

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate, in executive session, stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 30, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Norman Zdanowitz, King's Park Jewish Center, Long Island, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, cast Thy countenance and abundant blessings upon this great land. Fortify it physically and spiritually and protect it against all its enemies.

Bless our illustrious President and the constituted officers and leaders of the United States with wisdom and understanding, insight and foresight that they may be instrumental in resolving the social, economic, and political problems that confront our glorious Republic. As we approach Labor Day, we pray that the representatives of capital and labor will realize that both are vital and indispensable partners in our unparalleled economic order, and that both must plan and labor together in harmony in order to promote a better way of life. May we all be mindful of the unfinished labor of liberating the oppressed, of banishing violence and hatred, and of making the pursuit of truth and virtue the highest ideal and fondest ambition.

May the United States remain a citadel of freedom and a watchtower from which rays of light and hope shall be beamed to those who are now living in darkness, poverty, and despair. Hasten the day when the millennial hope of justice, brotherly love, and peace shall be established and will prevail throughout the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1467. An act to provide authorizations to carry out the beautification program under title 23, United States Code.

S. 1504. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for loans for enterprises to supplement farm income and for farm conversion to recreation, remove the annual ceiling on insured loans, increase the amount of unsoled insured loans that may be made out of the fund, raise the aggregate

annual limits on grants, establish a flexible loan interest rate, and for other purposes.

DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO.'S EXHIBIT OUTSTANDING AT THE PARIS AIRSHOW

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. 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. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have discussed the various American exhibits at the Paris Airshow. Today I would like to salute the Douglas Aircraft Co. for its participation in the airshow.

One of the most popular American exhibits at Paris was the DC-8-61 jet transport produced by Douglas. This airplane, flown to Paris by Eastern Airlines, is one of the new Super Sixty series of the DC-8, 37 feet longer than its predecessors and capable of carrying up to 251 passengers.

These new aircraft have been ordered by a number of airlines throughout the world and the Paris Airshow offered an ideal opportunity for the European public and potential customers from various countries to become familiar with the Super 60 series.

The introduction of the DC-8-61 jet transport—the world's largest—opens a new chapter in the history of aviation.

The Super 61 DC-8 is the first transport built to provide air carriers with a commercial jetliner specifically designed to meet the current and predicted expansion in air travel.

Increased in size, capacity, and efficiency, the Super 61 demonstrates the capacity for growth inherent in the DC-8 design. It is the seventh new version of the basic DC-8 which made its maiden flight May 30, 1958.

The giant transport is designed to provide efficient service at low seat-mile and ton-mile costs on high density traffic routes where the schedule frequency has reached near-saturation levels.

Capable of carrying up to 251 passengers, the Super 61's capacity is more than 30 percent greater than that of the series 50 DC-8, the largest DC-8 now flying.

The Super 61 fuselage is extended by adding a cabin section 240 inches long in front of the wing and one of 200 inches aft of the wing.

Baggage and cargo space under the floor are proportionately increased to 2,525 cubic feet—almost equivalent to that of a C-36—enabling an airline operator to pay the entire direct operating cost of the aircraft from cargo capacity.

Super 61 DC-8's will reduce direct operating costs to less than 1 cent per seat-mile for the first time in aviation history.

In its convertible passenger-cargo version, designated the Super 61 DC-8F Jet Trader, the giant airliner will have a total cargo capacity of more than 12,600 cubic feet, compared to 8,810 cubic feet for the series 50 DC-8F.

The increased cubic capacity of the newest Jet Trader makes it possible for aircargo operators to accept many categories of bulky, low-density items previously considered unsuitable for air shipment.

The Super 61 DC-8F will accommodate 18 cargo pallets, five more than any other commercial air cargo transport. Pallet size can either be 88 inches by 108 inches or 88 inches by 125 inches.

Overall length of the new jetliner is 187.4 feet. Maximum takeoff weight is 325,000 pounds, and maximum landing weight, 240,000 pounds.

