desert and called it peace'? Senator McGovern has expressed this point well: 'After all the dead are counted—American and Vietnamese—and the countryside is laid waste, what will we then have accomplished?'

"We are also concerned with the 'fall-out effects' that the war is having elsewhere. The Vietnam conflict has turned world opinion against us. East and West fear being dragged into another world war.

"At home, usually responsible Americans shout to 'forget the first amendment' and to 'handcuff them (dissenters), chain the anchor around their neck and throw them overboard.' In the name of democracy they would destroy democracy by adopting the tactics we ostensibly deplore.

"Most important, however, we believe that a nation in which one fifth of its population exists below a subsistence level, and which is faced with serious internal disorders, should regard its own domestic situation as the highest priority; and yet we spend as much a month on the War in Vietnam as we do a year on the War on Poverty. We share your enthusiasm, Mr. President, in your vision of the Great Society, but we are disappointed that it is being blurred by the billions being siphoned off to Vietnam.

"Finally, the war is alienating many of our generation. In this Post-Nuremberg world where each person is morally responsible for his own actions, many students cannot reconcile performance of military duty in Vietnam with their concepts of personal conscience. Many will be faced with the alternatives of going to jail or killing for a cause they consider unjust.

"We therefore believe that the fragmentation and disenchantment that this conflict has wrought upon our nation, and of particular relevance to us upon our generation, poses a far more serious threat to the stability and security of our own society.

"Many of our officials now admit our initial error in assuming this commitment and in our tactic of escalation. Yet rather than remedy the error they are compounding it. Before the entire world becomes Tacitus's desert, Mr. President, we urge a new effort to achieve peace. We join with such distin-

guished Americans as Senators Fulbright, McGovern, Hatfield, and Morse, and J. K. Galbraith, George Kennan, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., and Martin Luther King in repudiating the basic assumptions which have justified our intervention.

"We also add our voices to the 100 college student presidents and editors and to the 50 Rhodes Scholars who have also written to you. To date 12,000 of our peers have perished. Before more lose their chance to "do and build" for their country, we urge you, Mr. President, to begin the deescalation of the Vietnam War."

These young people have the right to voice their opinions, just as any other American, but it does distress me that there are those who would seek to exploit collectively this group of outstanding young people who come into our offices from all sections of the country. There are about 20 ringleaders of this movement, serving in offices which I shall not name, and calling meetings in Members' offices and it might not be a bad idea for Members to know for sure what is going on in their own offices.

The point here is that the prestige of our offices is being used to foster a given point of view and conceivably a number of these young, inexperienced people could find themselves caught up in and endorsing a movement which they know very little about. And may I remind you there are some 1,300 interns on Capitol Hill. If half of this number should become signers of a letter to the President, it would obviously command press attention, and this is one of the principal aims of the group—to get publicity.

While the ringleaders profess to be "builders and doers" I think it is significant to point out that none of their meetings have been held publicly, but behind closed doors.

The Congressional Interns for Peace movement is one of many movements acting as a spoke emanating from a hub, and the hub is an organization in the Washington metropolitan area known as the Spring Mobilization Committee. This latter committee is supported by such civil rights leaders and agitators as Julius Hobson of ACT, Rev. James Bevil, Anthony Thomas of the Young Socialist Alliance, Lester McKinney of SNCC, among many others.

I am reminded that this past week some of our colleagues circulated a letter making a point that professional agitators do not travel from State to State. This, of course, depends upon what one means by the word "agitator," but we have ample evidence and proof of people traveling from one area, city, and State to another to foment trouble, disturb the peace and domestic tranquility.

For example, back in June there was an intern party for Dick Gregory, who made the announcement that he intended to run for President. The written invitation to this party was followed up with a personal invitation by a representative of SNCC. When he was asked who was behind it all, he simply responded, "It is none of your business." Agitators were flown in from Atlanta, Ga. They were hippies who work with Hap Brown's SNCC.

Then, on June 28, an agitator who headed the recent demonstration protesting the war in Vietnam in general, and Lyndon Johnson in particular, spoke about the fiasco of their demonstration in Los Angeles where he was instrumental in inciting 100,000 protestors. He is here to help organize similar demonstrations in the District of Columbia area in conjunction with Rev. James Beville, the oft-times Pentagon agitator.

Proposals are now being circulated in the District of Columbia area for a Muhammad Ali demonstration. While the arrangements are tentative and organizers are waiting until they can get Muhammad Ali to come from California to the District of Columbia area, there is a notice of this being circulated by members of the Spring Mobilization Committee, and I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the text of that particular notice be included in the RECORD at this point.

PROPOSAL FOR A DEMONSTRATION IN SUPPORT OF MUHAMMAD ALI

Anti-war activists must defend all those who are persecuted by the government for their opposition and resistance to the Vietnam war and the draft. An attack on one is an attack on all. If the government were to be successful in isolating large numbers of opponents and resisters to this war by imprisonment or deprivation of rights, our attempts to build a massive movement to end the war in Vietnam would be weakened. It is also a responsibility of our movement to reach new segments of the population on issues relating to the war. In addition, it is essential that we condemn the totally racist character of the Vietnam war and the draft.

Muhammad Ali, the heavy-weight champion of the world, is probably the best-known victim of government persecution to opponents and resisters of the war and the draft. The anti-war movement must support Muhammad Ali's right to draft-deferment on the basis of his religious convictions and must reiterate its clear condemnation of the racist war and the racist draft. Action in support of Muhammad Ali would prove effective in reaching out to the Afro-American community where there is mass support for Muhammad Ali.

Therefore, we propose a demonstration by the Washington Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and other groups in support of Muhammad Ali. We propose that the demonstration take place on [still pending]. We propose that there be a rally at [still pending] at the John F. Kennedy playground at 7th and P streets, N.W. This should be followed by a march down 7th street to G street and over to the induction center at 916 G Street, N.W. A demonstration should be held at the induction center for approximately one hour. The character of the demonstration should be support of Muhammad Ali's right to deferment on religious grounds and condemnation of the racist war and the racist draft.

Jean Bell, Chairman, Finance Committee, D.C. Mobilization Committee; Terrill Brumback, Chairman, Mass Actions Committee, D.C. Mobilization Committee; Julius Hobson, Chairman, ACT; Lester McKinnie, Chairman, D.C. SNCC; Vivian Moore, Chairman, Mobilization Newsletter; David Rein, Esq.; Ray Robinson; Nancy Strebe, Chairman, Defense Committee, D.C. Mobilization Com.; Anthony Thomas, Young Socialist Alliance; Linda Wetter, Sec-

retary, D.C. Mobilization Committee; Dagmar Wilson, Founder, Women Strike for Peace.

You are all aware, I am sure, that our interns were invited to hear David Miller, the prominent draft-card burner in the caucus room, until the Speaker was told about it and scuttled the appearance. His speech was rescheduled off the Hill at the William Penn House, 515 East Capitol Street.

In closing, I should like to alert the Members to the scheduled meeting next Tuesday, July 25, at 11:45 in the Old Senate Office Building, room 457, where there will be supposedly a mass meeting of all interns interested in the congressional interns for peace program. And having some idea of the nature of that meeting, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but observe that at one time, particularly in the Kennedy administration, these young people were being wooed and courted in an unending stream by administration people, hopefully to get them to parrot the party line, so to speak. It seems, however, under the Johnson administration these lines of communication have become completely disrupted and we now find a very well-planned scheme being hatched right under our House "wing" to undercut and embarrass the administration.

THE RUSH FOR AN ANTIRIOT LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the shock stemming from the riots we have witnessed in cities scattered throughout our Nation, there is a great popular demand for a solution to these deplorable incidents.

I am fully sympathetic to this demand, and I think all of us honestly seek to find the key to stopping the destruction and heartbreak inherent in civil disturbances of this magnitude.

Yesterday we passed a bill titled by its proponents as an antiriot bill, but I do not think the question before us then or now is whether or not we are "anti" riots.

It is my concern that any bill publicized as "antiriot" will fall heir to popular support without careful analysis of its language and of the basic causes of these riots.

My concern is shared by others.

The American Civil Liberties Union, in a very sound legal analysis of H.R. 421, reached the conclusion that:

The question is not whether these disorders are to be tolerated, but what can and should be done in dealing with them. We fail to see how H.R. 421 in any way provides a constructive solution to the problem, and furthermore find in analyzing it that it is so badly drafted that it will infringe on First Amendment freedoms and will also violate the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment.

In my own State of California, the San Francisco Chronicle reminded us in an editorial on Tuesday that "riots are

for the most part home grown" and do not mushroom merely because of out-of-State agitation.

The Washington Post this morning, after commenting that—

The bill is about as sensible as an injunction against a hurricane.

Went on to say—

Most serious of all, however, in our judgment is the bill's flagrant misapprehension of the causes of rioting.

This bill came to us without having been subjected to full legislative hearings. Serious questions have been raised about its constitutionality and eventual effectiveness.

When this legislation is considered by the other body, I hope they will deliberate upon these objections, and should this measure come back to the House in any form, I urge a complete reevaluation of the premises on which it is based.

And more importantly, I hope this body will not feel it has accepted its full responsibility for solving the riots "born of alienation, despair, and a sense of injustice in urban slums" with the passage of H.R. 421. If we are truly anti-riots, a great deal more needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of our colleagues to a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union stating its objections to the language of H.R. 421, as well as an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of July 18 and the Washington Post of July 20, all three of which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point.

WASHINGTON OFFICE, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1967.

Re H.R. 421, the Anti-Riot Bill.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, too, along with all Americans, "share the deep concern widely expressed over the outbreak of riots and other violent disturbances in a number of cities in various sections of the Nation." (H. Rept. 472, p. 2.) The question is not whether these disorders are to be tolerated, but what can and should be done in dealing with them. We fail to see how H.R. 421 in any way provides a constructive solution to the problem, and furthermore we find in analyzing it that it is so badly drafted that it will infringe on First Amendment freedoms and will also violate the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment.

The bill provides that anyone who travels in interstate or foreign commerce or who uses the mails with intent to (a) "incite a riot or to organize, promote, encourage, or carry on a riot" or to aid and abet any person in inciting a riot, and (b) who performs or attempts to perform any overt act specified in (a) shall be fined \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years.

A section on definitions is included, § 2102, which defines inciting a riot as meaning "urging or instigating other persons to riot, but shall not mean the mere advocacy of ideas, or the mere expression of belief." Strangely enough, however, there is no similar definition of "encouraging" or "promoting" a riot.

1. The bill clearly violates the First Amendment's freedom of speech clause.

a. The bill attempts unsuccessfully to avoid a First Amendment problem by defining and limiting "inciting a riot" as "urging or instigating other persons to riot but shall not mean the mere advocacy of ideas or their mere expression of belief." This definition is apparently based on the Supreme Court de-

cision in *Yates v. United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957), in which the Court reversed the convictions of some second-string Communist Party leaders because the judge failed to instruct the jury properly on the difference between unprotected speech and advocacy of abstract doctrine. However, the definition in the bill ignores the additional factor the Court said must be present—that there must be the use of language reasonably calculated to induce action immediately. Justice Harlan, speaking for the Court, said that even “urging” forcible overthrow was not sufficient. There must be something more.

Where the bill goes astray in its definition is in assuming that only the “mere advocacy of ideas or the mere expression of belief” is all that is protected by the First Amendment. That is simply not true.

In *Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1 (1949), the Supreme Court reversed a conviction for breach of the peace of a suspended Catholic priest for giving a speech which the judge charged the jury “stirs the public to anger, invites dispute, brings about a condition of unrest, or creates a disturbance.” Justice Douglas in speaking for the majority said:

“A function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. Speech is often provocative and challenging. That is why freedom of speech, though not absolute . . . is nevertheless protected against censorship or punishment, unless shown likely to produce a clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest.” 337 U.S. at 4-5.

Contrary to the definition in the bill, free speech beyond “mere advocacy of ideas or mere expressions of belief” is protected by the First Amendment.

b. As we have noted before, only “inciting to riot” is defined, with the limiting language. Not defined or limited, in any way, however, are other verbs in the bill: neither “organize”, “promote”, “encourage”, or “carry on”. It is clear that all of these may involve—almost certainly do involve—speech. Yet, by reason of the fact that there is a limiting definition of “inciting” (no matter how defective) and not of these other verbs, the law could penalize individuals who “encourage” or “promote” riots even by the mere advocacy of ideas or the mere expressions of belief. As Mr. Justice Holmes said in his dissenting opinion in *Gitlow v. New York*, 268 U.S. 652 at 673: “Every idea is an incitement.”

Unless the House Judiciary Committee deliberately intended this dangerous result, we can only conclude it is an example of extremely poor draftsmanship.

c. The bill fails to draw a distinction between one who urges his listeners to riot, and one who speaks before a hostile audience which is inclined to riot against him.

In Section 2102(c), inciting a riot is defined as “instigating other persons to riot”. “Instigating” may mean “provoking”. Under this bill, if Dean Rusk crossed state lines in order to keep a speaking engagement to defend our policy in Viet Nam, but knew that a group of individuals intended to conduct a riotous demonstration if he appeared, he would violate its provisions.

We agree that it is far-fetched to believe that Dean Rusk would be prosecuted. However, the same blindness to this vital distinction has been characteristic of those who have been most outraged by the “outside agitator”. In the vast majority of civil rights

demonstrations in the South, the public disorders have been caused not by the non-violent demonstrators but by the antagonistic, hostile (not-so-nonviolent) bystanders. It is not at all clear that this bill is intended only to apply to those who enflame others to riot with the speaker—and not to those who take the law into their own hands to suppress a speaker whose views they find abhorrent.

“If the speaker incites others to immediate unlawful action he may be punished in a proper case, stopped when disorder actually impends; but this is not to be confused with unlawful action from others who seek unlawfully to suppress or punish the speaker.” *Matter of Rockwell v. Morris*, 12 A.D. 2d 272, 281 (1st Dept. 1961), *aff’d* 215 N.Y.S. 2d 502 (1961), *cert. denied* 368 U.S. 913 (1961).

2. The bill violates the due process clause in providing that intent and act do not coincide.

The bill makes it a crime for an individual to cross a state line or to go from a foreign country to a state or to mail a letter with a certain intent to incite or encourage a riot. Afterwards, even though he no longer has that same intent, if he commits some overt act that could be construed as encouraging or promoting a riot or other public disturbance, he will have violated the law, although his crossing of the state line may have occurred months or even years before. This violates a basic requirement of criminal law that the intent and the criminal act must be contemporaneous. *United States v. Fox*, 95 U.S. 670 (1877).

It is clear the bill does not require any specific intent at the time of the overt act—only at the time of the crossing of the state line. How a jury could possibly establish this intent unrelated to a contemporaneous act is impossible to fathom. Congressman Gonzalez discussed in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 17642 of the 89th Congress, a bill similar to H.R. 421 as originally introduced by Congressman Cramer, this constitutional defect. He stated in language still relevant to H.R. 421 as amended that:

“In other words, this bill would make it a criminal offense to think the wrong kind of thoughts while crossing a state line. This, in light of the language of the First Amendment, is such a flagrant and fantastic violation of the spirit and the letter of the Constitution, that I am frankly surprised and somewhat disturbed that the bill has received the serious attention it has.”

Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 20, page 27191.

3. The bill does not require a violator to be at the scene of a riot.

This tying of the intent to the crossing of state lines, rather than to the time of the overt acts, produces another anomalous result. For example, if a person flew from California to New York and then publishes a newspaper, or makes a speech in New York urging or encouraging Californians to riot he would be guilty of violating the law. In other words, he could violate the law 3000 miles away from the scene where he encourages a riot. It should be noted that the law does not require that a riot actually occur, only that the individual does some overt act to promote or encourage a riot.

4. The bill is unnecessary.

As the Committee Report acknowledges, every single state and the District of Columbia has statutes to punish affrays, disturbances of the peace, and riots.

As emphasized in the minority views of Congressmen Edwards, Conyers and Tenzer to H. Rept. 472, encroachment on state and

local police power is presently unwarranted. Despite great difficulties, local police generally have been able to handle the disturbances. Assistant Attorney General John Doar, head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, has stated that what is involved is “essentially local functions which should be handled primarily on the local level.”

Cities such as New York, Chicago, and Cleveland are utilizing specially trained riot forces to cope with these disturbances. These forces are trained to exercise sound judgment in determining when to make arrests so that while enforcing the law they will avoid the stirring up of mob anger. Ill-prepared federal officials acting under this proposed law may, while making arrests, unintentionally inflame tense situations. A Chicago handbook for the police advises: “Don't make an arrest unless you can make it stick and unless you are sure you won't be overwhelmed by the crowd”. Quoted in *U.S. News & World Report*, August 8, 1966.

5. The bill is based on the myth of the “outside agitator”.

The bill, in dealing with this extremely serious problem, rests on the theory that the urban riots since 1964 have been caused by “out-of-state” inciters (H. Rept. 472, p. 3). Not a single fact is alleged to substantiate this simplistic “scapegoat” concept. Ignored completely is the recent massive study by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. In the final volume of its report just published a few weeks ago, *Task Force Report: “Crime and Its Impact—An Assessment”*, the Commission failed to find any evidence that outside agitators had anything to do with Watts or any of the other racial riots which have occurred (see Chapter 9). The vast majority of riots were triggered by police arrest incidents, even though the police were not acting improperly at the time. The Task Force concluded that the riots were “social protest of a sort—a criminal sort”; that they were “unplanned, undisciplined, unled, and incoherent”; that they expressed “hostility, resentment, revenge” and the “increasing conviction of Negroes that legal methods of protest” are ineffectual; in other words, the riots are “not only an expression of hostility, but a cry for help.”

The real solution to riots is the elimination of the ghetto itself, with all the shameful economic, social, political, and psychological deprivations it causes.

The tragic irony of H.R. 421 is not only that the House once again leads itself astray in setting up the strawman of the “outside agitator” and in proposing a bill with heavy criminal penalties aimed at him, but, at the same time, it is cutting back on the Anti-Poverty Program, which in a very small and insufficient way, at least is attempting to alleviate the misery of the ghettos which is the real cause of the riots. Consequently we urge you to vote against H.R. 421 when it is scheduled for floor action on July 13th.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE SPEISER,
Director, Washington Office.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1967]

FEVER PITCH

The outbreaks of violence in Newark and Plainfield, New Jersey, during the past week doubtless fired the fever which brought the so-called anti-riot bill to passage in the House of Representatives. The bill is about as sensible as an injunction against a hurricane. But in the prevailing overheated atmosphere, reason was perhaps powerless to combat it.

We adjure the members of the Senate to reflect on this measure when it comes before that more deliberative chamber. It would fine or imprison anyone who travels in interstate commerce or who uses the mails with intent to "incite a riot or to organize, promote, encourage, or carry on a riot" or to aid and abet any person in inciting a riot. A group of thoughtful Congressmen, in a letter to their colleagues, summed up the objections to this bill. "The bill," they assert, "is wrong in conception, has received inadequate consideration, has grave legal defects and raises serious possibilities of interference with the legitimate activities of civil rights groups and labor organizations."

The terms of the bill are dangerously vague. What is meant by "encouraging" a riot, or "carrying on" a riot? No definition of these terms is provided. They may embrace exhortation meant to produce no more than peaceful protest. As the Supreme Court has observed, "A function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. Speech is often provocative and challenging."

There are ample laws in all the states of this Union to deal with rioting, looting, vandalism, arson, sniping and other forms of violence. These, quite properly, in the American governmental structure, are local crimes. No local or state law enforcement authority has requested Congress to supplement state powers by Federal intervention in this area.

Most serious of all, however, in our judgment is the bill's flagrant misapprehension of the causes of rioting. Riots are born, not made. They are born of alienation, despair and a sense of injustice in urban slums and they are sired by community indifference and obtuseness. The proposed antiriot bill merely fosters these conditions. Riots cannot effectively be forbidden. They can be prevented by rational prophylactic measures—education, slum clearance, the opening up of job opportunities. But to suppose that they are simply the consequence of incitement and agitation is to aggravate the sense of helplessness and hopelessness in which they are conceived.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, July 18, 1967]

THE RUSH FOR AN ANTIRIOT LAW

With the deplorable fury of Newark furnishing a pretext, Congressmen appear fairly certain tomorrow to pass the Cramer bill punishing anyone who moves across State lines, or uses telephones or other interstate facilities, "with the intent to incite a riot."

The need for a law like this is denied by Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who sensibly said it would have little effect in preventing riots. He said there was no evidence of interstate conspiracy to activate the Newark rioting, and for that matter, he said, riots are for the most part home grown. Common sense should teach anybody that.

The Justice Department has been consistent on the Cramer bill. Last year Assistant Attorney General John Doar testified it was of doubtful constitutionality and would be of little use. Riot control, he noted, has historically been a state and local police matter. "Support your local police" might for once be good advice to those Congressmen who are in full, emotional cry to do something, not just stand there.

INTRODUCTION OF CAB LEGISLATION

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1967, beginning on page 7336 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I outlined and detailed the exchange of correspondence which has occurred between the Civil Aeronautics Board and me between March 19, 1965, and March 20, 1967. At the time of my remarks, I stated that—

The documents indicate a very serious deficiency in the regulation of rates and fares by that independent regulatory agency which is, and I believe that all Members of Congress would agree on this, nothing, more or less, than an agent of Congress.

I am submitting, today additional correspondence which only serves to reinforce the statement I made March 20. That correspondence follows:

APRIL 27, 1967.

CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Chairman,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since the experience which international carriers have had in assessing a \$2.50 charge on movies in flight would be relevant to your current consideration of the imposition of a \$2.00 charge on domestic flights, I would appreciate receiving from you an analysis of what the experience with the \$2.50 charge has shown.

Your timely response to this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1967.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: The Chairman has asked me to reply to your letter of April 27, 1967, requesting an analysis of what the experience of international carriers with a \$2.50 charge for in-flight movies has shown.

The Board does not presently have usage data upon which the requested analysis can be made. However, there is presently pending before the Board a petition of Inflight Motion Pictures, Inc. for reconsideration of Order E-24823, March 6, 1967, in which the Board approved the IATA agreement specifying the \$2.50 charge. In its petition, Inflight has requested the Board to require each air carrier proponent of the agreement to file with the Board for its information and the information of interested parties: (a) data showing, by classes, the number of users of headsets and the number of passengers carried, on a monthly basis on each international route on which it provided in-flight entertainment during the period in which the \$2.50 charge has been in effect, and during the 12-month period preceding, and (b) such other data pertinent to a consideration of the public acceptance of the \$2.50 charge, as each such carrier may have. In addition, in its comments on the Board's proposal that a minimum charge of \$2.00 be required for visual in-flight entertainment in interstate and overseas air transportation, Inflight has requested that no action be taken by the Board on the proposal until such data have been filed with the Board and

interested parties have had an opportunity to file comments in the light of such data.

Since these matters are presently pending before the Board, I am certain that you will understand that I cannot comment on their merits. I shall, however, keep you advised of any further developments in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DREGGE,
Director, Community and Congressional Relations.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1967.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: In our letter to you of May 16, 1967 we advised you that the Board had directed the air carriers to supply information as to the utilization of head sets for inflight entertainment at the charge of \$2.50 in international transportation.

We have obtained this information showing users before and after institution of the \$2.50 charge from Pan American and TWA. Copies of their summaries are in somewhat different format but we believe they will give you the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DREGGE,
Director, Community and Congressional Relations.

TRANS-WORLD AIRLINES, INC., IN-FLIGHT ENTERTAINMENT

Percent of transatlantic passengers using earsets and number of flights, 1966

	No surcharge, 1st class	\$1 surcharge, coach	Number of flights offering in-flight entertainment
January.....	91.9	50.3	418
February.....	96.9	53.9	405
March.....	97.5	48.5	489
April.....	96.3	50.3	526

1966

1967

[\$2.50 surcharge, effective May 24, 1966]

	47.1	37.0	357
January.....	47.1	37.0	357
February.....	49.6	35.6	341
March.....	49.2	33.6	376
April.....	50.5	33.1	460

Note.—Winter configuration: 24 1st class, 114 coach. Summer configuration: 16 1st class, 126 coach (fully implemented by Apr. 28). Movies were deleted on late departures because of the airline strike on Sept. 1, 1966, and were reinstated on Apr. 18, 1967, hence an interim reduction in the number of flights with in-flight entertainment (movies).

Number of transatlantic passengers and earset usage on flights offering in-flight entertainment

Month	Number of passengers		Earset usage ¹	
	1st class	Economy	1st class	Economy
1966				
January.....	3,050	24,772	2,804	12,461
February.....	2,792	18,916	2,705	10,188
March.....	3,843	30,115	3,746	14,598
April.....	4,495	39,834	4,329	20,039
1967				
January.....	2,711	19,678	1,277	7,280
February.....	2,278	15,170	1,131	5,407
March.....	2,856	20,503	1,405	6,898
April.....	3,789	30,733	1,915	10,187

¹ This data was obtained from Inflight Motion Pictures, Inc. June 14, 1967.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC.