The Super 61 can carry its maximum capacity in passengers 3,900 statute miles without refueling. With a maximum payload weight limit of 77,500 pounds, the four-engine transport has a nonstop range of 2,860 statute miles.

All Super 61s are powered by four Pratt & Whitney JT3D-3B engines mounted on the wings, which have a span of slightly more than 142 feet.

The door to the cargo compartment under the floor of the Super 61 DC-8 has been enlarged from 36 by 44 inches in the standard DC-8 to 56 by 57 inches and has been designed as a sliding door rather than opening outward.

Production of the Super 61 began in 1965. The transport was rolled out January 24, 1966, at the Aircraft Division, Long Beach, Calif., and made its maiden flight in March 1966.

Enthusiastic endorsement of the Super 61 concept was evidenced even before the first flight. Eight airlines as of that date had placed orders for 28 of the jetliners.

Air Canada ordered four; Delta Air Lines, three; Eastern Airlines, seven; National Airlines, one; and United Air Lines, seven. Additionally, Trans Caribbean Airways, Saturn Airways, and Trans International Airlines each ordered two Super 61 DC-8F Jet Traders.

The Super 61 DC-8 is the first of three enlarged versions of the DC-8. The other two, the Super 62 and Super 63 DC-8's, are ultra-long-range transports designed for international operations.

At Paris the U.S. Navy also displayed versions of the A-4 Skyhawk attack aircraft, also produced by Douglas. These aircraft, more than 2,000 of which have been manufactured, are an important part of the Navy inventory and are performing particularly well in Vietnam. Other nations are interested in purchasing the A-4 and the Royal Australian Navy has just taken delivery on the first of 10 in the A-4G configuration.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my fellow Americans join me in commending the Douglas Aircraft Co. for representing our country so ably at the Paris Airshow. In addition to contributing significantly to our Nation's defense effort, companies like Douglas have made America a world leader in the aerospace industry.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SPEAKER AND PRIME MINISTER KY OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be

printed in the body of the RECORD correspondence between the Speaker of the House and Prime Minister Ky of the Republic of Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The correspondence is as follows:

REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM,
Saigon, August 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take the liberty to write to you at a time when the events in my country occasion passionate debates in the Congress of the United States. Since the American and Vietnamese nations are together defending freedom, and are consenting to tremendous sacrifices, I deem it my duty to affirm again the principles which command the conduct of national affairs by my government.

The defense of freedom in Vietnam requires more than our joint efforts at war, it involves first and foremost our mutual commitment to the achievement of democracy and social justice. Should we stray from that basic commitment, or should you misconstrue our purposes, our alliance would indeed be in jeopardy.

As my government is nearing the completion of its term of duty, I sincerely feel that we have dispatched our task with honesty and effectiveness under most difficult circumstances. I take special pride in the fact that we have successfully started the course toward democracy and equality for a society which was imprisoned within the deep walls of feudalism, corruption and intolerable social discrepancies. In spite of war, subversion and several grave crises, my government has undertaken to organize five nationwide elections of vital importance within about a year's time: elections for the Constituent Assembly in September 1966, elections for Hamlet and Village administration in April-May 1967, Presidential and Senatorial elections next September, and elections for the Lower House next October. I do not know of any better way to warrant our determination to stay the course toward democracy. For it would be proper for all concerned to acknowledge the painful dilemma of our nation, torn between the dream to attain the integrity of democratic life and the necessity to fight for survival. We have lost many of our people, our soldiers, our cadremen in the past elections, and undoubtedly we shall lose many more in the coming weeks; we must devote a great deal of resources to the exercise of democracy which are badly needed on the battlefield; we run the risk of subversion and division at a time when the nation must unite in the face of the enemy. Yet we have all accepted the challenge without a shadow of reluctance.

It seems a cruel irony that some of our friends chose this very moment to voice doubt on our sincerity.

Perhaps the fact that my government includes officers of the Armed Forces leads to misgivings, for I know of the inherent distrust toward military government in the advanced societies. But in our present historical context, the Vietnamese Armed Forces are of a very particular nature: 700,000 of our young men are under arms in a nation of 15 million people. Our Armed Forces are not composed of militarists or people inclined to the use of force or violence, but of all the generations of Vietnamese within the age of offering the fullest measure of service to their imperiled Fatherland. They are the Present and the Future of our nation.

Furthermore, my government did not seize power; it was a civilian government which, unable to resolve instability and division, passed on to the Armed Forces the burden of preserving the nation from collapsing. We then formed a mixed team of civilian and

military leaders, decided that our term of duty was to be a transitional one, and set out to establish the very rapid time-table for the advent of representative government. We are now reaching the final stage of that time-table.

Of course, two years are a very short period of time. We are convinced that we have engaged our country on the right path, but we are also aware that the tasks which we have begun, such as rural development, reorganization of the administration and of the army, reinforcement of the national economy . . . need to be continued. That is why, in good conscience, we deem it our duty to run for offices in due democratic process. We hope that the people of Vietnam will entrust us with further responsibilities on the basis of our past performances. But should the people decide otherwise, we shall readily accept their verdict.

I am particularly sad to hear accusations that the Vietnamese Armed Forces will resort to coups in the event the election returns should be unfavorable to us. We have devoted the finest hours of the past two years to bringing about the first democratic institutions in our country, we shall not be the ones to destroy them. I have repeatedly warned our soldiers, our civil servants, our cadremen against rigging the elections in any manner, for I think that dishonest elections would deprive our country of democracy for a long period of time. In 1963, the people and the Army overthrew a dictatorial government which was issued from dishonest elections.

That a few press correspondents should misquote my word of caution against unfair elections and make it sound like a threat of coup was, after all, understandable. But for a moment, I felt very discouraged to see some of the best friends of my country give credence to those inaccurate reports. Time and again, I have proven that I am capable of placing the interest of our nation above all possible personal ambition; the decision I made on the 30th of June to withdraw from the Presidential race and to seek the Vice Presidency instead, was another instance of my sincerity.

I see therefore no reason for attributing to ill faith on the part of my government the difficulties that the candidates may encounter in their campaigning. My country is short on physical facilities, several of our airfields are still unsafe, and the wind blows where it may . . . In my opinion, a dignified attitude for those among us who ambition to be public servants by popular choice should be to endure those misfortunes and persevere in seeking the support of the electorate, and not to display resentment against the adverse conditions which prevail for our entire people. In the meanwhile, I am satisfied that our government has done its very best to give all candidates a fair share of the means for campaigning. The same amount of money is allotted to all tickets. The government Television and Radio allow equal time to all candidates in direct broadcast, and anybody in Vietnam can testify that those means are used at their fullest capacity by our opponents. The Vietnamese press is free, and, in part, quite virulently antigovernmental; on the other hand the foreign press is at full liberty to cover the campaign and the forthcoming elections.

If by the standards of a country with a long experience in the exercise of democracy, and free from the predicaments of war and underdevelopment, our elections still present serious shortcomings, I am the first Vietnamese to deplore that situation. But I can say without any doubt in my conscience that my government does not deserve any lesson in honesty and patriotism from any quarter.

I am afraid that persistent criticism without substantiated evidence on the part of some prominent American figures may, in the long run, impair the harmony of our joint efforts. The Vietnamese are a proud people, they will accept any amount of tribulations

and sufferings, but their dead count as much as the dead from all the friendly lands, and they will admit no discrimination in all the men's supreme tribute to freedom and human dignity.

I see an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to keep an appropriate perspective in the partnership between nations, large and small, which are in pursuit of a common ideal; for intemperate reliance upon the physical scale of strength would be the negation of that very ideal.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask you to convey my letter to all the Distinguished Members of the House of Representatives of the United States.