SCHEDULE A.—Monthly summary of number of flights, seats, and passengers for scheduled services having in-flight entertainment since introduction of the \$2.50 charge

	Number of flights	1st class				Economy class				Total all classes			
		Seats	Passengers		Seats	Passengers		Seats	Passengers		Seats	Passengers	
			Total	Users		Total	Users		Total	Users			
1966:													
May 1.....	89	1,780	956	250	10,235	7,553	1,443	12,015	8,509	1,693			
June.....	503	10,060	5,503	1,387	57,845	46,912	9,429	67,905	52,415	10,816			
July.....	535	10,700	6,752	1,945	61,525	57,341	12,214	72,225	64,093	14,159			
August.....	543	10,860	6,321	1,555	62,445	56,138	11,621	73,305	62,459	13,176			
September.....	482	9,640	5,562	1,346	55,430	43,956	8,923	65,070	49,518	10,269			
October.....	371	7,420	4,719	1,090	42,665	27,348	5,688	50,085	32,067	6,778			
November.....	359	7,180	3,856	941	41,285	19,363	3,853	48,465	23,219	4,794			
December.....	350	7,000	3,015	846	40,250	25,273	5,323	47,250	28,288	6,169			
1967:													
January.....	437	8,740	3,854	948	50,255	27,590	5,546	58,995	31,444	6,494			
February.....	454	9,080	4,177	1,028	52,210	24,017	5,116	61,290	28,194	6,144			
March.....	521	10,420	5,075	1,259	59,915	30,736	6,762	70,335	35,811	8,021			
April.....	452	9,040	5,451	1,368	51,980	32,280	6,714	61,020	37,731	8,082			
Year ended Apr. 30, 1967.....	5,096	101,920	55,241	13,963	586,040	398,507	82,632	687,960	453,748	96,595			
Percent total passengers of seats.....		54.2			68.0			65.9					
Percent total users of seats.....		13.7			14.1			14.1					
Percent total users of passengers.....		25.2			20.8			21.3					

1 \$2.50 charge effective May 24, 1966.

SCHEDULE B.—Monthly summary of number of flights, seats, and passengers for scheduled services having in-flight entertainment at a charge of \$1 per passenger¹

	Number of flights	Economy class			
		Seats	Passengers		Users
			Total	Users	
1965:					
Oct. 16-31 ²	180	20,700	7,810	3,268	
November.....	360	41,400	9,937	4,589	
December.....	323	37,145	11,509	4,647	
1966:					
January.....	296	30,040	21,847	9,960	
February.....	336	38,640	13,925	5,883	
March.....	418	48,070	13,153	5,739	
April.....	389	44,735	17,322	7,169	
May 1-23 ³	294	33,810	15,428	5,831	
Total.....	2,596	298,540	110,931	47,086	
Percent total passengers of seats.....		37.2			
Percent total users of seats.....		15.8			
Percent total users of passengers.....		42.4			

¹ Data for economy class only; \$1 charge not applicable to 1st class.

² \$1 charge effective Oct. 16.

³ \$1 charge discontinued May 23. (\$2.50 charge for all international passengers became effective May 24, 1966).

The following letter is a reply by the CAB to a letter received from an individual who wrote concerning in-flight entertainment:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1967.

This will reply to your letter of April 30, 1967, requesting additional information on the proposed charge for in-flight entertainment.

Initially, in the absence of a separate charge for in-flight movies, the costs of this service are paid from the over-all revenues of the carriers. Since the fares paid by passengers provide a major portion of the revenues of most air carriers, there is little question that the funds paid by the carriers for in-flight movies can be traced back to this source. However, from a rate making standpoint the Board has not heretofore included the carriers cost for in-flight entertainment as one of the expenses to be considered in determining the lawful level of fares to be charged for air transportation. Thus, even though these costs are being ab-

sorbed by the carriers, the present level of fares has not been established to reflect this expense. The Board's proposal would continue to exclude the costs of in-flight entertainment from those carrier expenses which have been accepted for rate making purposes and not permit these costs to become imbedded in the fare level.

On the other hand, the service of meals at normal dining hours has long been considered as a part of the total transportation services provided by air carriers. In those markets, where meals are served the levels of first-class and coach fares reflect the average costs of this service per passenger and do not depend upon whether a meal is accepted or not.

I hope this information will be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. SHEEHAN,
Chief Counsel, Rates Division, Bureau of Economics.

Mr. Speaker, the CAB not only clearly and succinctly admits decisions were being reached without detailed evidence of in-flight motion picture use, but in a new proposed rule, the CAB will require each airline to file provisions for the type and amount of charges for in-flight liquor service in the same manner that they file passenger fares and cargo rates.

Does Mr. Murphy seriously feel the duty of the Board is to remove all vestiges of competition? How far will the Chairman eventually proceed down the road to complete disregard of the public interest?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think my colleagues and I can afford to sit idly by while this constant erosion of the competitive nature of transportation continues. The time to act on behalf of our citizenry and in support of free enterprise is now. I am, therefore, introducing the following legislation to prohibit further irresponsible activity on the part of the Board in the area of in-flight cabin services.

H.R. 11620

A bill to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from regulating the charges made by air carriers for certain in-flight services made available to passengers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 404 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which relates to rates for carriage of persons and property, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"CHARGES FOR IN-FLIGHT SERVICES

"(c) The Board shall not regulate the charges made by an air carrier for any in-flight service, not essential to the performance of the transportation function of the air carrier (including but not limited to in-flight food and beverage service and in-flight entertainment), provided for the benefit of only those passengers who desire to avail themselves of such service. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede any authority contained in this Act to regulate any such in-flight service in the interest of safety in air transportation."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Sec. 404. Rates for carriage of persons and property." is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"(c) Charges for in-flight services."

SUMMER ARTS FESTIVAL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this House the Summer Arts Festival which is currently in full operation in my city of Cleveland.

The Summer Arts Festival was conceived in the minds of public spirited Clevelanders as a means to bring live theater, music, and arts programs to 10 different neighborhoods throughout the city during the summer of 1967. Mr. Howard Whittaker of the Music School Settlement of Cleveland has acted admirably as executive director of this im-

portant group. Dr. Lester Glick, one of the Cleveland Summer Arts Festival founders, was elected as the festival's first president. Free performances have been scheduled of the Cleveland Play House, the Cleveland Orchestra, Lake Erie Opera Theatre, as well as features of local and national jazz, rock and roll, and other musical talent. The effort of the Cleveland Arts Festival is indeed unique in bringing entertainment right down to the neighborhood level throughout the city. The hard-working committee has included, as well, employment opportunities for young people from the neighborhoods in which performances will occur through grants from the Neighborhood Youth Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We have, since the first performance on June 25, seen the enthusiastic response from neighborhood people who have come by the thousands to attend the performances which have been offered. As is indicated in the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial of July 20, 1967, entitled "Good Happenings in the Parks," 6,000 people came to hear a rock and roll folk music concert in one neighborhood, and the average attendance throughout has been over 1,400 for the 38 outdoor performances of all sorts of programs which have occurred to date. I make special note of the important roles played by the Cleveland Welfare Association, the Music School Settlement, the Cleveland local of the Musicians Union, the energetic young group known as Group 66, the city of Cleveland's Recreation and Safety Director staff, the Cleveland Orchestra, the Cleveland Play House, the Lake Erie Opera Theatre, the Karamu House, as well as each of the board members of the Cleveland Arts Festival who have worked so hard individually to assure the success of this vital effort.

In addition, I wish to make special note of the workshops in creative arts which have been made available through the facilities of the Karamu House in Cleveland. These workshops have provided opportunities for thousands of neighborhood youngsters to participate in daytime creative activity which would not have otherwise been possible.

It is indeed my hope that what are now known as the Summer Arts Festival and the Summer Arts Festival Karamu Workshop, can be made a permanent and integral part of neighborhood programming on a year-round basis.

It is my hope and intention to determine ways in which this vital program can obtain the necessary level of Federal and local commitment required to assure its continuation on a yearly basis. This program has thus far amply demonstrated its worth through its high level of success which can only be shown by the high level of support given each performance by the local people in each of the neighborhoods.

I wish to include at this point an editorial from the Cleveland Press of June 19, 1967, entitled "A Summer To Be Richer With Arts Festival;" an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 20 entitled "Good Happenings in the Parks;" a comprehensive listing of the events of the Cleveland Arts Festival from June 19 through August 25 which

appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 7, 1967; an editorial which appeared recently in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, entitled "Summer Jobs for Hough Youth;" an article from the Cleveland Call and Post entitled "Summer Arts Festival Spotlights 'The Duke';" and finally an article concerning the election of officers of the Cleveland Arts Festival.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate all of those hard-working people associated with this fine program. It is my hope that we will see more such positive activities throughout the coming year and the summer to follow.

The editorials follow:

SUMMER TO BE RICHER WITH ARTS FESTIVAL

When you can see Shakespeare on a baseball diamond and hear opera at a skating rink, you can be sure culture has come to town.

It has come to town in a most entertaining way. The Summer Arts Festival opens tonight with a Play House production of Shakespeare's fantasy "The Tempest" at the Fairview Park baseball field and Puccini's delightful one-act "Gianni Schicchi," with the Lake Erie Opera Theatre and the Cleveland Orchestra at the Woodland Hills Park skating rink.

And this is just the beginning. In addition to 20 free performances of "The Tempest" and 10 of "Gianni Schicchi," the days ahead will also sparkle with dance programs, neighborhood drama workshops, puppet shows, and big name band concerts.

The Summer Arts Festival is a Cleveland first.

Clevelanders can show their appreciation to the sponsoring groups simply by enjoying the many attractions of the tuneful, colorful summer ahead.

GOOD HAPPENINGS IN THE PARKS

The Summer Arts Festival, born of desperation to get something concrete going for the hemmed-in dwellers of the inner city, is turning out to be one of the best things ever done in Cleveland.

When 6,000 come to a park concert blending rock-'n'-roll and folk music, when 4,000 come in the rain to hear Duke Ellington, when opera and Shakespeare play in the Negro areas and are well received, when Negro performers appear on the West Side and are well received there is no doubt about the response.

When older youths and young teen-agers dog the performers, asking how it is done, how does one break into this game—then one realizes how meaningful this program really is.

"Get your education" is the unrehearsed standard answer. If the boys and girls won't believe it from their parents, teachers or preachers, perhaps they will from those with a detached viewpoint.

The Summer Arts Festival goes beyond mere entertainment. It is opening up views to people who hardly knew a different kind of life or recreation existed.

Through yesterday, 53,500 attended the 38 outdoor performances since June 19. Average attendance is 1,408. The Lake Erie Opera Theatre with the Cleveland Orchestra put on "Gianni Schicchi" eight times, drawing 10,700. The Cleveland Play House put on Shakespeare's "The Tempest" 19 times, drawing 15,400, and 11 popular entertainment shows drew 27,400.

Not only is this the first time many in the free audiences saw live entertainment, not only has it introduced the people to Shakespeare, but it also has done much to introduce the world-famous Cleveland Orchestra to inner-city Clevelanders.

Music indeed is the international language. It is good to know that its charms are show-

ing in Cleveland. Hats off to all—the Welfare Federation, Music School Settlement, Musicians Union, Group 66, Mayor Ralph S. Locher, the city's recreation and parks departments and others—who are helping make a dream come true.

EVENTS LISTED FOR CLEVELAND'S FIRST SUMMER ARTS FESTIVAL

The full schedule of outdoor events for Cleveland's first Summer Arts Festival was announced today.

The festival, which opens June 19, will bring performances ranging from Shakespeare and comic opera through dance groups and rock bands into parks in 10 Cleveland neighborhoods.

Participating agencies include the Cleveland Play House, Lake Erie Opera Theatre, Cleveland Orchestra, Karamu House, the Cleveland Music School Settlement, and two local ballet groups.

There will be local appearances by jazz great Cannonball Adderly, singer Carmen McRae, folk singer Tedd Browne and other pop music favorites.

The 10 neighborhood areas where major events are scheduled are: Lincoln Park (W. 14th Street and Starkweather Avenue S.W.), Woodland Hills Park skating rink (East Boulevard near Kinsman Road S.E.), Fairview Park ball diamond (1687 W. 38th Street across from Kentucky School), J. Glen Smith Health Center (E. 111th Street and St. Clair Avenue N.E.), Garden Valley Park (7131 Port Avenue S.E.), Kirtland Park amphitheater (E. 49th Street and Memorial Shoreway N.E.), League Park (6601 Lexington N.E.), Central Playfield Showplace (Hough Avenue and Crawford N.E.), Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center parking lot (13200 Kinsman Road S.E.), and Kerruish Park (Lee Road and Tarkington Avenue S.E.).

The festival will run through Aug. 25 at these and other locations.

Here is the schedule of events as it now stands. Clip and save it as your day-by-day reference on what's going on in the Summer Festival. All performances will start at 8 p.m.

June 19—Fairview Park ball diamond, Cleveland Play House, "The Tempest"; Woodland Hills Park Skating Rink, Lake Erie Opera Theatre with the Cleveland Orchestra, "Gianni Schicchi."

June 20—Fairview Park ball diamond, "The Tempest"; Garden Valley Park, "Gianni Schicchi."

June 21—Lincoln Park, "The Tempest"; Kirtland Park Amphitheater, "Gianni Schicchi."

June 22—Lincoln Park, "The Tempest."
June 23—Kerruish Park, "The Tempest"; J. Glen Smith Health Center, "Gianni Schicchi."

June 24—Fairview Park ball diamond, "Gianni Schicchi"; Kirtland Park Amphitheater, James Brown Show.

June 25—Lincoln Park, "Gianni Schicchi"; Kerruish Park, Tedd Browne Show.

June 26—Kerruish Park, "The Tempest"; Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center parking lot, "Gianni Schicchi."

June 27—J. Glen Smith Health Center, "Gianni Schicchi."

June 28—J. Glen Smith Health Center, "The Tempest."

June 29—Woodland Hills Park skating rink, "The Tempest."

June 30—Woodland Hills Park skating rink, "The Tempest"; League Park, "Gianni Schicchi."

July 1—Kerruish Park, "Gianni Schicchi"; Lincoln Park, Laura Greene with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

July 2—J. Glen Smith Health Center, Laura Greene, the Lou Savilla Orchestra, and Eleo Pomare Dance Group.

July 3—Kirtland Park Amphitheater, "The Tempest."

July 4—Kirtland Park Amphitheater, "The Tempest."

July 5—Garden Valley Park, "The Tempest."

July 6—Garden Valley Park, "The Tempest."

July 7—League Park, "The Tempest".

July 8—J. Glen Smith Health Center, Sonny Terry and Brownie McGhee, the Jotham Callins Quartet, with the Hank Geer Orchestra.

July 9—Woodland Hills Park skating rink, Sonny Terry and Brownie McGhee, the Jotham Callins Quartet, with the Hank Geer Orchestra.

July 10—League Park, "The Tempest".

July 11—Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center parking lot, "The Tempest."

July 12—Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center parking lot, "The Tempest."

July 13—Central Playfield Showplace (Hough Central Playground), "The Tempest."

July 14—Central Playfield Showplace, "The Tempest."

July 15—Lincoln Park, Mitchell-Ruff Trio, Irene Reid, with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

July 16—League Park, Mitchell-Ruff Trio, Irene Reid, with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

July 17—Kerruish Park, Orchettes conducted by Ben Silverberg.

July 18—Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center parking lot, "Box Tops" and the "Singing Angels."

July 19—J. Glen Smith Health Center, Orchettes conducted by Ben Silverberg.

July 20—To be scheduled.

July 21—Fairview Park ball diamond, Modern Dance Association "Box Tops" and others to be scheduled.

July 22—Bands and entertainment to be scheduled.

July 23—Bands and entertainment to be scheduled.

July 24—Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center parking lot, Ballet Russe (Cleveland).

July 25—Kerruish Park, Ballet Guild.

July 26—Lincoln Park, Ballet Russe.

July 27 and 28—To be scheduled.

July 29—League Park, Big Maybelle with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

July 30—Central Playfield Showplace, Big Maybelle with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

July 31 to Aug. 4—To be scheduled.

Aug. 5—League Park, Carmen McRae, the Young-Holt Trio, with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

Aug. 6—Garden Valley Park, Carmen McRae, the Young-Holt Trio, with the Lou Savilla Orchestra.

Aug. 7—To be scheduled.

Aug. 8—Central Playfield Showplace, Sherman Puppets.

Aug. 9-18—Workshop performances to be scheduled with name bands on weekends.

Aug. 19—Woodland Hills Park skating rink, Cannonball Adderley.

Aug. 20-25—Workshop performances to be scheduled.

SUMMER JOBS FOR HOUGH YOUTH

U.S. Rep. Charles A. Vanik's announcement that federal agencies will provide 1,500 summer jobs for Hough area youths is welcome news.

High school pupils as well as dropouts and graduates desperately needing work will gain from the program. That gain will be not only in the immediate financial sense but in building up work experience and thus preparing for future employment.

Among the more striking job plans is one to employ 300 teenagers to help with the Cleveland Arts Festival effort. The festival will bring free music and drama to crowded neighborhoods and provide many cultural workshops. The young people will serve as ushers, distribute posters, set up scenery and in some cases serve as workshop instructors.

The federal Youth Opportunity Council will provide \$75,000 to hire the 300 for up to 20 hours a week.

Nearly 150 other young residents of gen-

erally disadvantaged areas will have jobs at the NASA's Lewis Research Center and will receive training courses there for later employment opportunities.

Vanik indicated that other federal employers will make special efforts to channel summer jobs for young people, in so far as practical, to those who need them most.

There still will remain thousands of jobless youths this summer, and time is growing short for private employers to join the current drives for providing additional opportunities.

SUMMER ARTS FESTIVAL SPOTLIGHTS "THE DUKE"

The great Duke Ellington and his orchestra head the list of outstanding performers being presented by the Cleveland Summer Arts Festival in more free outdoor programs in neighborhood recreation areas this week.

The world famous Ellington orchestra will play at a Festival program Tuesday (July 18) at 8 p.m. near the Woodland Hills Park skating rink on East Boulevard north of Kinsman Road. The show is another in the series of free programs of light opera, Shakespeare and popular entertainment being presented as part of the ten-week Festival.

The popular Mitchell-Ruff Trio and Vocalist Irene Reid will be featured on outdoor shows at Lincoln Park, W. 14th Street and Starkweather Avenue, tonight, and at League Park 6601 Lexington Avenue, tomorrow night. Festival programs start at 8 p.m.

Monday night at Kerruish Park, Lee Road and Tarkington Avenue, a music and dance program will be presented by the Orchettes, women's orchestra conducted by violinist Ben Silverberg, and the West Side Modern Dance Association.

Appearing on the free Ellington show Tuesday night will be the popular Modern Dance Association "Box Tops."

The Orchettes make another festival appearance Wednesday night in a free outdoor program at the J. Glen Smith Health Center, East 111th Street and St. Clair Avenue, while the Modern Dance Association "Box Tops" return Friday with the Hank Geer Orchestra for a performance at the city's Fairview Park Ball Diamond on West 38th Street north of Franklin Boulevard.

Next weekend the Clark Terry Orchestra will play at free outdoor programs at Kerruish Park at 3 p.m. and Kirtland Park Amphitheater, East 49th Street and Memorial Shoreway at 8 p.m. Saturday and at 3 p.m. Sunday at League Park and at 8 p.m. at Lincoln Park, W. 14th Street and Starkweather Avenue. Terry has been featured as trumpet and flugelhorn player in the NBC staff orchestra, seen by Cleveland TV viewers on the Tonight Show.

DR. GLICK ELECTED HEAD OF SUMMER ARTS FESTIVAL

Dr. Lester G. Glick, one of the Cleveland Summer Arts Festival's founders, was elected yesterday as the festival's first president.

Dr. Glick is vice president of the Lake Erie Opera Association which, with the Cleveland Orchestra, will give free evening performances at 10 neighborhood recreation areas, June 19-Aug. 25.

Free performances by the Cleveland Play House cast, appearances by performing and recording artists and cultural workshops at 14 neighborhood centers are included in the festival schedule.

Other officers chosen are vice presidents, David A. Leahy and Arthur L. Vance; secretary, Robert D. Storey; treasurer, George D. Kirkham.

New board members are Mrs. Worth Loomis and Mrs. James S. Reid Jr.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, many groups in our country have joined with President Johnson, who proclaimed the week of July 17 as Captive Nations Week, in asking that Americans everywhere remember the hardships and sorrow in which many millions of people live outside of the free world.

In my own area, the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans, through its chairman, Dr. Alton Ochsner, Jr., and the women's auxiliary of the chamber of commerce, headed by Mrs. Arthur F. Felt, Jr., marked the occasion by urging citizens to contact religious leaders for the purpose of offering special prayers during the week of July 16-22 to help restore freedom and a just peace to the world.

Captive Nations Week reminds us of the Communist takeover of once free and independent states and our hopes are directed to the future when these states will again be free to determine their own destinies.

Although Captive Nations Week is a solemn time for all freedom loving people it should not, I think, be marked only by sorrow. If there is one thing certain in human affairs, as Heraclitus noted almost 2,500 years ago, it is change. The persistent struggle of the peoples under communism for the right of self-determination gives us hope that no matter how high the walls, change will come. Indeed, many important changes have already occurred in the Communist bloc and it is becoming increasingly apparent, even to some Communist leaders, that no matter how much they desire it, the police state violates human nature and will not be tolerated for very long. The rocks thrown at Communist tanks in Budapest, the tunnels under the Berlin wall, and countless other examples provide abundant evidence that chains cannot be the foundation of a state, much less the basis for relationships among states.

Throughout the Communist world we see hopeful signs that the grip of the Communists is weakening. Freedom has not yet triumphed but the only inevitable thing about Marxism-Leninism is that it is a philosophy in decay, soon to take its rightful place on the scrap heap of history.

The United States, as the leader of the free world and as the first nation to experience the modern winds of change, will continue to fan the fire of freedom which is engulfing all the peoples of the world. Having led the way it is our duty as well as our self-interest to encourage the extension of freedom, liberty and economic progress. The pace of progress toward these objectives is bound to be different in various parts of the world, the resistance is bound to be stronger in some countries than in others, and our policies must take account of the diversity that confronts us.

We must be mindful that false starts, the product of impatience, can only delay

the realization of the objective, but we must never allow timidity to blind us to opportunities. We pursue these goals through peaceful means, knowing full well that the temporary fruits of aggression cannot be won back by further aggression, a course which is anathema to the people of the United States. Peaceful means though less dramatic than the putsch, offer the only real hope for the proliferation of freedom, and they are the only means acceptable to this country. But in the end freedom will come, and with it inevitably will come lasting international peace.

These are the objectives to which we renew our pledge during Captive Nations Week, confident that we and not the Communists know the true course of history.

AMERICAN AMBASSADOR G. FREDERICK REINHARDT DELIVERS COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS TO THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT INSTITUTE AT MONDELLO, SICILY

Mr. PRYOR. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on a recent visit to Italy, I was impressed once again with the fine support our Italian-American societies are giving to a number of orphanages in that country. Many of you share the same personal interest which I have in the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute at Mondello, Sicily. This institution, created by our good American friends Luigi Antonini and Vanni Montana and generously supported by the International Garment Workers' Union and the United Italian-American Labor Council has rendered an exceptional service to needy Italian youths since those war-torn days during which all Italy suffered so painfully. This institution which commanded the attention and interest of both President Kennedy and President Johnson is indicative of the type of generous support which Americans of Italian descent are giving to orphans throughout Italy.

On a previous visit to Italy, I had the good fortune of being able to make personal visits to Boy's Town near Rome and to Casa Saragat, a home for mentally retarded girls named after the late wife of Italy's President Giuseppe Saragat. I was also privileged to visit the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute in Mondello, Sicily, as well as the Casa Materna Orphanage near Naples. These visits made a profound impression upon me and made me more aware than ever of the bonds which exist between the people of our two countries.

I was indeed gratified to learn that our highly capable American Ambassador G. Frederick Reinhardt visited Sicily and delivered the commencement address in Italian to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute on June 6. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted

me I include the English translation of Ambassador Reinhardt's remarks on that occasion:

It is a great pleasure for me to be in Sicily today and to visit the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute on the conclusion of the 19th year of its activities, here between the sea and the shadow of Mount Pellegrino.

In October 1948 when your Institute was founded, Italy was still recovering from the ravages of World War II; families were torn apart by death, sickness, poverty, and the tragic consequences of war.

A group of Americans, including Luigi Antonini and Vanni Montana, who are here today, members of a major American trade union—the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and the United Italian-American Labor Council—generously made possible the formation of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute. Some of these Americans had, themselves, known deprivation and discouragement. In America these Sicilians together with other Italians had struggled and succeeded, first in creating a strong and democratic trade union, and then they also played a significant role in defending American and Italian liberties. This was during the dark days of World War II when the poor and oppressed all over the world listened to a message of hope, and admired the courage of the man who gave his name to your school—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. When they came back here after the war, Luigi Antonini and his friends saw the great suffering, but looked also to the future, and decided to develop here in Palermo in collaboration with the Italian Government a living monument—this Institute—expressing the ideas of freedom, liberty, democracy, and of personal responsibility on which democracy is based. I have been able to observe how the Institute nurtures these ideals by ensuring their daily expression in the activities of the school. For some years the Institute, ably presided over by Mrs. Rina Buzozzi, has been assisting approximately 250 students each year, training them in several skills so that on completion of their stay here they are prepared to seek work in the fields of mechanics and welding and other skilled crafts.

I have so far been speaking about your school. Now let me speak about you, students of this Institute, directly to you. Here on this platform are the men, particularly Luigi Antonini, who helped found your school. When they did this they thought of you, the students. When they come back again and again it is not to look at the buildings, but it is to see you. They are interested in you. Although usually away from here, living and working in New York, they are thinking of you and hoping that each and every one of you will grow up to find good jobs, friends, and to have a happy and useful life after leaving the Institute.

The two American presidents—Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy—whom you honor at this school—are good examples of how an individual can overcome adversity. They struggled and persisted, when it would have been easier to give up, to give up hope and give up trying. I think the example of these two presidents who did not give up hope and who kept on trying is an example for you. It can be an example to encourage you never to give up hope, always to persist. Thus, like Roosevelt and like Kennedy, you will become excellent workers, fine citizens, and a source of strength for your country and for the free world, and you will contribute your strength and skill to the new Sicily.

IN PRAISE OF THE SMITHSONIAN JULY FOURTH FOLK FESTIVAL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from California [Mr. REES] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, during the Fourth of July festivities something unique in Washington history occurred on the Capitol Mall. For the first time, thousands of people, over 430,000, experienced a live museum which exhibited the art of American folklife—and they loved every toe-tapping minute. From July 1 to July 4 visitors to the Mall were exposed to almost all segments of American folklife.

On July 1 such groups as the Galax Mountain String Band of Galax, Va.; the Blue Ridge Mountain Dancers of Asheville, N.C., the national championship folk dance group; and the Washington Scottish Pipe Band of the District of Columbia delighted the large audiences, while many visitors actually square-danced to the call of Maurice Flowers of Baltimore. The wonderful thing about it all is that Americans were participating in what was purely their own culture, as relatively new as it may be, as relatively long as it has been forgotten by subsequent generations.

Represented on the 2d of July was the type of music most uniquely American and most popular throughout the world, jazz. Born in the golden years of the 1920's in the southern region of our Nation, jazz immediately saturated the souls of millions. Although it has reached a more "sophisticated" stage in recent years, the original style as played by the original stylists was exhibited on the Mall. Billie and DeDe Pierce's renowned Dixieland group, the Preservation Hall Jazz Band of New Orleans, highlighted the July 2 program. From northern Mississippi came Ed Young and the Afro-American Fife and Drum Band.

Also on the day and night of July 2, the international influence on our folklife came to light with such groups as the Galician Pipe Band, Los Gallegos d'Espana; the Yomo Toro Puerto Rican Band; and the Turkish Sax Band, all of New York City. Further representing northern folklife were the Glinka Dancers of New York City.

On the 3d of July the "original" settlers of this multinational nation were represented by the Mesquakie Indian Dancers of Tama, Iowa, and the King Island Eskimo Dancers of Nome, Alaska. Bands utilizing instruments seen before only in museums exhibited their talents on that day also. For example, from Houston, Tex., came the Texas Bohemian Hammered Dulcimer Band, from New York the Irish Ceilidhe Band, and from Basile, La., the Cajun Band. Not forgetting our own District of Columbia, the Chinese Orchestra and Dragon Dancer of the District of Columbia showed its own example of American folklife. Rounding out the program were singers in the original folk style such as Libba Cotton, Mike Seeger, and the McGhee Brothers of West Virginia.

The festivities closed to a traditional Fourth of July concert in the evening.

The men most responsible for originating the program were Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and Mr. James Morris, assistant to Dr. Ripley, who brought forth most of the participants. Basket weavers, pottery makers, woodworkers, carvers, doll makers, needleworkers, tale tellers, boat builders, and the above folk singers, dancers, and musicians from all over the country were brought to remind Americans of their heritage—still a living part of our Nation. In this day of the frug and jerk Americans need to be shown what their own culture has produced and continues to produce.

My family and I found the entire festival both enlightening and educational, and I hope to see it again next year when we may have an even bigger and better all-American Fourth of July Festival.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week, Captive Nations Week, is being observed by citizens in all sections of the country.

One of the highlights of this ninth observance is the theme for a general and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R. As a matter of fact, in the whole history of the U.S.S.R. since its founding in 1922-23, there has never been a thorough examination by any governmental body in the free world of this colossus in the East.

I believe the time is now ripe for congressional hearings on this subject, particularly in view of Russia's bloody hand in the Middle East, not to speak of Vietnam, Cuba, and then the whole list of experiences on the part of the captive nations.

With permission, I wish to include below an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, entitled "Review of U.S. Policy Toward the U.S.S.R.":

REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R.:
A MAJOR THEME FOR THE 1967 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

During the period of July 16-22 millions of Americans will again observe in one form or another the annual Captive Nations Week. As in the past few years, they will be joined by increasing numbers of peoples in other lands—in Asia, Latin America, Western Europe, and Africa—where the annual observance has also taken root. Developed into a vital tradition since its inception in 1959, Captive Nations Week is entering into its ninth year of observance, and each year has exceeded in breadth and depth all preceding years.¹ The full spectrum of the 1966 observance, here and abroad, is well described in book form, and thousands of copies have al-

ready entered into circulation both nationally and internationally.²

AMERICA'S BREED OF PAVLOVIAN DOGS

Captive Nations Week has from the start proven to be a national forum for the discussion and evaluation of U.S. foreign policy, current trends in Cold War developments, and forecasts of Red strategy and tactics in the immediate future. It has become the midway point in any calendar year for the crystallization of thought and action bearing on the Red Empire and its dozens of captive nations. Moscow and its syndicated associates make no bones about their aim to have the Week eliminated, and in our country several circles have responded to Pavlov's bell, salivating with the same desire in behalf of what they call "detente," "peaceful coexistence," "easing of tensions," "relaxation" and other strikingly appropriate physio-psychological terms for the Pavlovian experience. Few will forget *Izvestia's* compliments to the editor of *The Washington Post* for his salivated response, which it characterized as a "realistic understanding of the matter" and then poured on the following for nuclearizing effect: "in a situation where the relation of power has shifted to the side of Socialism, the U.S. cannot force the peoples of the Socialist countries to adopt its standards without risking the holocaust of a world war. How long do the Capitol and the White House intend to amuse the world with their absurd plans?"³ And the dog is supposed to rest euphorically until the bell rings again.

As in many other spheres of Cold War activity, the Red attempt to cultivate the breed of Pavlovian dogs with regard to Captive Nations Week is persistent and, in individual cases, successful. In 1966, for example, Radio Riga blurted out, "We recall a meeting with Shabad, a correspondent of *The New York Times*, after the 25th anniversary of Soviet Latvia. He said he had never written about any such 'Week' and would not do it in the future because it was all lies."⁴ Interestingly enough, this controlled propaganda agency hammered away at the Week on six occasions. Here are a couple of samples: "The announcement that the so-called Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed, reaches us from the USA like a demagogical ghost . . . It cannot be fully ignored because such manifestations have become an important part of US political attitude (July 17, 1966). Three days later—"These miserable 'Captive Weeks,' proclaimed officially by Washington, serve not only the purpose of the cold war. The USA is endeavoring to pose, by this means, as a guardian of freedom and right, at a time when she conducts a sanguinary war against the Vietnamese people." Were he alive, Ivan Petrovich Pavlov, the famous Russian physiologist, would be aghast at the psycho-political applications of his theories on conditioned reflexes.

Especially illuminating is the fact that last year Moscow itself changed gears in radical departure as concerns its attitude toward the Week. After seven years of tirades and vehement denunciations it decided to try the technique of mute silence. This stance contrasted sharply with the past and particularly with Suslov's 1965 blast, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of the nations that have escaped from their yoke." Undoubtedly, by the silent technique the boys in *Agitprop* hoped to minimize the impact of the Week and at

the same time further their pretensions of peaceableness and conversion to "good and soft communism." They left the denunciatory task to puppets and subsidiaries, instead. For example, a Red periodical sought to tie the captive nations issue with anti-Semitism, referring to "criminals" who "are active in the organizations of the so-called 'captive nations' . . . have their own press and conduct war-inciting activities through demonstrations, picket lines, etc."⁵ The Reds are apparently concerned that the "captive nations" organizations are often connected with similar organizations in other countries in Europe and Latin America.⁶

If one bothers to scan the book on Captive Nations Week mentioned earlier, he cannot but be impressed by the fact that the spiritual communion extends to all continents of the world. In 1966, for instance, President J. Onganía of Argentina joined the many Chiefs of State in issuing a Captive Nations Week proclamation, urging government institutions and the people to mark the week by appropriate observance. Similar proclamations were issued by Argentine mayors, such as Mayor J. Schettini of Buenos Aires, and Cardinal A. Caggiano devoted a special solemn Mass for the captive nations in the Cathedral of that city. For the first time, too, Australia launched the observance, with Minister V. Meckman and others participating in rallies in Melbourne and elsewhere. Much to Moscow's chagrin, no doubt, the truths about the captive nations in the face of all the alleged "tremendous changes" in the Red Empire will not be allowed to be brushed under the rug of diplomatic expediency and make-believe.

The Week has also served the very important purpose of highlighting the numerous myths a number of Americans have been pavlovized into. For one, not a year goes by without the need for impressing upon our people the nonsensical conceptions still nurtured by many as to the nature and composition of the Soviet Union. Here is an outstanding example of misguided notions commercialized into the millions: "Geographically the largest single nation in the world, the land traditionally known as Russia sprawls across one-seventh of the earth's surface. . . After the U.S. this once-backward nation now produces more steel, oil, electric power, aluminum and cement than any other country. In 1949 the USSR became the second nation to produce an atom bomb. . ."⁷ In rudimentary fact, neither the Czarist Russian Empire—the so-called traditionally known Russia—nor the USSR has ever been a "nation," and the present empire's economic advances rest on broad foundations of Russian imperio-colonialist exploitation of over a dozen captive non-Russian nations and countries in the USSR, but one couldn't know these fundamental facts from this superficial, commercialized effort to "inform" the American reader. The untiring dispenser of Kennan's Fables spreads similar nonsense in garbled, sophisticated style, but fortunately few legislators are taken in by his involute language and weak judgments, notwithstanding the mass of conceptual confusion that underlies them.⁸ It is a pity, indeed, that through the club alliance in the Department of State the case of Svetlana Stalina was initially entrusted to the dispenser's care, but despite the fears of the club the situation can be properly sanitized by several Congressional

⁵ Chalm Suller. "Anti-Semitism In The USA," *Political Affairs*, Fall Issue, 1966, p. 26.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁷ The Editors of *Life*. *Handbook of the Nations and International Organizations*, Life World Library, New York, 1966, p. 14.

⁸ "Kennan's Version of Why Communist World Is Split," *The Sunday Star*, Washington, D.C., February 5, 1967, p. C-3.

¹ For a capsule account see author's article, "Forget The Captive Nations?," *Washington Report*, American Security Council, July 18, 1966.

² *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope*. National Captive Nations Committee, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, Washington, D.C. pp. 310.

³ *Izvestia*, Moscow, July 15, 1964.

⁴ Radio Riga, Latvian S.S.R., July 23, 1966.

hearings.⁹ A vaunted "Russian expert" is scarcely a competent analyst of one who can be tested on her Georgian background.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CURRENT ILLUSION

In the course of the 1967 Captive Nations Week several other myths, dominant wishful thoughts, and glaring omissions of thought will doubtlessly be underscored. One, of course, is the myth that the so-called satellites in Central Europe are progressing toward "independence." For a striking expression of this myth, read this: "With the exception of East Germany, Russia has no more satellites, in the sense the term was used for so long. Rumania has defied her, as did Yugoslavia and Albania years ago. Czechoslovakia has proposed Eastern European military arrangements that exclude the Soviet Union. To keep her troops in Europe, Russia has been forced to negotiate status-of-forces agreements, not unlike the ones we have around the world. Where she used to be able to commandeer the production of Eastern Europe for her own use, Russia now sends her raw materials to Hungary and Czechoslovakia and Poland, to supply their growing industries."¹⁰

Little has it occurred to the Senator grasping at these minor, accidental changes that each of these parts of the Red Empire is ultimately dependent for its survival under a Red regime upon the strength and power of the USSR. Also, the points he raises are given to other more accurate interpretations. The Rumanian contingent of the syndicate, for example, has defied the northern industrial sphere of captive Central Europe rather than what he calls "Russia." In short, there is no shred of substantial evidence that supports this convenient myth and, if as a case in point, the Senator wants to learn about Poland, he would do well to read the excellent summary on developments there as provided by one legislator who states, "Independence and liberalism in Soviet satellites—if Poland is typical of them—are myths."¹¹ Needless to say, as concerns the captive nations, the peoples themselves, nothing the Senator has said alters, or will alter, their basic state of captivity under the reign of the interlocking, though sometimes squabbling, Red syndicate.

Concerning Vietnam, those who have participated in the Captive Nations Week observances have consistently upheld President Johnson's actions in that heated arena of the Cold War. Criticisms have been directed, however, at the scope of his policy there and the implementation of our measures. Vietnam is a sterling example of our unpreparedness in the Cold War—too little and too late, followed as usual by desperate, last-minute recourse to military arms. At present, our situation there has assumed scandalous proportions, and when we are told that we can look forward to a long, drawn-out struggle, this is really the measure of the price facing us for our Cold War negligence in the past, from 1954 on.

The plight of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese will again be highlighted. It is strange, indeed, that few of our leaders ever discuss this troublesome subject. Yet it is crucial to our winning the war in South Vietnam. Canada's diplomat and former representative on the International Control Commission for Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, Theodore B. Blockley, has significantly pointed out, "Many of the North Vietnamese whom I met expressed the hope that one day

the Americans would 'again' liberate them from tyranny and oppression. The previous liberation, in their minds, was from the Japanese."¹² Characterizing the ICC as not only impotent but a "fraud," the Canadian diplomat has revealed how thousands of North Vietnamese had stormed the Canadian delegation's office in the mistaken belief that exit visas could be obtained. Lagging miserably in ways and means of psycho-political warfare, we haven't even begun to scratch the potentialities of the captive North Vietnamese in the war with totalitarian Hanoi, and this largely with free Vietnamese and Korean means in the spirit of "Asia For Free Asians."

Another chief theme of the 1967 Captive Nations Week observance is the fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. Moscow and its associates are planning a tremendous propaganda show this coming November, celebrating the 50th anniversary of this tragic event. Though scarcely any Western journalist or commentator surmised it, even the designation of the new USSR spaceship—"Soyuz"—is symbolically tied up with the forthcoming propaganda show. The emphasis on the "union" of the USSR will be in the forefront to conceal the captivity and exploitation of the numerous non-Russian nations in that artificial state. The sharp contrast these past 50 years between expansive Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, particularly in the USSR, and the almost complete decolonization process in the Free World should be of basic educational worth to our citizenry.

For those under the powerful Pavlovian influence there will also be the need to stress the anti-anticommunist drive of the Red Syndicate, the deepening reality of the Cold War, and Red economic strategy in the whole East-West trade issue. Those who wishfully think that concepts of captive nations, Red Empire, communist conspiracy and so forth are rigid and deep-frozen representations of thought should begin familiarizing themselves with Red literature. Actually, such people are mental throw-backs to the mid-30s and appetizing meat for the Pavlovian exercise. To mention only one, Moscow's *International Affairs* is replete with articles on exploiting "intellectuals," non-Communists, and liberals in the West for the destruction of anti-Communism. The same applies to those who through conditioned reflexes are under the illusion that the Cold War has ended or is on the verge of ending. The illusion itself is a prime product of Moscow's Cold War management, and this at a time when we are deeply steeped in a heated sector of the Cold War, namely Vietnam itself. Last September, *Pravda* summed up the matter this way: "The ways and methods of revolution embrace the whole arsenal of methods in the class struggle . . . including armed struggle." By class struggle is meant divide and conquer in behalf of ultimate Soviet Russian imperio-colonialist power, and the struggle proliferates with varying intensity on every continent, including our own country.

To facilitate Moscow's world-wide Cold War operations, especially in Vietnam, by liberalizing our trade with its empire borders on psycho-political lunacy. The present drive for such liberalization is also a shining example of our Cold War ineptitude, and in the end will result in desperate measures of military intervention, as seen in Vietnam. The matter of trade was brought up time and time again in the fight over the Senate's ratification of the US-USSR Consular Convention, which was the first part of a package deal that spells only a series of American Cold War blunders and losses. It is regrettable that Senator Dirksen, who could have won great distinction in blocking the ratifi-

cation, now thinks the USSR has made "a new ball game" for the East-West trade issue by signing a pact in March with Red China to step up the flow of war materials to North Vietnam.¹³ No, the ball game still is the old one, and it was best shown during the hearings on the Consular Treaty. That episode alone should convince us of the dire need for a full review now of US policy toward the USSR, rather than for us to bounce haphazardly from issue to issue as the winds blow tactically from the East.

PARAMOUNT SYMBOL OF U.S. POLITICO-CULTURAL LAG

To appreciate how much narrow domestic politics and pressure were exerted on this basic Consular Treaty issue, we can start with the concerned declamations of a lady Senator who changed her mind at the last capricious moment. Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine solemnly declared, "I find it difficult to rationalize making a consular treaty with a nation that is helping the enemy kill American service personnel. This situation is completely contrary to the alleged treaty goal of the development of more friendly relations between the United States and Russia."

Concise and taken alone, this statement points to the three essential aspects of the controversy that had significantly surrounded the issue of the U.S. Senate's ratification of the treaty. These basic aspects are: the poor timing for the treaty's ratification, the acute doubtfulness of its advancing "more friendly relations," and the flagrant misconceptions (e.g., USSR is "Russia") justifying the pressing need for a full and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the USSR.

The treaty could not have been pushed for ratification at a worse conceivable time. Signed on June 1, 1964, the convention had not been put to the test of popular interest and criticism until the summer of 1965 when an attempt was made to railroad it through the Senate for ratification. The attempt failed, but was repeated this past January, only to fall again as increasing numbers of Americans, concerned with the USSR's heavy support of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, demanded at least open hearings on the treaty. The situation in Vietnam was radically different in 1964 than it is now. Americans weren't being killed daily by Russian and other communist arms as they have been in mounting numbers since 1965. In March of this year about 100,000 tons of war supplies were shipped into Haiphong, the chief port of North Vietnam, by Red ships from the USSR and the so-called "independent" satellites of Central Europe.

In contemporary circumstances it was not only difficult, as Senator Smith said, to rationalize Senate consent of this treaty, but it was also irrational to accept a pact which by substantive analysis would guarantee a clear, net psycho-political advantage to our prime enemy in Vietnam. The war in Vietnam would not last long if Moscow and its Red associates in Eastern Europe were, in the interest of genuine peace, to cut off their flow of critical war supplies to Hanoi. In this ultimate sense of sustaining power in the war, Moscow, rather than Hanoi, is our chief enemy in Vietnam. Well over 80 percent of the high-powered items used by the North Vietnamese totalitarians is furnished by Moscow. Even now, long-range Russian weapons, the 140-mm. rockets have been provided the Viet Cong to intensify the decimation of American lives.

"Subtle" rationalization in support of the treaty and the next step, liberalized trade with the USSR, had gone so far in Washington that it is being argued, "It is not to American advantage to have the flow of Rus-

⁹ For a timed and planted article see Murray Marder, "U.S. Fears Svetlana Hill 'Circus,'" *The Washington Post*, April 23, 1967.

¹⁰ Senator Edward M. Kennedy, "Europe And The Next Generation," *Congressional Record*, April 21, 1967, page 10467.

¹¹ Congressman Paul Findley, "Poland: The Myth of the Independent Satellite," *Congressional Record*, January 31, 1967, page 2108.

¹² Associated Press, New York, February 6, 1967.

¹³ See on pact Karl E. Meyer, "Hanoi's Move In Sino-Soviet Pact Is Cited," *The Washington Post*, April 20, 1967.

sian aid to Hanoi reduced."¹⁴ The twisted logic of this position is that Hanoi's greater dependence on USSR support as against Red Chinese aid would enable Moscow to influence its compatriot aggressors into peace negotiations. It is small wonder that letters to Senators from citizens across the nation, many of them with loved ones in the war, have ranged in the ratio of 200 to 1 against a treaty with the prime enemy. Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois, who was elected to represent his alert constituents, actually boasted of defying a ratio of 7,000 to 46 in opposition to the pact.¹⁵ Despite the feelings of many Republicans in the House of Representatives, this and similar actions in the Senate killed the possibility of making this episode an issue for Republicans in the 1968 Presidential election.¹⁶ Only a 3rd Party candidate can make it a live issue.

Following the open, public hearings on the Consular Treaty, an obviously less "subtle" but further rationalization for Senate consent was the CIA's great desire to have the pact ratified. The new pitch to undecided Senators was the opportunity the treaty would provide for broadened CIA operations in the USSR. This so-called "confidential matter" changed the minds of several legislators as well as a few national leaders who had been previously against ratification. The rationalization only demonstrated how few really had bothered to seek convincing answers to poignant questions and points raised during the public hearings. Of course, a number were motivated to favor the treaty by political considerations far remote from its substantive contents, as next year's presidential elections, the open housing amendment, internal Party problems and the like.

The February hearings on the treaty established three general facts which should serve as solid lessons for America's alert citizenry in the future. As shown in the proceedings of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, the three facts are: (1) the clear inability of the treaty's proponents to meet the most fundamental points of criticism against its ratification, (2) a patent lack of awareness concerning the psycho-political ramifications of the pact, and (3) as indicated by outmoded preconceptions used, a deficient and stumbling understanding of the Soviet Union itself, which, behind the facade of "peaceful coexistence" is not only our prime enemy in Vietnam but also the chief instigator of anti-American attitudes and activity in Western Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.¹⁷ These easily substantiated facts cast grave doubts on the objective of "more friendly relations" that the treaty is supposed to advance.

One major objection is that the treaty is superfluous and represents a sham performance of improving relations with the Soviet Union. It is part of the present concocted make-believe in detenting the USSR. The objection is firmly based on the Roosevelt-Litvinov exchanges of 1933 that established diplomatic relations between the United States and the USSR. Aside from adventitious references made to a proposed consular convention then and an exemplifying German-USSR Agreement of 1925, Litvinov expressly agreed to the protection of American citizens touring or residing in the USSR in a November 16, 1933 communication. It reads: "Further-

more, I desire to state that such rights will be granted to American nationals immediately upon the establishment of relations between our two countries."

Predicated on the establishment of simple relations, this agreement was never legally abrogated and thus, in international law, has remained in force to the present day. Supreme Court decisions, such as U.S. vs. Belmont in 1937 and U.S. vs. Pink in 1942, as well as a case in New York, are founded on the exchanges. The so-called Russian concession on notification and access in the present treaty is really no concession at all. This right should have been demanded long ago on the basis of the '33 agreements. When this vital point was brought up in the hearings, the chairman, Senator J. W. Fulbright, rightly admitted—for the record shows it—that the State Department was never challenged on this. And this after two years of concern with the treaty! Yet, following the hearings the State Department minced the truth in response to the Committee's inquiry when it predicated the whole Litvinov exchange and declaration of protection on the German-USSR Agreement of 1925.¹⁸ It is amazing that no one in the Senate challenged this stratagem.

Another important legal objection is based on the misrepresentations in the treaty itself, which are clearly indicative of the askewed preconceptions dominating our officials who framed the pact. The treaty is replete with the notion of a "Soviet national," "a national of the sending state," "the national flag of the sending state," and "the national coat-of-arms of the sending state." Even on the basis of the USSR Constitution, not to mention rudimentary political realities in the USSR, there is no such political animal in existence as a "Soviet national," nor are there such objects in existence as a "national flag" or a "national coat-of-arms" of the USSR. These concepts are applicable to the United States, which is a nation-state, but they are myths as concerns the USSR, which is an empire-state made up of numerous, different national republics.