I stand in profound respect for the great traditions of democracy and justice embodied in your institutions. I greatly value the support of the Congress of the United States for the cause of Vietnam, and I am always ready to discuss in total candor with the Distinguished Representatives who wish to further examine the developments concerning the common endeavor of our two nations.

Sincerely yours,

NGUYEN CAO KY,
Air Vice Marshal.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1967.
Air Vice Marshal NGUYEN CAO KY,
Chairman, Central Executive Committee,
Republic of Vietnam.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Your letter concerning the principles which govern the conduct of national affairs by the Government of Viet-Nam has reached me, and I have conveyed it to the members of the House of Representatives, as you requested.

I have given the most careful consideration to your letter and I am sure that other members of this House will do likewise. In my opinion, your remarks are an eloquent and welcome reaffirmation of the ideals of national independence and individual liberty shared by our two peoples.

Let me assure you that no criticisms or reservations expressed by members of the House of Representatives in the exercise of their duty to inquire into the affairs of the United States have ever intended to impugn the encouraging course towards constitutional democracy which your country has undertaken. In fact, the attention given by the House of Representatives to the development of representative institutions in Viet-Nam is a measure of our common concern that the impressive pace of evolutionary political development to which you and your colleagues have contributed so much shall be sustained. Our admiration for these accomplishments is heightened by the realization that they were undertaken in the face of brutal opposition from an arrogant aggressor which would deny your people their right to self-government.

With my expressions of respect and my compliments to you and your associates, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

RESCUING OUR OLYMPIC BEGGARS

Mr. KUPPERMAN. 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. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the prestige of the United States continually at stake before the world, the area of amateur sports, especially the Olympics, continues to be of prime importance.

My constituent, Irving Jaffee, the great

Olympic skating champion of 1928 and 1932, whose exploits on behalf of the United States are remembered by all who saw or read of them, is vitally concerned about financing our Olympic teams.

In a very thoughtful article in the current issue of the American Legion magazine—September 1967, commencing at page 17—he considers the way we have financed previous Olympic teams, the unseemly last-minute pleas for funds, et cetera, and makes concrete proposals for the future.

The article follows and I commend it to my colleagues:

A PLAN TO RESCUE OUR OLYMPIC BEGGARS
(By Irving Jaffee, Olympic skating champion in 1928 and 1932, as told to Hal Bock)

The modern Olympic games were first held in Athens, Greece, in 1896. They have been held every four years since, except in the war years 1916, 1940 and 1944. The winter games were added in 1924. The United States has participated from the start. When we go into the 1968 games our Olympic experience will have spanned 72 years. Yet it is a foregone conclusion that it will be a crash operation to finance our 1968 team.

Undoubtedly our Olympic Committee won't go in the red. It will balance the books by a last-minute pleading for individual gifts, by swapping exclusive Olympic advertising endorsements for cash and equipment from U.S. corporations, and by practicing economies in Olympic expenses—economies that will include leaving some eligible athletes home.

That's how it has happened ever since I can remember. I was our fourth ranked speed skater in the 1928 Olympics. We were entitled to send a squad of 17 speed skaters to the St. Moritz winter Olympics in Switzerland. We prepared to send three. The ship was actually delayed in sailing at the last minute while a decision was made that they could afford to send me after all. By the skin of my teeth I made the trip. To everybody's surprise, including my own, I won the 10,000 meters. But my pride in beating the best skaters fielded by the entire world has been watered by an unresolved doubt ever since. If our fourth ranked skater could do that, perhaps our fifth or 17th could have beaten me. I'll never know. They stayed home.

At the Millrose track meet in Madison Square Garden, just before the last Olympics in 1964, the program was interrupted while a sentimental plea was made by old-time athletes for all the spectators to chip in for the Olympic fund when ushers passed among us rattling the cup.