In a court of law, a contract of this sort, dealing in part with mythical objects, would be thrown out for its crass misrepresentations. But worse still, from a psycho-political point of view, Moscow surely must gloat over the unbridged gap of understanding shown by our professed bridge-builders with regard to the many non-Russian nations in the USSR. On the one hand, it naturally welcomes this treaty and its fantastic conceptual contents, for by all evidence the treaty is essentially a diplomatic affirmation of Moscow's imperium in imperio, the Soviet Union itself; on the other hand, it will unquestionably use the treaty in its dealings with the non-Russian nations as prime evidence of the fact that they have little to look forward to from a country that in one breath speaks of "friendship with all peoples" and in the next doesn't even recognize their distinctive national identities, which Moscow at least nominally does.

Aggravating all this further is the branch principle of consularism, the instrument that supposedly attests to the "national" integrity of the USSR. Regardless of the specious distinction made between the treaty as a body of guidelines and subsequent negotiations on consulate locations, the very proffer of this principle in regard to the multinational USSR reduces the non-Russian republics in that state to a territorial expression of "Russia," negates their distinctive national identities and sovereign popular wills, and creates an additional legal mess where in the United Nations our representatives recognize both *de jure* and *de facto* two original, sovereign Charter mem-

bers, Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia. Again, on this point the State Department played on the weakness of many a Senator with a high-pressure memorandum that blatantly raised the question "Does the Convention prejudice the position of subject peoples incorporated against their will into the Soviet Union?" and then glibly answered it, "No, it does not."¹⁹

Plainly, if more windows are desired in "Russia," if mutual understanding toward all peoples were a sincere objective, and if we had the foresight to avoid these and other psycho-political disadvantages of the treaty, we would wisely consider the realistic alternative of setting up embassies in Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Kazakh Turkistan. This is accommodated by Article 18a of the USSR constitution. It would also be a real test of Moscow's desire for peaceful relations. Moreover, on a reciprocal basis with their embassies in Washington, we would be able to cover their espionage and subversive political activity far more effectively than with "Russian" consulates in Chicago and other cities. It is noteworthy that the State Department has consistently opposed the far more advantageous embassy idea because of the presence of more communists here; yet, with the consulate idea, it would allow for more of them in more vulnerable areas of the country.

Significantly, none of these points and criticisms were challenged by the treaty's proponents. The amateur show staged by Senators Morton and Percy avoided these points entirely, confused "Russia" and the USSR with "the Soviets" throughout, and came up with some fantastic interpretations as, for example, Latin American states won't follow us because they haven't in the past, not recognizing that Moscow just began to exert pressure there in a major way in the past ten years.²⁰ Neither have they or other proponents answered the additional criticism bearing on the real protection of Americans traveling in the USSR. Superficially bandying about the 20,000 figure of Americans touring the USSR annually and the 250 "Soviet nationals" here measures neither the relative intelligence worth of the projected ratio nor the scope of the hoped-for protection. With greater freedom of movement here the specially assigned 250 may in these terms be equivalent or exceed in value the 20,000 there, most of them given to typical American tourism and guided, of course, by overseeing Intourist. Furthermore, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the treaty's notification and access provision is no guarantee whatsoever against the continuation of arbitrary arrests of American nationals who, if they are important enough to Moscow, can easily be brainwashed in the span of three days. As in the recent Kazan-Komarek case, such Americans can be arrested and held incommunicado by the Russians indirectly on the terrain of their outer empire, in Poland or Czecho-Slovakia. It is noteworthy that almost immediately after the Senate's inept ratification the State Department released a brochure warning Americans, in effect, that travel in the USSR is at their own risk.²¹

The espionage and subversion disadvantages of the treaty were also not met with adequate explanation. The shell game of manipulating the 15 or 20 figure of Russian consular personnel expected here conceals the net disadvantage we face because of several reasons. One is that well spy-trained Russians would enjoy a larger pond to fish in

¹⁴ *The Christian Science Monitor*, February 23, 1967.

¹⁵ "Consular Pact Passes 1st Test," *The Evening Star*, March 10, 1967, p. A-5.

¹⁶ Rep. John M. Ashbrook, "The Consular Convention With The Soviet Union—An Issue For the 1968 Presidential Campaign," *The Congressional Record*, January 26, 1967, page 1775.

¹⁷ *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*. Hearings, Committee On Foreign Relations, United States Senate, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1967.

¹⁸ See *Congressional Record*, March 10, 1967, page 6269.

¹⁹ "US-USSR Consular Convention, Questions and Answers," Department of State, February 6, 1967, p. 7.

²⁰ *Congressional Record*, March 9, 1967, pages 5992-5996.

²¹ Hon. John R. Rarick, "Traveling to Communist Russia?", *Daily Congressional Record*, April 10, 1967, p. A1676-77.

here than we there. Second, the efficiency of their spy effectiveness is generally conceded to be greater. Third, a point which was completely overlooked though it is already well founded in this country, the Russians will have expanded opportunities for coercion, blackmail of U.S. citizens with relatives in the USSR, bribery, and sundry subversive tactics directed against ethnic groups; and this with unprecedented diplomatic immunity covering felonies such as murder and kidnapping. It doesn't require much imagination to see how little or no reciprocity there exists in this for us.

No reply could be found for the additional criticism that the treaty opens up a Pandora's box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. With the supposed leader of the Free World extending this benefit to the rules of the Kremlin, what Latin American government could refuse their request for a similar convention. Beginning with 15 or 20 here we may well end up with several hundred additional Russian operatives in the hemisphere, cloaked with diplomatic immunity and at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion south of the border. The Morton reply mentioned above is about as lame as one would expect, for we're in the 60's not the 30's.

Finally, Secretary of State Rusk was honest to point out that one objective for the treaty's ratification is its contribution to "increasing trade between our two countries." This is just the first step, a part of a large package. Piercing the vagaries and slogans of "normalizing relations," "advancing peace," "improving communications" and so forth, an internal analysis of the treaty results in a grave, disadvantage for us. It will even be graver if our citizens permit the next part of the package deal to be handled as in slipshod a manner as the first one was. For, on trade, we will only be repeating our tragic economic errors of the 20's and 30's in regard to the USSR. Flushed with a supposed victory on ratification, Senator Morton is talking antiquated nonsense when he states, "There are strong indications that a new era is beginning for the peoples of Russia and Eastern Europe. It is in our national interest that we make sure that American ideas and skill become a part of that changing world."²² He reveals not only his complete ignorance of the Cold War but also of the record of US trade with totalitarian powers.

Enough has been shown here to indicate the glaring politico-cultural lag existing in our country with regard to the USSR. It is almost like an ineradicable blind-spot for some legislators and others alike. However, the matter of accommodating Russian consulates in this country still is not resolved. Proponents of the treaty repeated ad nauseum the point that ratification of the treaty does not necessarily mean the establishment of Russian consulates here, which is a subject for further negotiations. Also, in rationalizing his switch Senator Dirksen stressed emphatically that the "treaty would not enable the Soviet Union to establish a consulate in Chicago or any other city."²³ Not only this, but the citizenry was informed that Dirksen "was assured by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that 'appropriate Congressional Committees' would be consulted before a U.S. consulate was established in Russia as well as clearance with community official before a Soviet consulate could be located in this country."²⁴ This agreement opens up a whole new area on the issue, and Mayor Daley of Chicago has already declared that his city wants no Rus-

sian consulate. As we approach Captive Nations Week, pressure is building up to have other Mayors of our port-cities declare themselves along the same lines. It will be interesting to see what counter-pressure will be brought to bear to overcome the agreement.

TIME FOR REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE USSR

The hearings on the Consular Convention have shown beyond question of doubt our pressing need for a full and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the USSR. On the scale of politico-diplomatic calculation the treaty definitely does not rest on a quid pro quo basis; the net disadvantage is ours. What makes the situation worse is that we, rather than the Russians, have pressed for it; and though the President could initiate negotiations for consulates without a treaty, it has been felt that at least the Senate should assume part of this responsibility. But the treaty is a vestigial remain of the 30's when our knowledge of "Russia" and its global ambitions and operations was quite wanting. Judging by the preconceptions and concepts displayed in the hearings, there still is the want, but will the need for such a review be recognized?

Never in our history has such a review been undertaken to eliminate the conceptual cobwebs which misdirect us into net disadvantageous positions. In part, Senator Roman Hruska has sensed this need in stating that this treaty and other measures "are going to affect the basic philosophy of our relations with the Communist countries." There can be no better time than now to do what we have never done before but should have done long ago.

The author offers a proposed resolution which, in content, can be easily documented and substantiated on the basis of the misconceptions and contradictions to facts uttered by our foremost leaders in the past twenty years, exclusively in relation to the Soviet Union. We rightly pride ourselves in this country on seizing upon the innovative, the new, and the changing. It will be interesting to see whether, with courage and foresight, we can bring into full public view and for unprecedented examination and assessment our policy toward the USSR. The proposed measure reads as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R.

"Providing for a thorough review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R.

"Whereas in his 1967 State of the Union Message the President declared 'the genius of the American political system has always been expressed through creative debate that offers reasonable alternatives'; and

"Whereas U.S. policy toward the USSR is most crucial to the issue of global peace or war, and the cumulative evidence of the past two decades, including Greece, Iran, Korea, Cuba, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam, casts a reasonable and heavy doubt on the peace-insuring efficacy of the pursued policy; and

"Whereas there has never been a thorough Congressional review of our policy toward the USSR, even at levels below another Great Debate, examining and illuminating questionable preconceptions, arrant conceptual confusions, contradictions to fact and principle, and high-level counter-contradictions that have surrounded this policy; and

"Whereas proposed particular measures, such as the U.S.-USSR Consular Convention, U.S.-Soviet trade, cultural exchange agreements, etc., depend for their accurate and proper evaluation on the soundness or not of the underlying assumptions and criteria in the general policy; and

"Whereas these assumptions and criteria have been too frequently conveyed by official assertions that are patently contrary to fact and/or principle, and especially at this

time deserve to be openly and thoroughly examined; and

"Whereas, to cite one example, on the highest level an old, imperial Czarist Russian usage, albeit fictional to present conditions, has been revived in the thought 'The common interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many'; and

"Whereas, by way of further example, the notion expressed by one of our Presidents, 'no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russian suffered in the course of the Second World War,' contradicts the facts that the ravaged territories in the USSR were largely non-Russian and the losses of Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Armenians and other non-Russian nationals were equal if not greater; and

"Whereas, in additional contradiction to fact, more than one national leader has voiced the mythical constructions of "200 million Russians" in existence and the USSR as 'Russia'; and

"Whereas, to mention another apt example, a high-level conception misjudges 'areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia' as constituting 'traditional parts of the Soviet Union . . . an historical state,' which factually has been in existence for only forty-five years; and

"Whereas, in sharp contradiction to this quoted misconception, an outstanding official U.S. statement in the United Nations emphasizes: 'An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917' and later 'with the help of the Red Army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the USSR'; also, 'In 1920, the Soviet army invaded, and Armenian independence, so long awaited, was snuffed out'; also, 'In 1921, the Red Army came to the aid of Communists rebelling against the independent State of Georgia and installed a Soviet regime'; and

"Whereas these selected examples of basic confusion, contradictions of reality, and official counter-contradictions are compounded by growing doubts related to operating principles, double-standards, and policy inconsistencies, even at a time when the USSR and its syndicated Red associates supply the totalitarian Red regime in North Vietnam to kill increasing numbers of American defenders of independent South Vietnam; and

"Whereas, on the basis of these and numerous other points of evidence, it is not inconceivable that the forthcoming 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which gave rise to Soviet Russian imperialism and its world-wide aggressive ambitions, might elicit in 'the spirit of peaceful coexistence' harmful expressions virtually equating this fraudulent revolution with our own American Revolution and its symbolization of national independence, individual liberty, and freedom; and

"Whereas a genuine policy of peaceful coexistence means progressive reciprocity, substantial reduction of barriers year by year, the absence of controlled movements, an intensified understanding between nations in the USSR and the United States, and surcease from indirect provocation in other parts of the Free World, none of which has been realized in the past decade; and

"Whereas a policy founded on basic misconceptions, myths, and internal contradictions generates a grand illusion which in the long run can only lead to disastrous results for our independence and national security and certainly, in the short run and with reference to the nations in the USSR fails to validate the President's declaration in his 1966 State of the Union Message: 'The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions . . . We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule: Now, therefore, be it

²² "Morton Asks Widening of Red Contacts," *The Washington Post*, April 4, 1967.

²³ "Consul Pact Will Not Aid Spies: Dirksen," *Chicago Tribune*, February 20, 1967.

²⁴ "Dirksen Says GOP To Back Consul Pact," *The Washington Post*, March 1, 1967.

"Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America (or the House of Representatives) in Congress assembled. That a complete and thorough review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R. be undertaken. The review shall be conducted by means of public hearings, designated studies relevant to all essential aspects of the subject, and scheduled symposia consisting of Members of the Senate (the House), representatives of interested areas in our Government, and invited participants from the private sector of our society. The results of this comprehensive review will be made available by publication and other media to the American public. On the basis of the results the Senate (the House) shall determine what 'reasonable alternatives' exist to our present policy toward the USSR."

In the midst of many foolish notions being expressed almost daily with reference to our commitment in Vietnam and the obvious inconsistency, nay irrationality, of policies pursued by the Administration in relation to different but inseparable sectors of the Red Empire, the American people, who in the last resort are called upon to sustain the price of policy misjudgments, are at least entitled to this kind of review—a truly first Great Debate on U.S. policy toward the USSR. Will courage, foresight, and open-mindedness prevail? This is the question for Captive Nations Week, 1967—or are we content to pursue make-believe measures based on crass misconceptions, Pavlovianized reactions, and insular political considerations?

LET THE HOUSE BE TRUE TO ITSELF

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted yesterday in opposition to the so-called anti-riot bill, not because I favor riots but because I consider this a totally ineffective means of preventing them.

I respect the views of my colleagues who look upon this as a way of protecting the public, but I believe they are wrong. I believe passage of such a bill as this is far more likely to incite riots than to prevent them.

As my colleagues well know, I do not relish the role of the dissenter, the last-ditch saviour of an ill-defined and mismanaged cause. But I do hold a higher view of the responsibility and character of the House than is reflected in this bill.

I am told that the House could afford to pass this bill because the Senate will save us from ourselves. We can wave a few flags, wrap ourselves in some bunting, and tell the folks at home we have done something to save them from civil disobedience—all the while recognizing that this is a useless, if not mischievous, bill that would do none of the things we claim for it. Mr. Speaker, this is not the kind of House of Representatives the American people want. This is not the kind of leadership that is expected of us. This is not the greatness that I know my colleagues are capable of.

History shows that great men and great public bodies achieved their greatness, not through acquiescence to the status quo or through "going along" with established patterns of sham and

deceit but through adopting for themselves goals and ideals of a higher nature. When good traffics with evil, evil always wins. When wise men give lip service to principles in which they do not believe, they minimize themselves and glorify error. I do not see my colleagues here or this great House of Representatives as followers of such a tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I most certainly do not want the House of Representatives to be the kind of body that has to be saved from itself. It is demeaning to suggest that a Member can afford to vote against his best judgment and highest principles on a bill like this because the other body of this Congress will keep it from becoming law. What this says is that the Senate is more responsible than the House, that its heads are older and wiser, that the House is an assemblage of schoolboys who occasionally must have their fun. I reject that thesis.

I am proud to be a Member of the House of Representatives, and I will continue to be proud even though this vote went against reason and the private judgment of most of my colleagues. But in casting my "no" vote I hope I may have helped kindle a small flame—a flame of awareness of the greatness this House can achieve through being true to itself.

I see greatness all around me in this Chamber. I am honored to serve with each and every Member. But on days like yesterday I see a tendency to sit back and let principle be bypassed for another issue on another day—and to let this be a day when pretense and sham prevail. I see this body as capable of greater consistency than this.

Mr. Speaker, I have said I am uncomfortable in a dissenter's role, and I surely am willing to accept the fact that some of my colleagues genuinely feel this anti-riot bill will help stop riots. I think they are wrong, but I respect them for being sincere in this belief. However, in my view those who truly believe this is a good bill are in a distinct minority. And, rather than being a dissenter, I am really speaking what is in the minds of a vast majority of my colleagues. I think it is the proponents of this bill who are the dissenters. They are dissenting from the decisions of the Supreme Court. They are dissenting from the first amendment. They are dissenting from the orderly processes of law enforcement in the 50 States. And I am only one member of a vast majority favoring free speech, due process and State's rights in attacking the problems of our country today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column by Tom Wicker appearing in the New York Times of July 13, 1967. Without objection, I shall have it inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I say let this be the day when the House calls a halt to further meaningless gestures of this kind in the place of meaningful solutions, to mob psychology in place of statesmanship, to pettiness in place of greatness. Let this be the day the House of Representatives

decides it has an obligation to history, its Members and the American public to be ever true to itself.

THE DEADLIEST POLLUTION

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—The other day in Cincinnati the Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth—once a lieutenant of Martin Luther King in the nonviolent upheavals in the South—told Gene Roberts of this newspaper that the basic reason Negroes rioted was that "they say, 'we've already tried nonviolence and we're still where we are.'"

Even Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, always a moderate, warned at the N.A.A.C.P. convention in Boston this week that the failure of public officials to respond adequately to the needs of Negroes was "an invitation to violence." And Roy Wilkins, who has risked his leadership to stand for reason and understanding, told the N.A.A.C.P. that Congress' refusal to pass open housing and other needed legislation was "creating the atmosphere" for violence.

IS GRATITUDE DUE?

This will outrage those whites who believe that the civil rights legislation of recent years ought to have "satisfied" the Negroes, and that "these people" are only proving themselves beastly ingrates by rioting in the streets. The fact is, however, that all that legislation has yet to produce real gains for ghetto Negroes in employment, housing or education; and while Southern Negroes finally have the right to vote and eat grits in the local cafe, and a small percentage of them can even send their children to adequate schools, why should they be grateful for that? What gratitude is due a thief who steals your money, keeps it for a few generations, then grudgingly gives a little of it back under court order?

LONG COLD WINTER

During this season's rioting in Buffalo, Mayor Frank Sedita pleaded for "just a few days" to find jobs for unemployed Negroes. He was willing enough to find jobs to end violence in the long, hot summer; but why had jobs not been found to prevent violence in what Martin Luther King calls the "the long cold winter"?

In an even more myopic answer—or non-answer—to the ghetto, the House may bravely pass this week an "anti-riot" bill that would make it possible to jail and fine anybody who crosses a state line "with intent to incite street violence and rioting."

This political pogon is aimed squarely at Stokely Carmichael, described by its sponsor, Cramer of Florida, as a giant of a fellow whose itinerant rabble-raising has left in its wake "thousands of Negroes whose blood is simmering and waiting for a chance to riot."

Even assuming that Carmichael and other supermen actually caused the trouble in Los Angeles, Cleveland, New York, Chicago, Rochester, Buffalo, Tampa, Lincoln, and points west; even assuming that local authorities could not, in that case, deal with them in the manner of Atlanta, which put Carmichael in jail; even assuming the constitutionality of the bill's language and intent; even assuming all these dubious propositions, the truth of this bill still is to be found in the words of Representative Celler of New York, who at least tried to block it.

Nevertheless, he confessed to the Committee on Rules, "I don't want to be in a position of opposing this bill."

That is what Shuttlesworth and Brooke and Wilkins, none of whom ever threw a Molotov cocktail or stoned a loan shark's office, were talking about. A Congress representing a dominantly white society, that will not pass even a diluted open-housing law or provide increased protection for civil rights workers, but which does not "want to

be in a position of opposing" a demagogic anti-riot bill, is unlikely to persuade unemployed, slum-dwelling, poorly educated, often ill-fed and ill-clad Negroes that they can get relief from the law before they can get it in the streets.

SQUEAKY WHEELS

Shuttlesworth told Roberts about a new park being built in the riot area of Cincinnati. "A lot of people think they got that because of rioting, and I think they are right," he said. "Nonviolence didn't get it."

And the final tragedy is that while violence produces jobs in Buffalo and a park in Cincinnati, it also produces untold hatred and suffering and bitterness. Thus white myopia and black despair work together to pollute a nation's soul.

THE IMPORTANT DOMESTIC RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and often twisted ironies of our time were exemplified in a news broadcast I heard this past Saturday. The first item concerned the Vietcong attack on our airbase at Da Nang. The second item had reference to the depressing situation in Newark, N.J. The single day death toll, Mr. Speaker, of the war in the streets of New Jersey's largest city was greater than the death toll of the attack at Da Nang.

This is a striking warning to keep our priorities in a reasoned and human perspective. The domestic unrest in our stifling and oppressive ghettos requires, indeed demands, that we not relax for an instant our vigilance in the fights against discrimination, inadequate education, poverty and joblessness. The riots are started by conditions, not by people. We must seek solutions to the root causes of these maladies and not content ourselves with inadequate and ultimately meaningless palliatives.

There will be little to gain, Mr. Speaker, if we win the fight in Vietnam and lose the war at home. This great and powerful Nation can meet its global responsibilities and, at the same time, meet our responsibility to provide equality of opportunity to all Americans in all areas of human endeavor.

We can do both—and we must.

MILITARY AID TO JORDAN AND SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that we are providing military training to men from nine Arab Nations,

including four that have broken diplomatic relations with the United States. I have twice earlier this week made myself clear on this point.

In a closely related matter, I was greatly distressed by a story in today's New York Times that indicated the United States is considering resuming military arms shipments to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Military aid, when appropriate, should rightfully go to our friends. It is never appropriate, wise, nor justifiable to send arms to our enemies. Both Jordan and Saudi Arabia have openly expressed their antagonism to the United States and the resumption of military shipments to these countries would be most unwise.

Yet the article I have reference to indicates that the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, is considering resuming shipments to both of these countries. Even to consider such an unwise and unsound move is incomprehensible. I urge that arms shipments not be resumed to Jordan and Saudi Arabia and to call the Members' attention to this most regretful possibility, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article from today's New York Times in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. ARMS MAY GO TO MIDEAST AGAIN—RUSK HINTS AT RENEWED AID FOR ISRAEL, JORDAN, SAUDI ARABIA TO COUNTER SOVIET

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk indicated today that the Administration was moving toward a revival of its policy of providing sufficient arms to maintain a military equilibrium in the Middle East between the nations dependent upon Soviet military aid and those dependent on Western aid.

In a State Department news conference he noted that the introduction of new Soviet weapons into the region was raising security problems for Israel and certain pro-Western Arab nations.

The Secretary said that the Administration was giving special attention to the question of resuming military as well as economic aid to Jordan. A resumption of aid to Jordan as well as certain other states in the area is "a matter of great preoccupation at the present time," he said.

State Department officials said that a review on arms shipments was focusing on Jordan, Israel and Saudi Arabia. Before the Arab-Israeli war last month, the United States was committed to provide—Israel with two squadrons of A-4 attack bombers, Jordan with two squadrons of F-104 fighter-bombers, and Saudi Arabia with Hawk anti-aircraft missiles and ground support equipment.

Jordan is regarded by State Department officials as the most urgent problem. In the past, 20 per cent of Jordan's revenue came from \$30-million in "budgetary support" supplied annually by the United States. The Jordanian armed forces were being modernized with new tanks and planes from the United States.

After the war last month, the Administration froze all aid to countries in the region.

Earlier this month, the Administration quietly gave \$2-million in "budgetary support" to Jordan as the final installment for the fiscal year just ended. Now a new quarterly installment of \$7-million is coming due, and a decision is required in the next few weeks on resuming full-scale economic aid to Jordan.

The general appraisal is that the Jordanian economy, seriously damaged by the war and the loss to Israel of the productive West

Bank, has sufficient foreign reserves to carry on for perhaps six months. It is generally recognized that the viability of King Hussein's regime and the kingdom's economy is likely to be dependent upon new United States aid.

For the moment, Jordan's ability to absorb new military equipment is viewed as limited. But some shipments are regarded as necessary to help Hussein keep his armed forces in line and resist the pressure from other Arab states to accept arms from the Soviet Union.

Mr. Rusk did not commit the United States to renewed military aid to the Middle East. But he moved considerably beyond the past State Department position that military aid was "under review," employing virtually the same phrases used in the past to justify arms sales and gifts to nations in the Middle East.

FEDERAL FAMILY SUPPORT ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], I am introducing H.R. 11633 entitled the Federal Family Support Act, which is more popularly known as the run-away pappy bill.

As its name implies, this bill has as its objective the closing of an important gap in our Federal system which each year allows hundreds of fathers to escape their moral, social, and legal obligation to support their dependent wives and children.

Our bill would accomplish this task by extending Federal jurisdiction to allow the dependent to execute his support judgment in the Federal court where the delinquent spouse resides and by amending the Federal criminal law to make it a crime for a person, subject to a support order, to travel in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent of avoiding the court order.

At present, a dependent wife or child may pay for costly legal proceedings in the State of the father's residence only to have the delinquent father leave that State to again avoid his obligations. The end result is not that envisioned in the State's support statute, or in the initial court order, it is instead a frustration of both. The father able to support his family again uses this loophole to free himself of his responsibilities. At the same time his family, having expended money for these legal actions, have nothing to show for their actions.

In most States, a failure to comply with a court order, in this case to support one's dependents, may subject the individual to criminal contempt and in the case of one outside the State, may subject him to extradition. This, however, is a procedure costly to the State and in the end is not calculated to obtain the objective, support to the dependent wife and child.

In summary, I firmly believe that this bill will have the overall effect of requiring the able-bodied husband to support his dependent wife and child avoiding as much as possible added expenses to the family and to the State of their residence.

THE UNSAFE AIRPLANES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on more occasions than I care to count, I have called the attention of the House to the appalling lack of safety in the air. Two months ago, I introduced Capt. Vernon Lowell, who wrote a book, "Airline Safety Is a Myth," which publication backs up many of the statements I have made during the past 4 years about airline safety and the lack of adequate control over the airplanes by the control system of the Federal Aviation Administration. I regret to say that some of my colleagues scoffed at me, and questioned the motives of my actions. Others tried to discredit me, and Captain Lowell, for criticizing the FAA. The FAA itself has repeatedly issued bland assurances that everything is all right in the sky, that the traffic control system is fine. Yet we keep having midair collisions. I regret to say that the tragedy at Asheville, N.C., was entirely predictable, just as was a similar collision at Dayton, Ohio.

It is sad to see, Mr. Speaker, that the FAA continues to deny any responsibility in midair collisions. There is never any fault found with the control system, or with the controllers; it is always a matter of "pilot error" or "the plane was off course." Naturally the planes are off course when they collide; the question is why were they off course, when the job of the FAA is to keep them on course.

Captain Lowell wrote me on June 29, citing many safety problems. Referring to midair collisions, he said:

The problems are many and complex, involving mixing of high-speed aircraft and low speed.

And that is exactly what happened at Asheville yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that another tragic event has taken place in the air. It is one of many such accidents, and I regret to say that we see more and more midair collisions every year. I wonder when the FAA will make any significant improvements in the traffic control system. The annual report for this year talks vaguely about testing of two new radars, and says one is under development, and one has been "successfully tested," whatever that means. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when improvement can be expected in air traffic control; I have seen no improvement in 4 years, but only excuses. I hope that we will not have to wait another 4 years for action.

Mr. Speaker, I am appending hereto the full text of Captain Lowell's recent letter and a recent article from the Washington Daily News—both grim warnings of what actually happened yesterday.

The material follows:

JUNE 29, 1967.

Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since my letter to you of May 12, 1967 the air safety problems mentioned in my recent book have attracted national attention but the needed corrections don't appear imminent.

Nearly every major newspaper in the country mentioned the book in either a book review, editorial or article but to my knowledge no one from the air transport industry (including the FAA and NTSB) has publicly denied or commented on any of the safety issues. The public is not getting protection when facts are hidden or distorted.

The new Department of Transportation should be able to function without fear of the aircraft manufacturers and the air carriers. Will the FAA be brought before Congress and be made to answer for its lack of action on safety issues? Historically the FAA doesn't stand up to the industry and require safety measures unless the industry agrees to "cooperate."

The public must have the protection of an independent industrial "watch dog" for safety. Therefore, the NTSB's accident investigation bureau should be the subject of a complete Congressional investigation of their freedom from industry pressure groups. This is essential so that proper corrective action can be taken following an air carrier accident.

To be more specific, the following deficiencies are due to FAA inertia:

AIRCRAFT FIRE

A modern airliner can be made substantially more fireproof than it is. There are two devices that should be required installations on all jets:

a. Fuel vent lines flame arrestors suppression devices that can snuff out both flame and electric discharge from lightning or static electricity.

b. Fuel tank fume inerting systems.

EMERGENCY ESCAPE

A new concept of emergency escape must be designed into new aircraft (particularly in the new 400-500 passenger jumbo jets) and incorporated in today's jet airliners. Fire trap conditions must be eliminated by improved systems and design—not by paper rules and unrealistic rehearsed drills.

AIRPORTS

Too many airport runways are only marginally safe, particularly when slippery. We must extend runway lengths and/or provide safe overrun areas. During periods when runways are slippery, a meaningful gross weight restriction must be enforced for both takeoffs and landings.

TAKE OFF DECISION SPEED (V-1)

Jet aircraft must be tested to determine actual accelerated stop capabilities under the same conditions they are flown while full of passengers and recertified accordingly. We must give major consideration in these certification tests to: a. slippery runways b. surprise element c. an unbiased, objective test crew. Further, this new criteria should be used as a safety guide for the pilot and not as a regulation that is used to protect the industry.

MID-AIR COLLISION

Air traffic control and the mid-air collision problem is a lot worse than anyone will admit. The recent hearings in Dayton, Ohio on the DC-9 and light plane fatal col-

lision highlighted what most people in the industry know—our airway traffic control system is not preventing collisions between aircraft. The problems are many and complex, mixing of high speed aircraft and low speed (VFR, IFR traffic), congestion, etc. We must develop an operational anticollision device and separate controlled traffic from the uncontrolled.

NOISE ABATEMENT

Noise abatement procedures are dangerous. The low altitude turns and power reduction would have been considered unauthorized acrobatics five years ago. The use of "preferential" runways which compromise safety under adverse conditions must not be allowed to continue.

SAFETY REGULATIONS

The FAA air carrier operating rules must be revised to serve only the purpose of air safety. Actually, the endless papermills of the Government and the carriers have ground out thousands of rules—so many are only intended to protect the government or interest groups when something goes wrong.

AIRMAN CHECKS

The FAA should limit their determination of a pilot's proficiency and periodic re-checking to training flights. When a captain assumes command of a flight with passengers on board, he should not be harassed by an FAA inspector. The carriers and aircraft manufacturers should not use the FAA checking as a crutch. The worn out excuse "approved by the FAA" should not be an acceptable reason when an incident or an accident occurs. Ultimate responsibility should be placed on the carrier through training personnel and procedures to accomplish the pilot's upgrading and proficiency checks. This would release the FAA inspectors to do more important jobs such as checking against sabotage and reduce the burden on taxpayers.

FAIL SAFE CREWS

A fail safe crew is needed on all jets. The new two-man crew operating under heavy traffic congestion is a serious safety consideration. Also, tied into this is the need for more actual flight training in the airplane for co-pilots so that they can land safely under adverse conditions in case of incapacitation of captains. Airlines have recently experienced an increase of landing accidents (none fatal so far) because of inadequately trained co-pilots.

TRAINING

Pilot training procedures should be changed to stop the practice of simulating one and two engines out at low altitudes.

FUEL

The FAA should rescind their approval for the use of JP-4 type fuel because of the dangerous characteristics of its fumes.

ROME ACCIDENT REPORT

Eight safety recommendations were made by the Rome Commission as a result of my accident in Rome. The FAA has not responded to these recommendations. Most of these, in my opinion, would vastly enhance air safety. The fact that the FAA has chosen to ignore these recommendations highlights their inability to deal with serious air safety problems.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The administrative head of a technical agency such as the FAA should be qualified and extensively knowledgeable in civil aviation. We have had three administrators of the FAA since its inception over eight years ago. Two of these men were from the military and their lack of knowledge in civil aviation was and is still apparent. The system of political appointees as administrators of technical agencies is not working. Passive ap-

proval by General McKee of the aviation industry is symptomatic of the industry complacency.

ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION AND DETERMINATION

We must establish a system so that the true probable cause of an accident can be determined. I have recommended in my book an "adversary type of proceedings" before a tribunal of judges or a jury. The present system of "public hearings" following an accident is simply a side show. During the recent hearings in Dayton, Ohio the Government appeared to be protecting other government agencies, aircraft manufacturers and air carriers; who protects the traveling public?

In the case of the Salt Lake City 727 accident involving Captain Kehmeier, the highly questionable conduct of the CAB and the FAA in protecting the airplane manufacturers and condemning the pilot may possibly involve distortion. The forced resignation of Captain Kehmeier and the offer of \$45,000.00 cash, along with United Air Lines consent for early retirement, was indisputably unethical. The facts here do not point to CAB's probable cause conclusion of "pilot error." For example, UAL's report of Captain Kehmeier's training record completely contradicted the CAB's report; the latter was the main basis for the "pilot error" conclusion. Another example: the flight recorder readout was distorted and shown on a graph using a scale that distorted the flight path and no consideration was given to altimeter log. Another example: his flight supervisor and co-pilots, who had knowledge of his professional ability, were not permitted to go on record in his behalf. Finally, the ALPA's report on the accident contradicts the CAB's report and places the blame on the characteristics of the airplane; characteristics which are now known to the industry.

In conclusion, the safety issues outlined above warrant immediate attention. These issues are not new. The industry, along with the Government agencies, are satisfied with their distorted safety record and will continue to procrastinate on these issues until pressure is exerted on them.

Again, Congressman Gonzalez, I wish to express my thanks to you for your continuing interest in the fight for safety.

Sincerely,

Capt. VERNON W. LOWELL.

[From the Washington (D.C.) News, July 11, 1967]

AIR DEATHS MAY TOP HIGHWAY TOLL

(By Seth Kantor)

"Our airway death toll may be as bad as our highway death toll 10 years from now," unless better air traffic safety devices are worked out, Sen. A. S. Mike Monroney (D. Okla.) warned today. Sen. Monroney, Chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, said the Air Traffic Control system of the Federal Aviation Administration is "in serious need of modernization."

"The explosion of air traffic in the past two years has thrown our timetable for installing the newest and safest equipment off course," he noted.

Sen. Monroney's fears are supported by air-traffic expert Francis M. McDermott, whose charges of defects in the nation's air safety program rival those Ralph Nader has made against the auto industry.

Mr. McDermott charged today:

Safety factors in the FAA's control towers are "lagging further behind" than they were 10 years ago.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has "never adequately investigated an aviation accident with respect to ATC, air navigation or the services of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

The CAB has always allowed the FAA to investigate its own operation and has simply incorporated the conclusions into its air accident reports. As a result Mr. McDermott

charged, the investigations have been "worse than superficial."

EXAMPLE

One example he cited involved the mid-air collision of a capital airlines Viscount passenger plane from Pittsburgh with a Maryland National Guard jet trainer nine years ago. All the passengers were killed.

After its investigation, the CAB determined "the probable cause" to be lack of vigilance by the jet trainer pilot.

Last summer a Federal judge found that the CAB had not evaluated all the facts correctly and that the "government personnel at the (FAA's) Washington traffic control center" were "guilty of actionable negligence" by failing to anticipate the collision and forewarn the Viscount pilot.

Of greater significance than the actual number of air collisions," said Mr. McDermott, "is the number of near-collisions, most of which go unreported."

Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D., Tex.), an ardent foe of FAA safety procedures, said "a great many pilots are afraid to speak out" about near-collisions "because they fear the possibility of retribution from the Federal agencies which are charged with safety but which spend much time saving face."

The pilot is at "the complete mercy of the ATC system," said Mr. McDermott, a former air controller and now a private aviation consultant.

MONSTROSITY

He charged that "the resources provided by Congress to improve air safety have been misappropriated to create an FAA management monstrosity which cynically disregards the plight of the controller.

Sen. Daniel B. Brewster (D., Md.), a member of the Monroney subcommittee, said "Members of Congress have a special interest in seeing that air safety is more than a 'pure-luck' system."

Sen. Brewster wants "a careful Congressional study" of responsible charges that the FAA's air traffic system has serious problems.

FAA Deputy Administrator David D. Thomas insisted the "biggest need in improving air traffic control is more airports."

He said a \$300-million sophisticated new radar automation system, known as alpha-numerics which is to be in wide use by the early 1970s, will be "the biggest breakthrough."

SAME THING

Since April the newly formed Department of Transportation's National Transportation Safety Board has taken over from the CAB as aircraft investigator. Mr. McDermott says the NTSB is no more prepared to investigate ATC "mistakes" than was the CAB.

Mr. Thomas, in reply, said: "Nothing is more of a fishbowl than the ATC system. Everything is recorded. The tower's conversations with planes are all on tape."

But Mr. McDermott said the FAA prepares an "accident package" for the NTSB, making its own transcript from the tape, and charged that there have been "critical omissions."

Thomas denied that the FAA provides "loaded" transcripts.

PENNSYLVANIA SUCCESS STORY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and charts and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania has

been one of the pioneers in the consumer finance industry. The first small loan law was placed on the books in 1911, and Pennsylvania, enacting small loan legislation in 1915, became one of the first five States to provide a responsible source of cash credit to consumers.

Since 1875, the business of lending small sums developed in a number of cities without any protective legislation for the consumer. As a result, the small loan business had become the object of unfavorable publicity, stimulating the reliable lenders in the various States to unite and form State associations. Members of five State associations—Ohio, Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, and Pennsylvania—met in Philadelphia on April 19, 1916, to discuss the organization of a national association. The organization that materialized as the result of this meeting was the forerunner of the National Consumer Finance Association.

Coincidentally, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws will hold its annual meeting in Philadelphia in 1968 and it is expected that a final draft of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, on which this distinguished committee has labored for several years, will be proposed at that time.

How important is the consumer finance industry today? How important is the automobile industry? It is no coincidence that the growth of the automobile industry closely parallels the development of the consumer finance industry. There is no question that the automobile industry is a prime mover in our economy; yet how many people could afford to buy an automobile for cash?

Approximately 60 percent of all automobile purchases today involve the use of sales installment credit, or "sales finance." To contemplate a 60-percent reduction in automobile sales, would be to contemplate a disaster not only to that industry, but others including; steel, automotive parts, petroleum, highway construction, and the tourist trade.

Yet the growing finance company today is properly concerned with diversification as competition from other lending institutions has come into the picture, particularly with respect to automobile sales finance. The success stories of growth in other areas is equally impressive as the consumer finance industry continues to maintain its position as a dynamic and enterprising segment of the American economy.

On April 25, in the Senate Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware, Mr. Boggs, called attention (S. 5833) to the sound and spectacular growth of Finance Factors and included a stirring article from Hawaii Business and Industry demonstrating the impact this far-seeing consumer finance company has had on the aforementioned State. The senior Senator from Hawaii, Mr. FONG, as chairman and president of Finance Factors, is to be complimented on his role in guiding the company through its formative years.

Another example of a useful life and an exciting, growing business enterprise that has already left its mark on not only a community and State, but the Na-

tion as well, was recorded in an editorial in the Morning Call of Allentown, Pa., in the May 23, 1966, issue. I quote in part:

This community never has been short on the documented tales of how men with vision and courage and skill have put down their roots here to establish and develop great enterprises that have spread over wide areas. The biography of the late F. Reed Wills is such a story, a notable chapter in any compilation of outstanding examples of the attainments that are possible under the American system of free enterprise.

The story is closely tied to the growth of the General Acceptance Corporation he established here some 30 years ago when Allentown and the rest of the nation were deep in the throes of the great depression. Before his death over the weekend, he saw it recognized as one of the world's largest independent finance companies, doing business of \$1 billion a year and serving many thousands of customers through some 500 offices in this country and abroad. He guided that growth as president and more recently as the chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, the General Acceptance Corp., is the only multinational finance company with headquarters in Pennsylvania. According to quotations compiled for the American Industrial Bankers Association by A. G. Becker & Co., the General Acceptance Corp., ranks fourth in net worth among sales finance companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange. In addition, statistics published by the First National Bank of Chicago show that although the General Acceptance Corp. is not now the largest in the industry, they have outperformed the finance field by a significant margin, as accompanying charts indicate. Moreover, the General Acceptance Corp., to my knowledge, is the only company of any size in the consumer finance industry considering official board action endorsing the principle of full disclosure of meaningful consumer finance charges as embodied in S. 5. It is my understanding that the GAC board is expected to take this action at their next meeting on the 26th of July.

Legislation enabling finance companies to make consumer installment loans is on the books in every State except Arkansas. During 1966, over \$13 million cash loans involving a volume of \$9.2 billion were made by finance companies. This constituted 37 percent of the installment loans made by all financial institutions. A comparison of the annual reports for 1966 of the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.—the largest commercial bank in Pennsylvania—and the General Acceptance Corp. gives one a greater appreciation of the operations of both types of lending institutions.

The Mellon Bank employed 3,809 persons; paid out \$28,673,262 in salaries and employee benefits; and in the installment loan category, had an average outstanding of \$184 million.

The General Acceptance Corp. employed 5,225 persons; paid out in employee salaries and benefits \$33.5 million; and their outstanding installment loans totaled over half a billion dollars.

Within the boundaries of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there resides an estimated 1,500 GAC employees, working in 35 facilities and generating an

annual income of over \$21 million. The company spends another \$1 million on supplies and services from suppliers located in the Allentown area, and over a quarter of a million dollars annually in State taxes. With the recent acquisition of the Continental Commercial Corp. of Pittsburgh, these figures will be increased substantially.

In the first full year of operation, GAC had two offices in Pennsylvania and did \$616,000 of financing business. In just the first quarter of 1967, in the State of Pennsylvania alone, GAC had \$29.3 million outstanding in installment loans. In 1961, GAC instituted its unique finance program known as "private brand financing." From 1963 through 1966, this division increased over 100 percent each year. Already in 1967, a GAC agreement has been signed with the Radio Corp. of America providing for the wholesale financing of RCA products at the dealer level through GAC Credit Corp. on a national scale. This is doubly pleasing news to me in that RCA has plants at Scranton, Meadowlands, and Lancaster, Pa.

The General Acceptance Corp. is highly responsive to local needs and sentiment. Therefore, in April of 1964, without the assistance of others in the industry and without any offer of aid from local welfare agencies, but with permission from the State, GAC established Philadelphia's first effective budget counseling office.

GAC credit counseling service manager, Charles Bailey, explained shortly after the office opened:

When a person goes into debt more deeply than he can afford to pay, more and more often he is being referred to us. These referrals come from a wide range of sources including other loan companies that GAC, a bank or a social welfare agency, an employer, a church credit union, family counseling services or even the Internal Revenue Service, or city and state tax agencies.

Bailey added:

Our average client is in debt to nine or ten creditors and owes over \$3,000.

The first 130 clients to take advantage of GAC's free counseling service had a total indebtedness of \$400,000 which manager Bailey reduced within a few months by \$70,000. The GAC Counseling Service continued to provide relief for many hardship cases and produced an aura of goodwill which resulted in the office being turned over to an independent organization composed of finance companies, banks, labor unions, welfare agencies and churches. Until the transition was completed in August of 1966, the expense to the General Acceptance Corp. is conservatively estimated at \$28,000.

In December of 1966, 10 families in Scranton were displaced victims of a mine fire and it appeared as though they would be out in the cold on Christmas Day. The General Acceptance Corp., however, moved quickly to the scene, providing new rent-free, three-bedroom mobile homes which were completely furnished—even to a Christmas tree in each living room. The expense to the company is estimated at close to \$20,000 and in 1967, GAC will contribute at least

another \$30,000 for local charitable activities.

The Scranton case was not the first time the corporation has stepped in to help a stricken community in which it operates. Back in 1964 when the deadly Hurricane Cleo struck the South with incredible damage, one of GAC's subsidiaries, Stuyvesant Insurance, flew a whole crew of adjustors into the area. Many claims were ready to be adjusted days before policyholders returned and within 1 month every claim had been adjusted satisfactorily. I am not surprised that the company received public recognition for its efforts including a letter from the Florida State Treasurer saying:

We knew we could depend on you and your company.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the General Acceptance Corp. is dedicated to service as well as profits.

In my own State, the Aetna Steel Co. of Pottsville, which has seen its employment rolls drop from a high of 850 to fewer than 100 in this last year, was taken over by the General Acceptance Corp. and has a new future. Matt Shook, Jr., industrial commissioner of Pottsville said:

If this new firm does in Pottsville what it has done in Wisconsin, it will be the greatest boom ever to hit this city.

Aetna Steel will become a division of GAC's manufacturing subsidiary, Highway Trailer Industries, Inc., of Edgerton, Wis.

The General Acceptance Corp. is able to move swiftly and effectively when new opportunities arise because, according to an analysis by R. W. Pressprich & Co.:

Hayward Wills and his senior management team devote much of their time to long range planning and financial control, leaving the divisional management to responsible proven executives on a decentralized basis.

The aggressive Mr. Wills, chairman and president of GAC, was just appointed to serve on the 1967 National UN Day Committee with Charles G. Mortimer who was named chairman last month by President Johnson. The GAC chairman will meet with other leading industrialists, labor leaders and businessmen to promote, according to Mr. Wills:

The advancement of peace, freedom and justice through international organizations.

The GAC executive vice president, T. Alec Vaughey, last year led a successful United Fund Campaign in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley. It is obvious the philosophy of F. Reed Wills has had a lasting impact among executives of the General Acceptance Corp.; namely, that of helping people:

His concern about how they lived was underscored by his great interest in the causes of his church, the institutions of the community, and the opportunities he constantly sought to help those in unusual need and circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the February 1967 issue of Fortune magazine giving a more detailed insight into the individuals and

operations of the General Acceptance Corp. I respectfully submit the magazine article and the accompanying graphs and charts which illustrate my remarks in the RECORD at this point:

GENERAL ACCEPTANCE—LOOKING AROUND FOR TROUBLE

The General Acceptance Corp., a finance company based in Allentown, Pennsylvania, managed with no difficulty at all to get through the first three decades of its existence in relative obscurity. Businessmen in its own field would have identified it readily enough as a well-managed and growing enterprise that financed other enterprises and individual consumers in a variety of ways; but most businessmen would have had trouble differentiating it from all those other finance companies with vaguely similar names—and some have even persisted over the years in confusing it with the General Motors Acceptance Corp.

In its fourth decade, which began four years ago, General Acceptance has suddenly been all over the business pages and entangled in situations that demanded attention. The situations all had a certain similarity: they involved other enterprises in desperate trouble, and they also involved efforts by G.A.C. to turn the trouble to its own advantage. One such enterprise was Highway Trailer Industries, which was losing money in large bundles, was plagued by stockholder suits, and had directors who had been indicted for illegal stock promotion (they were ultimately acquitted). G.A.C. moved right in and bought Highway. Before that deal was even completed, it also began buying some assets of Atlantic Acceptance Corp., a Canadian-based finance company whose sensational bankruptcy in 1955 had sent shock waves through scores of companies all over North America. And not long after that, G.A.C. was trying to buy Pioneer Finance Co. of Detroit, which was also insolvent. It was still not clear as this article went to press whether G.A.C. would succeed; some Pioneer stockholders had been resisting the deal strenuously (as some protographs above make clear), but G.A.C. was still in hot pursuit of the company's assets.

But if it has pushed into the news, a lot of businessmen must still be hazy about its purpose and direction. What's the angle? Stated simply, it's a willingness to take on all sorts of scary-sounding situations and an ability, most of the time, to deal with them so that they're not as scary as they sound. As it happens, the angle and the man who has it are worth examining closely because G.A.C. has been growing faster than ever in the last few years—so fast, indeed, that a few of its bankers have been registering concern about the pace of expansion and the management problems almost certain to be associated with it. G.A.C.'s per-share earnings rose by 44 percent in 1963-66, far more than the comparable figure for C.I.T. Financial, Commercial Credit, or Associates Investment, the three largest diversified finance companies. (G.A.C.'s net income in 1966: about \$7 million.)

The company's asset growth has been only fair in these particular years, but over the entire past decade it has far outstripped most big finance companies in this respect, with an average asset gain of 17 percent a year compounded. (Its assets at year-end: over \$600 million.) The management tries to get a minimum return of 10 percent on the capital it puts into new ventures.

THE AGGRESSIVE MR. WILLS

A good deal of the management is a tall (six feet three) young (forty) man named S. Hayward Wills. He is chairman, president, and a testimonial to the fact that nepotism occasionally works out just fine. G.A.C. was founded by his father, Francis Reed Wills,

who died last May. As young Wills's policies suggest, he is a tough and aggressive operator with a flair for the original. One often repeated story about him suggests that he has had these qualities for quite a while. During World War II he was stationed at an Army officer-candidate school in Columbus, Georgia. On leave one weekend, he stopped in at the Southern Savings Bank in Atlanta, which was owned by G.A.C. (the bank is now out of business), and borrowed its official car. When he returned it, he made a mental note of the mileage, and on several later visits to the bank observed that the figure was unchanged. Wills thereupon made the natural inference that no one was using the car. Accordingly, he "borrowed" it once more, kept it at Columbus, and began charging his fellow officer candidates \$5 a ride for trips to Atlanta. But then the bank, or possibly its auditor, discovered that the car was missing. When the elder Wills was told the news, the first person he called was Hayward. Many presidents of financial institutions would pay a fair amount to keep a story like that suppressed; Hayward tells it himself, with obvious relish.