This begging to help the richest nation on earth send its squads to the Olympics makes me absolutely furious. But while I can contain myself, my wife can't. She wants to take it out on the only target available—the poor ushers who pass the tin cup. "Why aren't they planning something," she cries, "instead of embarrassing and humiliating our sports, our nation and our whole program?" She and I aren't alone. As a former Olympian, and as one who ever since has identified himself with the development of young American athletes, I am often the target of a blunt question from others:

"What the hell is the matter? Why do they have to put Bob Hope on a telethon to raise nickels and pennies, or enlist Bing Crosby in appeals to the public, or ask people to send in soap coupons with the promise that the manufacturer will give so much to the Olympic fund for every so many coupons?"

They do have to do that, and our 1968 Olympic team will need your support in every conceivable way in order to make out. There's no chance of getting out of the old rut in the little time remaining. Maybe we'll never get out of it. Maybe the begging, penny-pinching, commercialization and crash op-

erations will go on and on in the nation that is reputed to have the greatest reservoir of management ability in the world.

There's a simple and logical way to assure our Olympic team the money it needs in a planned, non-begging fashion—with enough money left over to provide some needed support for the better development of amateur athletics in the United States.

That is another sore spot. We do perhaps the sorriest job of any major nation when it comes to developing young athletes. That could surprise you, since we turn out many great champions. Truth is, we do it the hard way, and we are weak in many sports where we could be strong.

Versions of my own story, minus the happy ending, could be repeated by tens of thousands of American boy and girl athletes and by thousands of adults who have tried to help them. To put it briefly, I was bitten by the skating bug at age 14, while living in a poor neighborhood in New York's Bronx. I had to go to Manhattan to find a rink I could use (Roseland Dance City occupies those premises now). To pay for the privilege of skating I swept the ice regularly. I sold newspapers to earn subway fare to the rink. I wore borrowed skates that were too big for me. Stuffing the toes with newspapers I managed to win a medal in a novice race. A year later I won an important race, the New York Daily News Silver Skates. I didn't even know what I'd done right, for I had never been coached. After that, opportunities opened up so that I could have coaching and decent equipment, thanks to the interest of individual older skaters in a promising youngster. This doesn't exactly read like a program for the development of young athletes.

Things aren't exactly the same today, but there is still no trace of anything like a national program to give kids such as I was a chance to get started. In Canada, the government hires top-notch coaches in speed skating and figure skating. They travel the country and give mass instruction at "clinics" to which any interested youngster can come. We have "Olympic coaches," but theirs is chiefly an honorary job, involving the management and discipline of the Olympic team once it is chosen.

Until recently, there was not a single Olympic-size quarter mile or 400-meter racing rink in the United States. Now the state of Michigan has built one at Flint. Small wonder that while an American like Terry McDermott could win an Olympic short race in 1964, we are consistently left behind in distance skating. Our young distance skaters practice on ponds, rivers and lakes (when weather permits) or at undersized hockey rinks. When they enter a world contest it's like going onto the field for the first time. The city of Moscow has ten 400-meter rinks where the smallest children can practice under Olympic conditions. Norway has about 40, Sweden 30, Finland 10—and so it goes.

Many European nations have from 10 to 20 Olympic bobsled runs. In the United States we have one—at Lake Placid. The State of New York and the town of Lake Placid foot the bill for it. The winter athletes aren't the only ones who have little chance to develop or get good coaching in the United States, but skating is my field so let me say a little more.

France sends her most promising Olympic figure skaters to the United States, with all costs paid, to be coached by Pierre Brunet, now an American citizen. In 1928, he, with his wife, won the mixed-pair Olympic figure skating crown for France.

We send nobody anywhere for the coaching that a top figure skater needs. And it costs plenty. If you have the stuff to be a figure skater in the United States, you must have rich parents or some private club or sponsor behind you in order to develop. Either is a matter of luck.

Our own wonderful Carol Heiss and Peggy

Fleming lacked family wealth. Fortunately, the New York Skating Club sponsored Carol, while Peggy is a world champion thanks to the backing of the Broadmoor Skating Club in Colorado Springs.