Though his rise to the presidency of G.A.C. was a product of nepotism, it was not exactly automatic. After he had the Army and studies in business administration (at Syracuse University) behind him, Hayward was asked by his father to come to work as an adjuster—this being a usual starting point for trainees. Hayward declined, tried to negotiate a higher place for himself, went to work at Macy's when the negotiations broke down—and finally came back to G.A.C. in its advertising department, in a position high enough so that he could at least claim a moral victory. A few years later his father made him a vice president; at the same time, however, Hayward's brother Bowling was also made a vice president. The elder Wills had a notion that the two boys could work as a team, and that seemed to be fine with Bowling. Hayward immediately made it clear to his brother that he felt the company would ultimately have to have just one boss; he also made it clear that he expected to be it. Bowling now runs Eastern Industries, a lime producer and building-materials manufacturer in which the Wills family has about a 30 percent interest.

WHAT'S UNDER THE UMBRELLA

Hayward Wills has been more daring than his father in searching out opportunities for expansion, but his aggressiveness in business is not entirely unprecedented in the company—or in the family. It has some roots in a formal policy decision made by his father in the 1930's. General Acceptance was formed in 1933, after F. R. Wills took over the Allentown Wimssett Thrift Co. In those days the "finance industry" had a strong small-business flavor; most of its members were operating on a local basis. Credit cards were virtually unheard of and credit unions were less significant as competitors than they later became. Most commercial banks had not yet begun to compete aggressively in personal loans and sales finance, the two staples of the finance industry. In addition to having these fields mostly to themselves, finance companies were freer than they are now to pass money costs on to their customers; almost none of the present regulation of sales finance charges was then in effect. Many finance companies thrived in this environment, and very few felt any inclination to change.

F. R. Wills was nevertheless astute enough to see that the small companies would not have protected local markets forever. Big nationwide companies would have one crucial advantage over small ones: the cost of their raw material, money, would be lower because they would be better credit risks. Wills decided that he was faced with two

choices: either sell out to another, larger finance company or make G.A.C. grow itself. Rapid growth obviously meant dilution of the Wills family's controlling interest in G.A.C. (it was 59 percent at one point), for the company's cash was tied up in its operations, and acquisitions would necessarily involve stock. Wills nevertheless decided that G.A.C. would grow by acquisition. Hayward is certain that his father had already settled on this course before World War II (and there were in fact some small acquisitions then), but it was not formalized until a directors' meeting in Colorado Springs in 1958. According to the minutes, F. R. Wills "explained that due to the competitive factors of the larger companies with low money costs and larger capital funds, it became more difficult for small companies to survive and that this in turn might cause the smaller companies to consider the sale of their assets to the larger companies . . . Mr. Wills then continued to discuss the future conduct of the corporation and stated that the corporation should take the following steps: (1) continue to build by acquisitions . . ."

In any case, General Acceptance today has quite a few operations going. Aside from personal loans and sales finance, and its new venture into the trailer business, the G.A.C. umbrella now covers an ordinary commercial bank, casualty and life-insurance companies, a commercial-finance operation, a rediscounting operation, and a unique project called "private-brands financing." The last of these is a special pet of Hayward Wills. The idea is that, just as Armstrong Rubber manufactures tires for other companies to sell under their own brand names, G.A.C. sets up captive finance companies—for example, Hupp Credit Corp., which finances both Hupp Corp. sales to its distributors and the distributors' sales to their dealers. (Sometimes the private-brand package also includes financing of retail sales.) G.A.C. does all the work—credit investigation, inventory checking, and collection—and generally charges 2½ to 3½ percent on sales for 90 to 120 days; ordinarily, the yield on money G.A.C. employs in this operation is 12 to 15 percent a year. Wills believes private-brands financing has the greatest growth potential of any of his company's finance operations. Volume in private brands was about \$130 million in 1966, up 46 percent from 1965 and up more than eightfold since 1961, its first year of operation. Aside from Hupp, the customers include Emerson Radio, Sylvania Electric Products, Larson Boat Works, Sherman Car Wash Equipment Co., and Space Conditioning, Inc.

The commercial bank is in Atlanta; it was started there in 1964, mainly, it appears, because the Willses couldn't bear to let a commercial-bank charter they had inherited from the old Southern Savings Bank go to waste. Atlanta was a tough city for a new commercial bank to crack, however. The metropolitan area already had several big banking powerhouses, conspicuously the Citizens & Southern, and about 125 bank headquarters or branches in existence—a figure some bankers viewed as saturation. G.A.C.'s American Bank of Atlanta did in fact lose a little money (\$8,000, to be exact) in its first year of operation and a little more (\$55,000) the second year. But a better mix of time and demand deposits, and a more selective lending policy, helped it to turn the corner. Final figures for 1966 are not yet available, but there is no longer any doubt that American Bank is a viable enterprise. At midyear its assets were up to \$12 million (versus \$7,600,000 at the end of 1965), and it has already opened its first branch. "It's gone faster than I thought it would" says Hayward Wills.

G.A.C.'s ventures into insurance have had varied results. The ventures began with the acquisition in 1945 of the Stuyvesant Insurance Co. of New York, a small fire-and-casualty outfit. In 1953, G.A.C. put the com-

pany into credit life insurance and in the mid-1950's it expanded still further, into fire-and-casualty reinsurance—i.e., insuring contracts already written by other underwriters. But in this case G.A.C. went too far too fast and let its internal controls get out of hand. Automobile casualty claims ran far ahead of expectations, and hurricanes and other bad-weather problems were also compounding the difficulties (and hurting casualty companies generally); G.A.C.'s venture was soon in big trouble. In 1963 the reinsurance operation was discontinued, which resulted in a special charge of \$1,800,000; the accumulated underwriting losses in the casualty division since 1962 have come to over \$12 million. The casualty business was cut back sharply. Ironically, these dreary results represented a kind of vindication of Bowling Wills, who had earlier repeatedly warned his father and Hayward that they were taking too many big risks in insurance. (Indeed, the immediate cause of Bowling's earlier departure from G.A.C. was his inability to persuade them of this.)

Life insurance, however, has become a big moneymaker, apparently contributing over \$3 million to G.A.C. profits last year. The bulk of the business stems from credit life policies sold in connection with personal loans. In most states a finance company could simply take commissions on such policies into corporate income. Instead, G.A.C. leaves the income in Stuyvesant—and life-insurance companies' effective tax rate is much lower than other corporations' (in 1965 Stuyvesant Life's was 26 percent). The legality of such tax shelters in corporations with credit-life subsidiaries is now being contested by Internal Revenue.

A MATTER OF CONTROL

The company's alarming experiences in some of its insurance operations fortified a conviction that Hayward Wills had been developing for some time—that G.A.C. had grown to a point at which it sorely needed some stronger central controls. One of his first acts as president in 1964 was to set up a "control group," under a vice president, that continuously audited G.A.C.'s varied operations and reported findings directly to him; Hayward now consults with the group head every working day.

The new role of the control groups may have led Hayward to decide on a much more conservative stance in G.A.C.'s commercial lending last year. The commercial receivables had shot up from \$5 million in 1961 to \$54 million in 1965. The loans involved were, of course, to companies that had not qualified for ordinary bank loans; some of them were for sizable amounts. Wills ordered that no more loans be made that exceeded 5 percent of G.A.C.'s common equity, or \$1,500,000; in addition, late last year he brought in Robert Kurau, a former banker, as head of the commercial operation.

In the face of the extraordinary money shortages of 1966, the commercial division was not the only G.A.C. operation on which more conservative lending policies were imposed. Rediscounting—i.e., financing other, smaller finance companies—was deliberately held back last year, even though it had been a growing and profitable business for G.A.C. and is less risky than commercial lending (because the loans are generally smaller). In 1960-65 the average annual growth rate of rediscounting receivables was 17 percent; in 1966, when receivables probably ended up around \$105 million, the rate was under 5 percent.

Sales finance was also put under restraint last year. This policy could not have been an easy one for Hayward Wills to adopt because he had previously done a lot to make the sales-finance division a viable and growing enterprise. In the late 1950's, when he had been made a vice president and charged with responsibility for the division, it was,

like many other independent sales-finance operations, being hit hard by competition for its biggest and most dependable customers, the automobile dealers; commercial banks and the manufacturers' "captive" finance companies were proving to be irresistible competitors and forcing down profit margins. Hayward concluded that G.A.C. must emphasize growth in other industries, notably mobile homes. The switch enabled the division to continue growing despite the leveling-out of auto business; in mid-1966 sales finance represented some \$195 million of G.A.C. receivables, up about \$150 million from the level of the late 1950's.

The decision to restrain commercial lending, rediscounting, and sales finance last year arose out of Wills's desire to put as much money as possible into G.A.C.'s personal-loan division, which is more profitable than any of these. It is true that state laws establish ceilings on the interest rates that can be charged to personal-loan customers; it is also true, however, that the ceilings run over 40 per cent a year in some states (e.g., 48 percent in Alaska and 42 percent in Hawaii, Louisiana, and Wyoming). On balance, and even in periods of rising interest rates, G.A.C. earns a lot more in personal lending than in its other financing operations. Indeed, personal loans become relatively more attractive when interest rates are high. In other kinds of finance the critical cost is money; in personal lending the costs include a sizable component for such work as credit investigation, surveillance, and collection, and the prices of these were not rising as steeply as the price of money last summer. On June 30 G.A.C.'s personal-loan receivables were \$197 million, up from \$164 million a year earlier and \$79 million at the end of 1960.

SHOCK WAVES FROM CANADA

G.A.C.'s beefed-up internal controls allowed it to take a growing interest in troubled finance companies whose receivables looked as though they might be bought at bargain prices. Such considerations were evident in G.A.C.'s moves on both Atlantic Acceptance and Pioneer Finance.

Atlantic Acceptance hit the news pages on June 14, 1965, when it defaulted dramatically on a \$5-million credit obligation. Within a week, Walter Strothman, G.A.C.'s controller and chief take-over strategist, and T. P. McGinn, senior vice president in charge of personal-loan operations, had obtained permission to prow around Atlantic's Toronto offices. "We had a whole army of men ready to move over the border," Strothman recalled, exaggerating only slightly; by the end of June, in any event, G.A.C. had a hundred men in Canada, most of them credit specialists scrutinizing every piece of Atlantic Acceptance paper they could get their hands on. A few weeks later G.A.C. also had worked out a deal to serve as a consultant to the receiver, the Montreal Trust Co., on the problems of running a finance company. But its main interest, of course, was the possibility of buying some Atlantic assets.

The G.A.C. investigators actually turned up a good deal of the evidence indicating that some dealings of C. Powell Morgan, Atlantic's president, had not been entirely above-board. Eventually, it was estimated that some \$60 million of Atlantic's net receivables were uncollectable. Morgan was personally involved in some of the companies that benefited from Atlantic's commercial loans, but the full extent of his dealings may never be known; he died last October, before an Ontario Royal Commission could complete its investigation. Strothman says that Atlantic's 1964 annual report read "like *Grimm's Fairy Tales*." The company's reported net receivables had grown from \$19 million at the end of 1960 to more than \$142 million when it collapsed.

G.A.C.'s investigation was conducted mainly in order to find out which pieces of Atlantic might be worth buying. The investigators soon found that Atlantic's commercial-finance paper was mostly worthless. There appear to have been no limits on the size of loans that could be made, almost no reporting system on the current status of accounts, and few appraisals of collateral. Atlantic's sales-finance operations were also in bad shape; many accounts had been rewritten within the previous ninety days, presumably to keep them from formal delinquency. At the time of the collapse the sales-finance receivables were listed at \$61 million. Collections and write-offs later reduced the figure to \$20 million. But because there remained some doubt that even this amount was collectable, G.A.C. was able to pick up the receivables for \$12,400,000.

Atlantic's personal-loan operation was in somewhat better condition. Still, according to G.A.C., forty-two of the forty-seven branch offices that had been opened between 1963 and 1965 were not earning enough to cover their expenses. Atlantic had made loans to people with weak employment records, had extended a lot of credit to teen-agers, and had obviously sacrificed quality to volume at every turn. The books showed \$35,700,000 in personal-loan receivables outstanding at the time of the collapse. G.A.C. decided only \$26 million of them were worth buying.

PIONEERING IN DETROIT

The woes of Pioneer Finance Co., on which G.A.C. began trying to capitalize before its deal with Atlantic was even completed, were also rooted in overexpansion; however, there was no aura of fraud at Pioneer. Its difficulties date back to 1959, when it entered shell-house financing in a big way. By 1962 shell housing accounted for \$60,300,000, or 51 percent, of Pioneer's total receivables. Financing the purchase of a shell and letting the buyer put his own "sweat equity" into it looked like a promising avenue of growth. But as things turned out, many shells never were completed, and only a handful of shell-house builders manager to survive.

Pioneer itself still seemed to be in good enough shape in the early 1960's. By granting extensions on shell-house loans and refinancing accounts on extended terms, Pioneer was able to look healthier than it really was. But its difficulties finally came out into the open after it brought in a new auditor, Haskins & Sells, in the summer of 1965. The firm appears to have taken a tougher line than its predecessor, Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart, and after the first Haskins & Sells audit a special charge of \$2,500,000 was made, mostly to provide for an additional allowance for losses on shell-housing paper.

Even before the new audit was made public, one of Pioneer's biggest bank creditors, the National Bank of Detroit, decided to take a closer look at the company. It found that Pioneer had lost some other lines of credit during the preceding six months; it also found out about the \$2,500,000 special charge. N.B.D. decided not to renew its own line of credit to Pioneer. This meant that the company would not be able to pay off other short-term loans coming due; furthermore, the \$2,500,000 special charge had reduced Pioneer's capital below the level specified in its loan agreements—and these things meant that the company was in technical default on all of its \$118 million of loans. Pioneer was not immediately thrown into bankruptcy because most of its creditors felt there would be more to salvage through a merger or sale of assets; bankruptcy proceedings, furthermore, would be costly and time consuming. But it turned out that not even Haskins & Sells had fully realized the extent of Pioneer's troubles; in the spring another special provision of \$11,100,000 had to be made for

anticipated losses, and an additional charge of \$6 million was made to reflect changes in Pioneer's accounting practices. Pioneer ended up with a deficit of \$16,400,000 in the fiscal year ended last March 31 (in contrast to a profit of \$963,000 for the previous fiscal year).

AN INSIDE TRACK FOR G.A.C.

Meanwhile, G.A.C. had sent a team of specialists to Detroit to evaluate Pioneer's receivables. Another team was dispatched to Florida to check out the company's loan offices there. G.A.C. negotiated a contract to help collect Pioneer's receivables as they came due and seemed to have the inside track when it came to buying any pieces of the company. But as things turned out, buying anything from Pioneer was difficult, because the company had seven different classes of stockholders, and a variety of creditors as well, all of whom had to approve the terms of the merger.

G.A.C. wanted a merger with Pioneer. The specific attractions were some \$60 million of net sales-finance receivables, most of them in mobile (not shell) housing; some \$13 million of net personal-loan receivables; and about \$40 million in cash. The acquisition would, of course, enable G.A.C. to expand its sales-finance and personal-loan business in several areas of the U.S. in which Pioneer had strong positions, notably Michigan and Florida. But far more important to Wills was an unparalleled opportunity he saw in the deal to raise capital at a low cost—no mean trick in 1966—and to increase his company's borrowing power. He proposed to pay for the Pioneer package with a package of his own consisting mostly of debt securities: G.A.C. would give Pioneer's stockholders and creditors about \$20 million of its own preferred stock and subordinated debt and \$80 million of newly issued senior notes paying only 4 to 5 percent. When the merger became effective, G.A.C. would also pay Pioneer's creditors about \$15 million in cash.

As it turned out, most of Pioneer's bankers and senior creditors accepted the package immediately, apparently believing that the offer was the company's only alternative to bankruptcy. However, the holders of Pioneer's 6½ percent preferred stock—who were being offered some G.A.C. preferred in the deal—turned it down and demanded better terms. Wills came up with a somewhat sweetened package for the dissidents, and it appeared last month that they would accept it. If they did not, or if any other stockholders or creditors resist the package, and Pioneer

is forced into bankruptcy, G.A.C. still plans to bid for the receivables.

THE ROAD TO HIGHWAY TRAILER

For all the peculiar circumstances of the Atlantic and Pioneer deals, the deal involving Highway Trailer Industries is doubtless the most bizarre caper that G.A.C. will ever be involved in. The company, a manufacturer of large truck trailers competing mainly with Fruehauf Corp., is now 84 percent owned by G.A.C. and represents its only excursion beyond the normal boundaries of finance; yet it has proved at least in the first year, to be the most profitable acquisition of all. For four years before it bought Highway, G.A.C. financed some of its trailer sales through the private-brands program. At the same time Highway also borrowed heavily from other creditors, often paying over 9 percent for its money. Its performance during this period deteriorated under several different managements installed by David B. Charnay, its controlling stockholder. Before he took over Highway, Charnay had led a colorful career as a reporter for New York's *Mirror* and *Daily News* and had operated his own public-relations firm. (Among his clients: the Mine Workers under John L. Lewis, the Teamsters under Dave Beck, and Louis Wolfson's Merritt-Chapman & Scott.) Highway lost \$5,200,000 in 1964 and was in the process of dropping another \$1,500,000 in 1965 when G.A.C. decided to move in and buy Charnay out.

Turning Highway around proved to be mainly a matter of getting low-cost capital and a hard-working management at reasonable salary levels. "There were too many people on executive salaries, too many high expense accounts, and too many absentee man-

agers living in New York," says H. A. Berger, G.A.C.'s vice president in charge of diversified operations. In 1963 five officers drew salaries above \$36,000 a year—which is what J. T. Colliflower, the current Highway president, earns. Charnay himself was paid \$153,097 in 1963, according to a 1964 proxy statement. Two federal grand-jury indictments against Charnay and two associates compounded his troubles. The first, for perjury before the grand jury, was dropped, and the second, involving some sales promotion charges the grand jury had been looking into, resulted in a not-guilty verdict after trial.

G.A.C. formally took over Highway in October, 1965. Colliflower, a former Litton executive who had joined Highway later in 1964, has brought in eight other Litton people, meanwhile retaining only three of fifteen men from Charnay's management group. He sold off a Pennsylvania plant and concentrated the company's trailer production at its headquarters in Edgerton, Wisconsin. He also sold off an excessive inventory of used trailers, raised trailer output and prices, and slashed the sale staff from sixty-five to thirty-five. G.A.C. provided a vital transfusion of capital. Highway Trailer turned around dramatically, contributing about \$2 million in profits to the parent company last year.

Despite the success with Highway, some of G.A.C.'s bankers still want to see the company slow down its acquisition rate for a while, to digest all the new assets it has swallowed in the last few years. Meanwhile, however, Hayward Wills obviously has an eye out for any other situations like Highway Trailer. He's still a good bet to be heard from when somebody else is in trouble.

General Acceptance Corp.—Percent of net profit to average net worth and to common equity

Year	First National Bank ¹		General Acceptance Corp.			
	Sales finance	Loan	Average net worth	Net income	Percent return on total net worth	Percent return on common equity ²
1961	7.60	10.76	\$32,469,512	\$3,084,875	9.50	13.07
1962	7.35	11.98	40,935,125	3,931,132	9.60	13.94
1963	7.30	11.18	45,028,335	4,435,649	9.85	14.84
1964	8.35	12.92	48,791,996	4,886,405	10.01	15.33
1965	8.72	12.51	56,256,486	5,815,409	10.34	18.09
1966	7.93	11.87	65,514,619	7,145,914	10.91	18.84

¹ Percent return on average net worth per ratios published by the First National Bank of Chicago.
² After deducting preferred dividends.

Comparative Statistics—Loan, 1966

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	GAC combined	GAC loan	Beneficial finance	Household finance	American investment	Seaboard
Average net worth	\$65,515		\$409,402	\$372,107	\$74,989	\$75,434
Average total assets	\$577,612	\$191,560	\$1,314,609	\$1,344,184	\$493,819	\$499,468
Average money employed	\$493,129	\$180,492	\$896,123	\$1,199,973	\$428,440	\$442,300
Gross income	\$75,582	\$44,216	\$207,298	\$248,246	\$93,020	\$10,4651
Percent to average money employed	15.33	24.50	23.13	20.69	21.71	23.66
Percent to average total assets	13.09	23.08	15.77	18.47	18.84	20.95
Loss provision	\$9,810	\$6,758	\$17,990	\$19,775	\$11,696	\$10,813
Percent to average money employed	1.99	3.75	2.01	1.65	2.73	2.44
Percent to average total assets	1.70	3.53	1.37	1.47	2.37	2.16
Operating expense	\$33,099	\$22,992	\$90,875	\$100,246	\$46,376	\$50,854
Percent to average money employed	6.71	12.74	10.14	8.35	10.82	11.50
Percent to average total assets	5.73	12.00	6.91	7.46	9.39	10.18
Net branch income	\$32,673	\$14,466	\$98,433	\$128,225	\$34,948	\$42,984
Percent to average money employed	6.63	8.01	10.98	10.69	8.16	9.72
Percent to average total assets	5.66	7.55	7.49	9.54	7.08	8.61
Cost of borrowings	\$27,716	\$9,845	\$43,511	\$43,575	\$21,540	\$20,527
Percent to average money employed	5.62	5.45	4.85	3.63	5.03	4.64
Percent to average total assets	4.80	5.14	3.31	3.24	4.36	4.11
Pretax income	\$4,957	\$4,621	\$54,922	\$84,650	\$13,408	\$22,457
Percent to average money employed	1.01	2.56	6.13	7.06	3.13	5.08
Percent to average total assets	.86	2.41	4.18	6.30	2.72	4.50
Tax provision	\$1,301	\$1,545	\$29,649	\$42,650	\$4,688	\$9,382
Percent to average money employed	.26	.86	3.31	3.55	1.09	2.12
Percent to average total assets	.23	.81	2.26	3.17	.95	1.88
Net income	\$1,746	\$3,076	\$55,594	\$57,289	\$10,227	\$13,075
Percent to average money employed	1.45	1.70	6.20	4.77	2.39	2.96
Percent to average total assets	1.24	1.60	4.23	4.26	2.07	2.62
Percent to gross income		6.96				12.49
Percent to average net worth	10.91		13.58	15.40	13.64	17.33

¹ Includes net income from subsidiaries not consolidated.

Comparative statistics, rediscoun¹ and commercial, 1966

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	GAC combined	Commercial		Total commercial	Rediscoun ¹	Total rediscoun ¹ and commercial	Heller	Talcott
		Divers	Regular					
Average net worth	\$65,515						\$75,077	\$66,444
Average total assets	\$577,612	\$33,010	\$45,608	\$78,618	\$71,530	\$150,148	\$543,252	\$614,493
Average money employed	\$493,129	\$25,625	\$44,480	\$70,105	\$72,450	\$142,555	\$486,191	\$554,096
Gross income	\$75,582	\$3,597	\$4,498	\$8,095	\$7,075	\$15,170	\$65,303	\$62,125
Percent to average money employed	15.33	14.04	10.11	11.54	9.77	10.64	13.43	11.21
Percent to average total assets	13.09	10.90	9.86	10.30	9.89	10.10	12.02	10.11
Loss provision	\$9,810	\$189	\$1,341	\$1,530	\$765	\$2,295	\$8,089	\$7,022
Percent to average money employed	1.99	0.74	3.01	2.18	1.06	1.61	1.66	1.27
Percent to average total assets	1.70	0.57	2.94	1.95	1.07	1.53	1.49	1.14
Operating expense	\$33,099	\$1,690	\$813	\$2,503	\$1,165	\$3,668	\$19,108	\$17,814
Percent to average money employed	6.71	6.60	1.83	3.57	1.61	2.57	3.93	3.21
Percent to average total assets	5.73	5.12	1.78	3.18	1.63	2.44	3.52	2.90
Net branch income	\$32,673	\$1,718	\$2,344	\$4,062	\$5,145	\$9,207	\$38,106	\$37,289
Percent to average money employed	6.63	6.70	5.27	5.79	7.10	6.46	7.84	6.73
Percent to average total assets	5.66	5.21	5.14	5.17	7.19	6.13	7.01	6.07
Cost of borrowings	\$27,716	\$1,385	\$2,402	\$3,787	\$3,919	\$7,706	\$23,843	\$27,209
Percent to average money employed	5.62	5.41	5.40	5.40	5.41	5.41	4.91	4.91
Percent to average total assets	4.80	4.20	5.27	4.82	5.48	5.13	4.39	4.43
Pretax income	\$4,957	\$333	(\$58)	\$275	\$1,226	\$1,501	\$14,263	\$10,080
Percent to average money employed	1.01	1.30	(0.13)	0.39	1.69	1.05	2.93	1.82
Percent to average total assets	0.86	1.01	(0.13)	0.35	1.71	1.00	2.62	1.64
Tax provision	\$1,301	\$111	(\$19)	\$92	\$452	\$544	\$6,490	\$4,800
Percent to average money employed	0.26	0.43	(0.04)	0.13	0.62	0.38	1.33	0.87
Percent to average total assets	0.23	0.34	(0.04)	0.12	0.63	0.36	1.19	0.78
Net income	\$17,146	\$222	(\$39)	\$183	\$900	\$1,083	\$19,253	\$5,280
Percent to average money employed	3.45	0.87	(0.09)	0.26	1.24	0.76	1.90	0.95
Percent to average total assets	1.24	0.67	(0.09)	0.23	1.26	0.72	1.70	0.86
Percent to gross income		6.17		2.26	12.72			8.50
Percent to average net worth	10.91						12.32	7.95

¹ Includes net income from subsidiaries not consolidated.

Comparative statistics—Sales finance, 1966

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	GAC combined	GAC SF	Commercial credit	Associates	CIT
Average net worth	\$65,515		\$344,709	\$206,887	\$455,971
Average total assets	\$577,612	\$149,940	\$2,865,510	\$1,722,055	\$3,248,319
Average money employed	\$493,129	\$144,454	\$2,449,707	\$1,502,676	\$2,660,050
Gross income	\$75,582	\$16,195	\$282,993	\$183,155	\$326,154
Percent to average money employed	15.33	11.21	11.55	12.19	12.26
Percent to average total assets	13.09	10.80	9.88	10.64	10.04
Loss provision	\$9,810	\$593	\$23,537	\$19,289	\$21,720
Percent to average money employed	1.99	0.41	0.96	1.28	0.82
Percent to average total assets	1.70	0.40	0.82	1.12	0.67
Operating expense	\$33,099	\$6,439	\$102,188	\$62,114	\$112,800
Percent to average money employed	6.71	4.46	4.17	4.13	4.24
Percent to average total assets	5.73	4.29	3.57	3.61	3.47
Net branch income	\$32,673	\$9,163	\$157,268	\$101,752	\$191,634
Percent to average money employed	6.63	6.34	6.42	6.78	7.20
Percent to average total assets	5.66	6.11	5.49	5.91	5.90
Cost of borrowings	\$27,716	\$7,811	\$118,237	\$71,793	\$112,236
Percent to average money employed	5.62	5.41	4.83	4.78	4.22
Percent to average total assets	4.80	5.21	4.13	4.17	3.46
Pretax income	\$4,957	\$1,352	\$39,031	\$29,959	\$79,399
Percent to average money employed	1.01	0.93	1.59	2	2.98
Percent to average total assets	0.86	0.90	1.36	1.74	2.44
Tax provision	\$1,301	\$452	\$13,627	\$10,638	\$43,150
Percent to average money employed	0.26	0.31	0.55	0.71	1.62
Percent to average total assets	0.23	0.30	0.48	0.62	1.33
Net income	\$17,146	\$900	\$25,404	\$19,321	\$54,963
Percent to average money employed	3.45	0.62	1.04	1.29	2.06
Percent to average total assets	1.24	0.60	0.88	1.12	1.69
Percent to gross income		5.56	8.98	10.55	
Percent to average net worth	10.91		7.37	9.34	12.05

¹ Includes net income from subsidiaries not consolidated.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AVIATION SAFETY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's midair collision between a commercial jet and a small aircraft is a grim warning that this Nation is failing to provide adequate safety precautions for air travelers. At the same time, we are

endangering numerous people on the ground.

While our vote this week on appropriations for the Department of Transportation had nothing to do with the tragic crash, we should certainly pause and reflect on the wisdom of cutting 5 percent from the Federal Aviation Administration's budget. I voted against this cut because I think aviation safety will be affected by this reduction in funds.

With air traffic increasing at the rate of approximately 17 percent a year, I hardly consider this the appropriate time to reduce the FAA's budget. We must find ways to reduce Federal spending in many programs, but I strongly oppose cutbacks

that may result in unnecessary loss of life.

Mr. Speaker, in the last one-third of this decade we face an enormous crisis in transportation. The death toll on our highways is a great national tragedy. Hopefully, we are moving forward with new programs to make automobile travel safer. Aviation safety, however, is the greatest challenge we face in the entire field of transportation. As the speed of aircraft increase along with many more aircraft using the airspace, there is little doubt that our problems may multiply faster than our ability to solve them.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen has a right to expect the Government to take all

necessary precautions to insure the safety of all air travelers as well as people and property on the ground. The Congress will be derelict in its responsibility if adequate funds for aviation safety are not approved.

**DR. WALTER W. WILCOX, DIRECTOR
OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS**

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, some of those opponents of the feed grains and wheat programs who support repeal bills now pending in Congress have charged the Secretary of Agriculture with using statistics that are not supported by the economists as claimed and have criticized his Director of Agricultural Economics, Dr. Walter W. Wilcox.

They say Secretary Freeman distorts facts when he says elimination of Government farm supply-management programs would cut farm income by one-third, and question the scholarship of the Agriculture Department analysis upon which Secretary Freeman bases his contention. I do not see how any economists could conclude that farm income would not be reduced drastically but even those who might should not question the sincerity or ability of Dr. Wilcox. Mr. Speaker, I have known and admired Secretary Freeman's Director of Agricultural Economics for many, many years. This is the first time I have ever heard the distinguished Dr. Wilcox accused of poor scholarship.

Dr. Wilcox has degrees from Iowa State University, the University of Illinois, and Harvard University. He began his career in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1930. Later he taught at Iowa State University and the University of Wisconsin, and during World War II he served in the War Food Administration. Since 1956 he has served on occasion as a technical expert and consultant in Latin America and Africa for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. He was a visiting professor at the University of Minnesota and regents' professor at the University of California for several months in 1958 and 1966, respectively.

For 16 years prior to assuming his present role in January of 1967, Dr. Wilcox served as senior specialist in agriculture for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He has authored or coauthored several books and many articles on farm policy and related subjects.

To charge a man of such impressive credentials with poor scholarship is a serious matter, indeed, and I am pleased that Dr. Wilcox has responded to the charges.

I insert in the RECORD the text of Dr. Wilcox's letter, and the text of the docu-

ment in question, the USDA analysis entitled "Farm Program Needs, 1968-70."

Dr. Wilcox's letter convincingly answers the specific charges and does so with what seems to me admirable restraint.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 11, 1967.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Your letter and press release of July 10 is most surprising. The agricultural economists who counseled with me in the preparation of the report "Farm Program Needs, 1968-70" all sent me copies of their replies to your inquiry.

A full and accurate review of their replies should convince anyone that the conclusions that net farm income would drop $\frac{1}{3}$, if the farm price support and adjustment programs were dropped, are substantially what they would expect on the basis of their own studies.

In no case did they offer any serious criticism of either the assumptions or methods used in the analysis. I suggest you reread those letters from this point of view.

The general acceptance of this report which the economists expressed in their letters to you is not surprising. Its findings are similar to conclusions reached in other substantive studies in this area in recent years by Iowa State University, Pennsylvania State University, The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and the National Agricultural Advisory Commission's report "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead."

This report, "Farm Program Needs, 1968-70", was not prepared as a reply to any legislative proposal. Rather it was prepared to indicate the probable economic effects of "no-program" in the period 1968-70, in response to many suggestions from urban people who thought that since the surpluses were gone price support and adjustment programs were no longer needed.

I accompanied Secretary Freeman on his mid-western trip and when reporters asked if he was referring to the Curtis bill when discussing the economic effects of no-program, he pointed out that the Curtis bill did not eliminate the cotton program. He often asked them, however, how long they thought the cotton program would be continued if the wheat and feed grain programs were scrapped.

I realize you prefer to make as much of an issue as possible out of Secretary Freeman's reference to the university professors' counsel and advice, as concurrence in the conclusions. The report itself is clear on this point, however, and to the best of my knowledge this wording only occurred in the duplicated copies of the speeches at Hutchinson, Kansas; Ames, Iowa; and Decatur, Indiana. I was present at these meetings and he did not make this statement in his oral remarks.

Thus far not a single university professor has charged the Secretary with "political perversion of agricultural scholarship" or me with "poor scholarship" as a result of the issuance of this report.

Mr. Findley, I'm puzzled by your attack on this report and so are my university associates.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER W. WILCOX,
Director, Agricultural Economics.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
March 1967.

SUMMARY (FARM PROGRAM NEEDS 1968-70)

American farm products today are in a much better supply-demand balance than at any time in the past 12 years. Except for cotton, the burdensome surpluses of all crops accumulated in earlier years have been liquidated and domestic and export demand for farm products now is at record levels.

This does not mean, however, that the commodity price support and adjustment programs can safely be discontinued. In the absence of such programs for feed grains and cotton, production of these crops could exceed available market outlets, at prices near current levels, by as much as 25 million tons of feed grains and 4 million bales of cotton. Within a few years wheat production might again exceed desirable levels, depending on weather conditions here and elsewhere in the world.

Oversupplying markets with this unneeded production could cause corn prices to fall to around 70 cents a bushel, cotton prices to between 18 and 20 cents a pound, soybeans to about \$2.00, and wheat to around \$1.00 a bushel. Within a year or two, livestock supplies would increase and livestock prices would fall.

Despite larger output, farmers' cash receipts from marketings would decline. Net farm income could drop about one-third below the 1966 level. Government payments also would be lower, but the drop in net farm income might well be nearly twice as much as the reduction in government costs.

If, however, weather conditions should be unfavorable, resulting in a short harvest, or if exports increased more than expected, the acreage adjustment programs could be modified as necessary to assure continued ample supplies for all domestic and export needs.

In preparing this report, analysts in the Department of Agriculture benefited from the advice and counsel of nationally recognized agricultural economists at Iowa State University, University of Minnesota, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, University of Wisconsin, Ohio State University, North Carolina State University, Harvard University, and Stanford University.

During the period 1968 through 1970, an imbalance is expected to continue between the production capacity of our farm plant and market outlets at stable farm prices. Most of this excess in production capacity exists in feed grains and cotton.

Suppose that these excess acres were not idled under annual diversion programs, but instead were brought back into production by farmers during the 1968-70 period. In that case, total net farm income might well fall over \$5 billion below 1966 levels. The net farm income drop would be even greater if the additional 10 million acres idled under the long term Conservation Reserve programs also were brought back into production.

The yields assumed in this analysis of the 1968-70 period are based on the Department of Agriculture's Yield Estimates Committee projections. Utilization estimates are the combined judgment of the analysts within the Department of Agriculture, after consultation with trade and university personnel.

It is assumed that the economy will grow at a rate sufficient to increase the per capita purchasing power by about 2.3 percent per year. Our population is assumed to increase at the rate of about 1.4 percent per year. World tensions are assumed to continue during the next four years, but will not materially alter the present international trade patterns. It is further assumed that the Food for Freedom program, while placing greater emphasis on self-help, will continue to require significant quantities of U.S. produced food and fiber.

If the annual adjustment programs were discontinued during the 1968 to 1970 period, the utilization of the excess productive capacity would result in a general and significant decrease in farm prices. The level of all major grains and livestock prices would be affected—even though the excess capacity today is centered primarily in feed grains and cotton.

After allowing for shifts in acreage between crops, feed grain prices would fall to a level where corn prices would probably be around 70 cents. Cotton prices would fluctuate.

tuates, ranging between 18 and 20 cents per pound.

Soybean prices would probably be reduced to around \$1.90 to \$2.00 per bushel. Wheat would fall to about \$1.00 to \$1.10 per bushel.

Further—because of uncertainty—acres, prices and utilization of each commodity group would fluctuate from year to year. If the production of one commodity in the first year was significantly expanded relative to the others, sharply lower prices for that commodity would follow.

With no annual adjustment programs and no commodity loans during the 1968-70 period, it is estimated that total crop output would be at least 15 percent greater than in 1966. Since there would not be any rebuilding of grain reserve stocks, livestock output, however, would average over 10 percent larger at the end of the period. A decline of over 20 percent in the price level of all crops and nearly 10 percent for livestock would be expected by 1970. Despite the greater output, total cash receipts from marketings by farmers would drop. The loss of government payments also would be significant.

Farm production expenses would continue to rise somewhat. The lower livestock and grain prices would reduce the costs of purchased feeds and feeder animals. But these lower costs would be more than offset by the added costs of machinery, fertilizer, lime and other nonfarm purchased inputs needed to produce the increased volume of crops and livestock.

Net farm income might well fall by about \$5 billion below the 1966 figure of \$16.3 billion. The net result of discontinuing annual adjustment programs would be a drop of about a third in net farm income from 1966—or back to about the level of income in 1957.

In addition, grain and cotton carryover stocks would be at a lower level than the national reserves that otherwise will be carried, partly as a result of Commodity Credit loan programs, during the 1968-70 period.

In response to the lower feed grain prices that would accompany elimination of the feed grain and wheat programs, production of livestock would increase. The major production increase would center in hogs and poultry. Increases in total numbers of cattle are limited by the size of the breeding herds and the length of time required to increase numbers. Hogs and poultry, on the other hand, can be stepped up in production much more rapidly.

By the same token, the price impact from the increase in feed grain output would fall the heaviest on hogs and poultry. The lightest impact would be on dairy. The effect on beef prices would be intermediate—here the impact would stem also from the increased competition from additional market supplies of pork and poultry.

If acreage diversion programs were discontinued, but commodity loans were retained—although at lower levels than recent market prices—the farm income decline would be tempered and slowed down. However, government-held surplus stocks would again accumulate, creating greater problems in later years. At any moderate level of price support there would be a heavy movement of commodities under government loan.

To the extent that this removal of stocks from market would reduce commercial grain marketings and restrain livestock production, the decline in farm income would not be as great. But the net commodity accumulation into government hands would be substantial, with the cost to the government increased accordingly. And the CCC would be left with surplus stocks in which its investment was higher than the market value.

CONDITIONS MAKING ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS UNNECESSARY

If market requirements were greater, or because of unfavorable weather crop yields

were lower than estimated in this analysis—or if a combination of these two should occur—then acreage diversion programs might not be needed.

There is little likelihood of a sharp increase in domestic demand over that projected in this study. Thus, any increased market requirements would have to come largely through increased foreign trade.

If exports of feed grains could be increased some 75 percent above those currently estimated for the 1968-70 period, soybean exports could be increased by a little over 10 percent, and common exports increased 60 to 70 percent, no adjustment programs would be needed to maintain farm income near recent levels. Exports of feed grains by 1970 under such conditions would be nearly double the figure currently estimated as likely for that year with a continuation of present programs. Soybean exports would need to be nearly 15 percent higher.

Also, a balance might be achieved while maintaining farm price levels if, due to unfavorable weather, crop yields remained near recent levels. The corn yield would need to stabilize at 68 to 70 bushels per acre. Grain sorghum yields would need to remain at 48 to 50 bushels per acre.

Yields for cotton under conditions of no adjustment programs and large acreages would be lower than current levels. There has been an upward trend in yields since the end of World War II and only national or eco-

nomics disaster would force yields to balancing levels.

Obviously if yields fall below projected levels and stocks are at or below desirable levels, appropriate changes could be made in the annual adjustment programs.

CONCLUSION

Agriculture's surplus problem has been significantly diminished, as a result of the elimination of the surplus carryover stocks. According to earlier studies, if farm programs—both annual and long-term diversion—had been terminated in earlier years while these large surplus carryover stocks were hanging over the market, net realized farm income would have been reduced about 50 percent. This analysis indicates that with the elimination of surplus grain stocks, if the annual programs were now terminated (while continuing the long-term cropland diversion programs), realized net farm income would be reduced by over 30 percent.

Net farm income would fall by more than \$5 billion from the 1966 level. But government costs of the farm programs would be reduced by only \$3 billion. Thus the decline in farm income would be substantially greater than the reduction in government costs.

Such a decline in net income obviously would have an adverse effect on farm land values. Farmers' net worth probably would decline much more than the reduction in net income.

Farm output, prices, and income in 1966 and in 1968-70 in absence of programs¹

Item	Unit	1966	1968-70 without programs	Percent difference
Prices:				
All products	Index 1910-14=100	265	227	-14.3
Livestock	do	292	265	-9.2
Crops	do	235	183	-22.1
Output:				
Livestock	Index 1957-59=100	111	123	+10.8
Crops	do	112	130	+16.1
Cash receipts:				
Livestock	Billion dollars	24.7	25.1	+1.6
Crops	do	18.2	16.7	-8.2
All products	do	42.9	41.8	-3.6
Government payments	do	3.3	0.3	-90.9
Nonmoney income	do	3.4	2.7	-20.6
Gross farm income	do	49.5	44.8	-9.5
Farm production expenses	do	33.2	33.8	+1.8
Realized net farm income	do	16.3	11.0	-32.5

¹ Assumes a continuation of current tobacco, peanuts, and rice commodity programs and no change in the current trend of CAP and conservation reserve programs.

AN ARGUMENT FOR RAT CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has often occurred to me that, if Government would occasionally pay more attention to the trees instead of concentrating on the forest, life in our cities would be more livable. By that I mean that we become so preoccupied at times with vast master plans for renewal and redevelopment of our cities that we tend to forget the people who are living in them.

This is one of the reasons I introduced a bill to implement rodent control. Many of the plans for rehabilitation and renewal in our cities do not have immediacy of a rodent control program,

which can offer a specific cure for a bad situation in our cities. We are all familiar with the sickening stories of the nightly combat that is conducted in slums between man and rat—the stories of children bitten—the threat of disease.

In my home city of Philadelphia the health department has a rule of thumb in measuring the rat population. There is one rat for every man, woman, and child in that city. That means we have 2 million rats.

What is more the problem of rats is not confined to the slums. It exists wherever there is substandard housing. Rats can be found on any vacant lot, in any sewer or on any street or alleyway. In Philadelphia, the problem is getting more serious every day. Last year, for example, the city received 5,000 complaints from homeowners alone. While the health department does a commendable job, its budget for rodent control is a modest \$85,000. Some officials in the city government believe that we are barely holding our own in rodent control and that the situation has all the earmarks of getting out of hand.

My hope is to see this measure and similar concrete, specific proposals, become part of an overall attack on the problem of the cities. As presently worded, this program would be established as an individual effort within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It would enable cities like Philadelphia to apply for 50 percent of the cost of a local rodent control program which would include training of personnel in the use of new and improved methods of control and materials.

As part of a general urban development act, it could be effectively incorporated with other measures designed to treat sewage problems, clean up vacant lots and rehabilitate substandard housing. It could also serve as a useful addition to urban renewal legislation. One of the most severe aspects of renewal is that it aggravates the rodent problem. A useful provision in future urban renewal legislation could, for example, require that no renewal can take place without appropriate programs for rodent control in the designated areas.

There is a deep and immediate need to improve the present conditions of city life, not only for the long range, but for the immediate cares of the people who today and tomorrow are seeking a better way of life in our cities.

THEODORE GRANIK'S "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW" BROUGHT BACK TO WASHINGTON ON WETA-TV

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Theodore Granik's time-honored television program, "Youth Wants To Know," has, through the years, provided some of this Nation's finest news and information shows.

For many years, I have had the pleasure of knowing Ted Granik—a real pioneer in both radio and television. He has provided much of the leadership and imagination that has made the radio and television industry what it is today.

In this connection, I am happy to note that "Youth Wants To Know" is now being made available to the Washington, D.C., public through WETA-TV, the educational station in our Nation's Capital.

It is my understanding that Mrs. Allie S. Freed, president of Buckingham and Claremont communities, is responsible for making "Youth Wants To Know" available on WETA-TV. Through the leadership of Mrs. Freed, the Buckingham and Claremont communities are performing a most valuable public service in making these programs available and providing for a better informed public.

I hope this example will encourage others to support public service programs such as "Youth Wants To Know" in an effort to keep the American public bet-

ter informed on the vital issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of appearing on WETA-TV on June 20 in the first of the new series of "Youth Wants To Know" television programs in the Washington area. I appeared with Mr. Granik and a panel of students from the Walter Johnson High School.

I place a copy of the transcript of this program in the RECORD:

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

Youth Wants to Know Presents: Congressman Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas.

Mr. GRANIK. Youth Wants to Know—the penetrating, provocative questions of America's young people, created and produced by Theodore Granik.

Welcome to Youth Wants to Know. Our guest is Congressman Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas. Congressman Patman is Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and Vice Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. Throughout his distinguished career, the Congressman has been a fighter for plentiful credit on reasonable terms. The state of our nation's economy will be the subject of many questions by our panel of Walter Johnson High School students.

Let's begin with you, Tom.

Question: Congressman Patman, just what is the state of the nation's economy right now?

Representative PATMAN. I think it is in good condition, real good condition. We, of course, have a war going on. The worst thing against our economy is the high interest rates that have been established the last few years. And these high interest rates are imposing a terrific burden on us right now on the national debt. We have paid twice as much interest on the national debt—\$14 billion a year—the second largest item in the budget—we are paying twice as much as we should pay according to our experiences in the past that were proven to be good. And high interest rates are upsetting the economy. In New York, they are even resorting to gambling, a lottery, as a source of funds because high interest has taken so much of their money that they don't have an adequate source of funds. I'm opposed to it myself.

Question: Congressman, if the ceiling of 4½% interest on long term bonds is removed, what will be the effect on well, say, the small businessman?

Representative PATMAN. It will just hurt them because small business is hurt by high interest rates. Big business is not hurt. Number one, big business there in the 50% bracket, they pay just half that much interest effective rate. Furthermore, they can use retained earnings. Little business can't. Furthermore, they can go public if the interest is not satisfactory. Little business can't. The higher the interest rate is, the harder it is on the little businessman.

Question: Do you feel the war in Vietnam is necessary for a healthy economy?

Representative PATMAN. No, I don't think anybody would consider that. I hope not.

Question: What do you believe will be the effect of the 6% surtax?

Representative PATMAN. Well, of course, that could have some effect to siphon off money if we have inflation. Unless we have inflation, we don't need it. The best way to stop inflation is to impose taxes and take the tax money and pay it on the national debt then that is an effective way to stop inflation. But if you take it away from one crowd or one group and let other people spend it, that's inflationary itself. So if they use that money to pay on the national debt, it would be wonderful, and a deterrent to inflation.

Question: Congressman Patman, you are

quite vocal in your opposition to tight money. How would you suggest we fight inflation?

Representative PATMAN. Fight inflation? Just like I said. Impose taxes to siphon off the excess money and pay it on the national debt. That is the most effective way.

Question: Congressman, I was under the impression that—you gave the impression—I'm not sure—that the Federal Reserve Board members were using the information that they received from the Open Market Committee meeting for their own purposes or to benefit themselves?

Representative PATMAN. That's right. They're human beings and human beings always do that. Now see, they have secret sessions down there on Constitution Avenue at the Federal Reserve Board every three weeks. They are very secretive. Nobody is supposed to know. Why? Because if they get ahold of that information, they can go into the stock market, commodities markets, different things like that. And profit, make millions of dollars a day sometimes, on the information they have. Therefore, they want to keep it down. But they overlook the fact that there are about 2,000 people in the Federal Reserve System that get that information. Now out of that 2,000, naturally there are heads of big concerns, don't you think they would use it to their advantage?

Mr. GRANIK. You mean it is a confidential release?

Representative PATMAN. It is not a release. It is just knowledge.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you think that these meetings and the books of the Federal Reserve Board should be open for public scrutiny?

Representative PATMAN. Why certainly. It should be out in the open. Now the Moss Bill, which will be effective in July, requires them to open it up. It is just not necessary to be in secret. Why should a few people have knowledge—that's like Russia. That's the way they do it in Russia. We don't want to do it that way. It's not necessarily just for that reason, but it is just not a good thing to do. We shouldn't operate our government in secret.

Question: Congressman Patman, I was wondering how you felt about the Presidential appointment of a man who has only a businessman's knowledge of economics to the Federal Reserve Board as in the case of William Sherrill?

Representative PATMAN. Oh I think it is fine. I know William Sherrill. I've known him for a long period of time. He is a banker and a savings and loan man, and all that. But he is a wonderful outstanding American citizen. He is one of our best and I trust him. I think he is all right.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you think the war in Vietnam, the cost of it, has hindered the present Poverty Program to such an extent that a complete revision will be necessary?

Representative PATMAN. Not necessarily. We could carry on both. But if we had not had these high interest rates, it wouldn't have bothered us at all. But we're paying \$7 billion a year more interest than we should pay. In addition to that, we are paying \$14 billion a year interest more than we should pay for the last 15 years, we've been doing that under William McChesney Martin. He is a pretty expensive luxury.

Question: Congressman Patman, every year Congress seems to raise the debt ceiling. Of what value is the debt ceiling if it has to be lifted every year?

Representative PATMAN. Well, it is something to lift, you know, we've got something that is kind of a guide to go by. And my personal opinion is that if the Congress went ahead and appropriated the money anyway, that the debt ceiling wouldn't mean anything because the most recent act of Congress would prevail. But I think it is well to have a guideline, something to shoot to

or shoot at, and so as to keep us from trying to at least spend too much money. I think to that extent it is all right.

Question: Congressman Patman, a question that might be closer to you, what do you feel about the oil depletion allowance?

Representative PATMAN. Well, I'm for honest oil depletion allowance. Now the worst steal on earth is letting these big companies have a deduction on their income tax for depletion in Iran, and these Middle East countries, or anywhere else outside of the United States, even Mexico or South America. Now we can justify depletion up to a point, because it is depleting our capital. But why should we let them have a tax deduction for depleting the capital in another country. That's something I can't understand.

Question. Congressman Patman, do you feel that President Johnson's reappointment of Mr. Martin was a personal slap in the face?

Representative PATMAN. Oh no. It was a terrible thing for him to do, but looking at it from his standpoint, of course Mr. Martin has been giving these fellows \$14 billion a year extra interest and, of course, they think a lot of him. And the banking community and the financial community and by reappointing him he keeps the confidence of these different groups that are so powerful in our economy. At the same time he is going to appoint another person in Mr. Shepherdson's place. I opposed his extension, and he agreed with me on that. He didn't extend Mr. Shepherdson's time, but he appointed another man. That gives him four on that Board. That's all he needs anyway.

Question: Then you feel that his reappointment was to appease the Wall Street bankers?

Representative PATMAN. Well, I wouldn't say appease. It was just using maybe a little political savvy and judgment of what could be done there and still not hurt the public interest, because he was appointing another man which would give him four on the Board anyway. And if Martin wanted to go the other way, why he would be deterred by these four members to three.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you think Congress should give the go ahead to the anti ballistic missile system?

Representative PATMAN. Well, of course, I don't know as much about that as people who serve on those committees. But offhand, my personal opinion would be that it should.

Question: Congressman Patman, is the housing industry in this country in a depression, and if it is, how did this come about?

Representative PATMAN. In a terrible depression, of the 1930's type. It is in the worst depression. Because of high interest rates my dear friend. They were unnecessary.

Question: Would you like to see some Congressional action on the housing depression?

Representative PATMAN. Yes, I certainly would, and the lower interest rates started down, you see. Mr. Johnson is a low interest rate man—and they have been going down, and Mr. Fowler came before the Ways and Means Committee the other day and advocated taking the lid off of that 4½% rate on long term government bonds, which I thought was a terrible thing. It was shocking to me. That rate has been there since 1918, almost 60 years, and you know what it means. It means that we keep rates down by keeping the long term government rate down. Now if we take that rate off, they claim the rates will be lower. That doesn't make sense. Raise rates to make them lower. It just doesn't happen that way. That rate should be retained and should not be moved, and I am going to oppose the Administration on that, because I think it is clearly wrong, against the interest of the people. They are already paying too much in interest. If you take that lid off, they're going way up higher again.

Question: Congressman, will the agreement reached at the Kennedy round of talks in Geneva have any adverse effect on the small businessman?

Representative PATMAN. We don't know enough about them yet. I don't think they will, unless there is something in there that I don't understand. I don't see where they would interfere between little business and big business.

Question: Congressman Patman, I was under the impression that it had been tried for several years in Congress to get changes through concerning the Federal Reserve Board. And I was wondering if you think that the proposals you have made as to the changes will be passed this year in the Congress?

Representative PATMAN. We are trying to get them passed, but, of course, we're up against a big lobby. You take the banker's lobby is the biggest lobby in America. They've got more funds and they interlock with all other big companies, and it is not only their lobby, but when they need help, they call on the lobbies of other big concerns, like General Motors and Ford and these different foundations. They have big lobbies, you know. And it is such a powerful lobby, it depends on our ability to get members to look at this strictly from the standpoint of the public interest. That's the way we should do it.

Question: Congressman, you seem to be an advocate of the small businessmen. Do you think he has as much prestige in society now as he used to?

Representative PATMAN. Oh no. They have been crushed—unmercifully crushed, many of them have, without reason.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you believe that appointments to the Federal Reserve Board make it swing toward political—toward a political organization?

Representative PATMAN. Oh no, but at the same time, we don't want it a banker's organization, like it is now. Why should the banks that profit from high interest be allowed to impose a high interest? People on that Board should not be connected with the banks or any other group. They ought to be public interest people, dedicated to serve the public interest. And that is the kind of a Board we need. We don't need one that is run by the bankers.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you think the federal government is giving enough help to the small businessman?

Representative PATMAN. In extension of that, pardon me just a moment—I'll get to that. You know, you wouldn't have the Interstate Commerce Commission composed of presidents of railroads to fix the freight rates. You wouldn't have the broadcasting industry run by people directly interested in the broadcasting industry. You need dedicated people who look at this thing from the public interest, not feeling either way but just the public interest. Now on the Small Business Administration, you asked me if we have done enough to help small business. We have proposed laws but in the administration of the laws, they have not been as effective as we have wanted them to be. Small business has not gotten a good deal ever since Ted Granik and I have known each other, for 30 years. He is always an advocate of small business. I was on his station WOR in New York, and have been with him all during the years. But you see although we have advocated and secured the adoption of many bills intended to help small business, they haven't always resulted in the help that we expected to have.

Mr. GRANIK. It was quite a job to get small business a government contract during the war years.

Representative PATMAN. That's right. You know right now people can get a little loan to fight among other small businessmen from the Small Business Administration, but they can never get enough money to get in competition with the big man, because that source

of funds is not available now. They've got to go to the big banks to get it and who is on that Board? Of course, the steel companies have representatives on there, and all the other interests that have Directors on that Board, and anybody wanting a loan couldn't get it. We tried it. We had a steel mill down in my district and we wanted a loan of \$75 million. We went to the bank and they were going to help us through New York. We got to New York and they had a big Director's room, and there was U.S. Steel's Director, and there was all the rest of them around there. They tried to talk us out of it. And then, of course, we went back and then we went to the insurance companies in Dallas, which are pretty big, and they were going to help us. But we landed in New York again with the big insurance companies. They were going to make the \$75 million loan, but there was Jones and Laughlin, Bethlehem, you know, the same Directors, representatives of the same steel companies. They tried to talk us out of it. Then I came down to Mr. Roosevelt, and I asked him to have Mr. Jesse Jones there, and I presented the case for \$75 million. The steel men were there, and the steel men said, "Oh, it would be a waste of public funds." They said they can't make steel down there in east Texas. They don't know now, and furthermore their ore is not good, and their coal won't make good coke for making pig iron. They gave every reason. But Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Jesse Jones listened to it for about two or three days. They were very attentive. They were interested in this. I pointed out at the map—I said, Mr. President take the Soo Canal up there. One well placed bomb by the Germans would put us out of the steel making business for eighteen months. He said, "We realize that. That's the reason we want new steel plants." And we convinced them and we got \$75 million. We built the plant, and the best steel workers in the world were from the surrounding countryside there, these farm boys. They were taught. They were soon able to make the same wages they make in Birmingham or Pittsburgh, and then the result was, after twenty years, the steel company had paid income taxes of more than \$75 million. The men who worked there had paid more than \$75 million. The government has its money back with interest. You can't improve on that.

Question: Congressman Patman, I believe in your proposals for changes in the Federal Reserve Board you wish to shorten the term of the members that are appointed. Do you feel that if this happens that the Board would be under political pressure?

Representative PATMAN. Oh, no. Listen, you should want it under political pressure. Then somebody could be held responsible if they put us into a depression unnecessarily. Like it is, they are non-elected officials, there's no way to reach them. If they make a decision that ruins the country, we can't reach them at all. If they are elected officials, they can be reached right quick, but they're not going to make that mistake if they're elected officials.

Question: Congressman, there has been a lot of talk about Congressional ethics with Mr. Dodd and Mr. Powell. What do you think should be done about this question?

Representative PATMAN. Without reference to the two you mentioned, I wouldn't want to pick out anybody, but I think we should have a good code of ethics in the Congress. Of all places, there is where we need it the most. And there should be no conflict of interest. That is what I am opposing the Federal Reserve on is too much conflict of interest in this thing, too many reasons why they do things against the public interest to help something that they're more interested in. And so I think we should have a good strong code of ethics.

Question: Congressman Patman, if you were on the Interstate Commerce Commis-

sion, would you approve the merger of IT&T and ABC?

Representative PATMAN. I don't know whether I would or not. I haven't studied it. Offhand, I don't look with favor on those mergers. You see, our country is becoming merger-minded. You take two concerns that merge, that means that all of the managers of one of them doesn't have any management authority any more. It is putting people out of business as working for them. And I don't look with favor on these mergers at all, irrespective of that one, because we have had too many mergers. We should encourage private enterprise, locally owned and conducted by local people, as much as possible.

Question: Congressman, do you think that Congressmen should use the money received at testimonial dinners in any way they choose?

Representative PATMAN. I never did have one like that myself, and personally I wouldn't have one.

Mr. GRANIK. You've been elected twenty times, haven't you?

Representative PATMAN. Yes. And more than that. I was in Congress, in the legislature with Lyndon Johnson's father. He and I were desk mates, Sam Johnson. I knew Lyndon. He came in there one day when he was twelve years old. He was about six feet tall, it looked like. And that's when I met him. And I've known him ever since.

Mr. GRANIK. There are only two members, two of our friends, two of them who have been there a little longer than you. That is the Speaker, John McCormack, and Emanuel Celler.

Representative PATMAN. That's right, the two of them. And, of course, I was in the legislature four years. I fought the Ku Klux, you know, they threatened to run me out of the state. And I had some terrific fights like that nine years before I came to Congress.

Mr. GRANIK. And yet you like it every two years?

Representative PATMAN. Well I was District Attorney five years—four years—about five. I dealt with the thugs from Chicago and New York that had come to Texarkana. You see, Texarkana has four states right there that converge, and it is easy for criminals to go from one state to another, and we had more than our share there when I was District Attorney.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you oppose the concept of tax sharing, returning a fixed percentage of tax receipts for expenditures in health, etc.?

Representative PATMAN. You mean to let the state Governors handle it any way they want to?

Question: More or less, yes.

Representative PATMAN. Well, of course, I'm opposed to that. That would be cannibalizing our government, the federal government. We have a great responsibility. We have the responsibility for the security of our nation. We can't afford to be promising certain big hunks of it out in advance because it might jeopardize the security of our nation. Not only that, under the Constitution, we can't appropriate money unless it is for something definite, for a good cause, and for, you know, the general welfare of the nation. And if we were to appropriate money to the different states without knowing how it was going to be used, I wouldn't consider that Constitutional. And many of the states don't use their full taxing power anyway. And are we going to subsidize a state that is not using its full taxing power because it hasn't got enough money, why we'd have to consider that.

Question: Congressman Patman, would you approve of President Johnson's idea that Representatives be given four year terms?

Representative PATMAN. No, I'm opposed to it, because—I've always been opposed to it. I think this government is wonderful. The House of Representatives, 435 members, are

elected every two years. That means that the people have charge because the principal bills like revenue and appropriations must originate there in that body only. They can't originate any other place. And when the people have charge by electing a new House of Representatives every two years if they want to, they have charge of the purse strings of the nation. And if the Members get off too far, why they can get them back.

Mr. GRANIK. At the end of the year, they almost have to be preparing to run again.

Representative PATMAN. That's right, and the best place to run is doing your duty right. That's the best place to run.

Mr. GRANIK. You mean in the halls of Congress?

Representative PATMAN. Yes sir. That's the best place to campaign.

Question: Congressman, would you vote to stop college deferments in the draft?

Representative PATMAN. I don't know too much about that. Like they've been doing it, I assume has been all right. I think it seems to have worked all right. And I think it is contemplated that we pass just about the same law, isn't it, Ted?

Mr. GRANIK. Yes.

Question: Congressman, would you support the taxation of certain tax exempt organizations, like the National Rifle Association?

Representative PATMAN. Well, I happen to be Chairman of the Foundation Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, and we have been investigating the privately controlled foundations, and we have made some shocking disclosures. And among them, we have shown where tens of millions of dollars have been evaded that tax money should have been paid on. And the Internal Revenue Service has actually collected tens of millions of dollars by reasons of our studies. Now I wouldn't want to pass on the merits of any particular one, but where they use it for tax evasion or avoidance as a gimmick, or something like that, they should be brought to justice.

Question: Congressman, what about taxing incomes churches receive as a result of investments?

Representative PATMAN. Well, of course that's traditional policy of our government, you know, that a church can have a securities of their own, and not pay taxes. That's a big question to consider, changing it either way. I wouldn't know just how we'd draw the line, but it is worthy of consideration.

Question: Representative Patman, would you like to see the ceilings on income for people earning Social Security or veterans benefits removed?

Representative PATMAN. Well, I would be in favor of doing that normally. Of course, there might be some cases where it wouldn't be fair, but generally I think they've just been a little bit too tight, particularly among the groups that you mentioned.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you think the cost of campaigning and trying to get elected has risen to such an extent that the small man who doesn't have any backing can't possibly rise in politics?

Representative PATMAN. Well, if he has a good idea, you don't need too much money. You know, someone once said that the most powerful thing on earth is an idea whose time has come. And a politician with an idea whose time has come doesn't have any.

Mr. GRANIK. But he still has to buy time on the air.

Representative PATMAN. He's got to buy time but he's got plenty of support if he has got a good idea. And if the people believe he is a good conscientious person who will do the right thing, he'll get lots of support from people generally.

Question: Could you give me some idea of what you believe would be the strongest Republican ticket against Johnson in 1968?

Representative PATMAN. Well I don't think they could get up a very strong ticket. That's

my feeling about it. I don't think it is possible. The Democrats are split, but the Republicans are split worse.

Question: Whom do you believe would have the best chance, though?

Representative PATMAN. Oh, I don't know of one now that would have a good chance.

Question: Congressman Patman, I was wondering if you had any opinions as to U Thant's frequent comment that Vietnam is simply the starting point of World War III?

Representative PATMAN. That's always a possibility that this fight could result finally in a clash between nations, World War III. But I don't think it is necessary—I don't think anybody could say it is necessarily a step in the direction of World War III.

Question: Congressman Patman, do you think that Social Security earnings should be taken out as the cost of income goes up?

Representative PATMAN. Social Security earnings—well they are taken off now in the Social Security law, as I understand it. The companies pay half of it, you know, and they deduct it.

Question: Congressman Patman, I was wondering if you knew—had any opinion as to changing in the voting age?

Representative PATMAN. Yes. I'm for 18 years. I have a Constitutional Amendment pending right now introduced the first day that Congress met to change the Constitution to let them vote at 18.

Mr. GRANIK. Why Congressman?

Representative PATMAN. Well, because at 18 now I think people are better qualified to vote than they used to be at 21 or 25. In other words, people are just better educated. They are more sophisticated, and they are more knowledgeable at 18 than they used to be at a much older age, and I think that they have sufficient maturity and knowledge to justify all of them voting at 18.

Question: Congressman, then you would put in the Amendment an actual age for voting rather than leaving it up to the states as it has been?

Representative PATMAN. Yes I would. No, I'd leave it to the states to do it, but make it possible for them to vote at 18, if they want to, like in Georgia, and maybe Alabama and one or two other states now.

Question: Do you think this has any possible chance to get through?

Representative PATMAN. Yes I do, because there has been a sort of a feeling the last couple of years in favor of lowering the voting age.

Question: What do you think the results will be if Mr. Wallace runs as an independent candidate in 1968?

Representative PATMAN. Well, he won't get anywhere. I don't think he will get anywhere.

Mr. GRANIK. What progress is he making now throughout the country?

Representative PATMAN. I don't think he is making any. He is just getting together the fellows who are that way anyway. It is just kind of a mutual society of friends that believe the same way.

Question: Representative Patman, do you think Adam Clayton Powell will drop his fight in the courts and come back to Congress since he has been reelected?

Representative PATMAN. Oh I wouldn't want to express an opinion on that. That involves a lot of questions. It is up to him. If he wants to be in Congress, he has an opportunity right now to come back there and say I want to be sworn in, because he could be sworn in right now.

Mr. GRANIK. I'm sorry to interrupt. I know there are many more questions, but there just isn't time. Thank you, Congressman Patman, for being our guest on Youth Wants To Know. Our thanks to you, panel, for your most interesting questions, and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. Please join us again next week on Youth Wants To Know, where through the eyes of youth, we

explore, we discover, we measure the important people, ideas and events of our time. And now this is Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

Produced by: Theodore Granik.
Associate Producer: Jay B. Cutler.
Assistant to the Producer: Susan Gallagher.

MAIL-ORDER MURDER

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill H.R. 11616, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the control of the interstate traffic in firearms. I feel that the passage of this legislation, to be cited as the "State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967," is not only long overdue but is absolutely necessary for the future safety and welfare of all the American people.

This legislation will place controls on the business of buying, selling, and transporting handguns and other firearms in interstate and foreign commerce.

In essence, the bill applies to firearms importers, firearms manufacturers, and firearms dealers. My bill, which has been recommended by the President of the United States and the National Crime Commission, would require these businessmen to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and to conduct their firearms activities in the manner established in the bill.

The bill would restrict the interstate shipment of firearms to manufacturers, dealers, and importers, thus eliminating the present flow of \$1 million in expensive mail-order weapons annually. Many of these guns go to juveniles, persons with criminal records, and those who are emotionally unstable.

It would prohibit the retail sale of all firearms to youths, and the sale of handguns to persons who are not residents in the State of purchase—thus helping the States to enforce their own firearms regulations.

It would sharply curtail the importation of foreign military surplus weapons, which account for the bulk of the cheap mail-order trade, and the bulk of the large-caliber weapons sold in the United States.

H.R. 11616 would not prevent or curtail the right of the individual to acquire or possess handguns, rifles or shotguns for the purpose of sport, hunting or self-defense; require individuals to register, or acquire a permit for, their handguns, rifles, or shotguns; or prohibit sportsmen from carrying their shotguns or rifles across State lines. This bill will not inconvenience any legitimate sportsman, who may buy his rifle or shotgun either in his own State, or in person in another State, so long as he complies with State laws.

Mr. Speaker, how many more cracks of rifles, shotguns and even automatic weapons in the wrong hands, leading to death in our Nation's streets, must we witness before the Congress acts? As one of our Nation's leading tabloids said the other day:

It is almost as easy to buy and transport a killing weapon from one state to another as it is to smuggle a carton of cigarettes to avoid the tax.

Mr. Speaker, basically this bill would subject deadly weapons to a lesser control than we have always imposed on automobiles, liquor, or prescription drugs. The use and sale of these things are carefully regulated by Federal, State, and local governments. The same should be true of firearms.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that enactment of this bill would be this Congress' most important contribution to the war against crime.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WYATT (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona), for today, July 20, on account of official business.

Mr. McMILLAN (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for Wednesday and Thursday, July 19 and July 20, on account of death of his brother.

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. STEED, for 1 hour, July 27.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. WINN), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEVINE and to include extraneous matter on discussion of the rule on H.R. 11000.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WINN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLLIER in two instances.

Mr. COWGER.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. GIAMMO.

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. 1577. An act to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 24, 1968, 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:

941. A letter from the Acting Director, Civil Defense, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment during the quarter ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

942. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract to provide an automobile service station and merchandise facilities for the public within the Jeff Busby Park site of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Miss., for a period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1972, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-249; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11641. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2477. A bill for the relief of John J. McGrath (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4404. A bill for the relief of Hubert Ashe; with amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5368. A bill for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6666. A bill for the relief

of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette; with amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10932. A bill for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 743. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 9826) entitled "A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 11601. A bill to safeguard the consumer in connection with the utilization of credit by requiring full disclosure of the terms and conditions of finance charges in credit transactions or in offers to extend credit, by establishing maximum rates of finance charges in credit transactions, by authorizing the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue regulations dealing with the excessive use of credit for the purpose of trading in commodity futures contracts affecting consumer prices, by establishing machinery for the use during periods of national emergency of temporary controls over credit to prevent inflationary spirals, by prohibiting the garnishment of wages, by creating the National Commission on Consumer Finance to study and make recommendations on the need for further regulation of the consumer finance industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr. FINO, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 11602. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 11603. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 11604. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 11605. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which tickets to professional, semiprofessional, and amateur baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and soccer games will be furnished at no cost by local police officers and firemen to individuals under the age of 19, particularly such individuals who are economically underprivileged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11606. 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. 11607. 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. CURTIS:

H.R. 11608. A bill to provide refunds of manufacturers' excise taxes under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 11609. A bill to designate the Town Bluff Dam and the B. A. Steinhagen Lake on the Neches River, Tex., as Dam B Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 11610. A bill to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 11611. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11612. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11613. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make widows of servicemen who die on active duty in the Armed Forces eligible for educational assistance under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 11614. A bill to amend the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to the discontinuance of passenger-train operations and to impose an 18-month moratorium on the discontinuance of any passenger service by rail; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 11615. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that product advertising shall not be deemed to constitute the discussion of issues of public importance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11616. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 11617. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that product advertising shall not be deemed to constitute the discussion of issues of public importance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11618. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BOW, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DENT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MYERS, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 11619. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for increased safety consideration in the construction of certain highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 11620. A bill to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from regulating the charges made by air carriers for certain in-flight services made available to passengers; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 11621. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11622. 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.

H.R. 11623. 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. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. ZION, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. GUDE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BURKE of Florida):

H.R. 11624. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an interim across-the-board increase in monthly benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967, equal to the maximum percentage increase which can be provided without increasing taxes and without impairing the actuarial soundness of the trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11625. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. St. ONGE):

H.R. 11626. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. FREIDEL, Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, Mr. MACHEN, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 11627. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11628. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 11629. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11630. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11631. 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.

H.R. 11632. 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. MORRIS (for himself, Mr. FISHER, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 11633. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 11634. 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. QUIE:

H.R. 11635. A bill to provide for the election of one member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a School Board, and a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives; to provide for the location of certain agencies under the jurisdiction of the Board of Commissioners; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. COWGER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WINN, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. ESCH, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MESSKILL, and Mr. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 11636. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an interim across-the-board increase in monthly benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967, equal to the maximum percentage increase which can be provided without increasing taxes and without impairing the actuarial soundness of the trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11637. A bill to continue until the close of December 31, 1967, the existing sus-

pension of duties on certain forms of nickel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 11638. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11639. 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. WATSON:

H.R. 11640. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 11641. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.J. Res. 734. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 735. 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. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution relative to captive nations days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Res. 752. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 7; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

260. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to mail order list brokers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

261. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the issuance of an appropriate commemorative stamp honoring the University on its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

262. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to providing a sound and healthy trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection against such imported products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11642. A bill for the relief of Edson K. Hartzell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11643. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII,

129. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Victor Bosnich, St. Peter, Minn., relative to a writ of habeas corpus, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, many friends and associates of former Congressman Emmet O'Neal were saddened on the occasion of his recent death. Congressman O'Neal represented my district of Louisville, Ky., for five consecutive Congresses, serving here in Washington from January 3, 1935, to January 3, 1947. He was a lifelong Democrat who not only served in the Congress of the United States, but was also honored with the appointment to Ambassador to the Philippines from 1947 to 1949. The Honorable Emmet O'Neal was born in Louisville, Ky., on April 14, 1887, attended our public schools, was then graduated from Centre College in Danville, Ky., attended Yale University, and graduated with a law degree in 1910 from the University of Louisville. During the First World War former Congressman O'Neal served

overseas in the U.S. Army as an enlisted man in the 5th Field Artillery of the 1st Division. His Army service included the years 1917 to 1919 and he was separated from the Army as an officer in the 103d Field Artillery of the 26th Division. He returned to the practice of law in Louisville and was first elected to the 74th Congress. In 1953 he was appointed Chairman of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Until his death he was actively engaged in the practice of law in Washington, D.C.

Former Congressman Emmet O'Neal served well his city, his State, and his Nation. His many friends in Louisville and in Washington pay respect to his memory.

Maine Sugar Refinery Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have previously expressed my-

self on the \$2,250,000 loan made during the last half of 1966 by the Economic Development Administration to the Maine Sugar Industries of Easton, Maine, to convert an existing beet sugar factory to a cane sugar refinery. It was my opinion at that time, and it is my opinion now, that this loan is in violation of section 2 of the EDA Act that provides that loans shall not be made when the effect in substance is merely to transfer employment from one section of the country to another section.

With the two refineries in my district continually operating under capacity I am fearful that employment in the Boston refineries will be curtailed when the Maine plant refines sugar on a year-round basis. It is absurd to provide cheap Federal loans in order to create employment in one place when by so doing you eliminate employment somewhere else.

In addition to this \$2,250,000 conversion loan it was my understanding that the EDA guaranteed a working capital loan for \$1,800,000 which was made at the same time. From testimony at an Appropriations Subcommittee hearing on April 6, 1967, it would appear that working capital loans in the amount of \$3,600,000 rather than \$1,800,000 were