European governments in general will hire successful coaches—from abroad if necessary—to train their Olympic hopefuls.

In the United States, the development of young amateur athletes is carried on in the schools or by volunteer adults. We are all familiar with the volunteer programs—the Little Leagues, American Legion Baseball, Babe Ruth Leagues, police athletic leagues, Boys' Clubs, Boy Scouts, and so on. Then there are purely local sports programs conducted by a park department or by willing adults who earn a living from nine to five, then turn out to help what youngsters they can.

It is a tribute to such volunteers that they have done as well as they have. Their struggles to find playing space and equipment, uniforms, tournament costs, adequate instructors or transportation for the youngsters would curl your hair if you knew the details. To put it bluntly, volunteers who are perfectly willing to train your child or mine usually have to spend more time and energy begging for money or other needs (the way the Olympic Committee does) than they are able to devote to the youngsters.

Our national American Legion Baseball tournament nearly died in 1933 when the major leagues withdrew the support that helped underwrite the national elimination contests. Newspaper publishers saved the day. They followed the example of the late Frank Knox, Knox, former Secretary of the Navy, and a publisher of papers in Manchester, N.H., and Chicago, put up the first \$5,000. The late Dan Sowers, of West Virginia, and other hard-working Legionnaires used Knox's gift as a base to solicit more from other publishers. The major leagues, whose roster today are loaded with former Legion youth baseballers, eventually restored their guarantee.

Readers of these pages well know what many of the individual Legion Posts go through in order to support the local teams in the program. The Post that plays host to the national finals may find that it will make out very well—if a substantial committee of able men anticipates every detail and exploits every avenue of support a year or two in advance. Otherwise it may struggle for another year or two to get out of the red.

Unlike us, many foreign nations have national physical fitness programs. True, there is an element of deceit in some of them. They help to field well-trained "amateurs" in the Olympics who would be professionals by our standards. The Communist nations, of course, simply support and pay their "amateurs" to keep in training.

They aren't the only ones. Ethiopia's great distance runner earns army promotions by winning international races. Sweden's definition of an amateur permits an athlete to capitalize on his reputation in any manner except coaching. Amateurs make out so well financially that professional sports are all but unknown there. By contrast, if I should check hats at a skating rink in this country I could be declared a professional.

Decelful rules allow the top athletes in many lands to support themselves through their sports while reaching their peak of performance, as professionals do here. But there is nothing deceitful about the facilities and instruction that help young boys and girls to develop in nations that have genuine physical fitness programs. From Japan to Europe there is mass opportunity for exposure, training and competition in a broad spectrum of sports for young people, without forcing hit-or-miss volunteer adults to beg and improvise.

We do have a national physical fitness program in the United States—so-called. Stan Musial was named to be its first director by

President Kennedy. It wasn't Musial's fault that his chief duty was to talk to adults, for it is only a paper program. There's no money in it with which to achieve anything. Begging, borrowing and improvising is our way.

A deal I tried to pull off in New York a few years ago would be unthinkable in Sweden—and so would its failure. There was a chance to let thousands of city kids skate in rinks in the parks system for a dime or so. I was concerned about the many poor boys and girls who wouldn't have skates or the money for them. I approached an athletic club with a proposition that it work with department stores to collect "trade-in" skates from well-to-do customers, and issue them for use of children in the city parks. The whole thing fell through in a mass of red tape. But my point is that this is typical of the kind of improvising and wheeling and dealing that takes place on behalf of kids in your town as well as mine. Money is always at the heart of it. Raffles and bingo used to support many volunteer youth programs, but most states have clamped down on them. Commercial sponsors are often appealed to. Thousands of local businessmen in the United States put up money or uniforms to support teams in this or that, for the privilege of the words "Goode's Grocery" or "Smith's Hardware" on the athletic shirt. This too is hit-or-miss, and it's a form of begging to ask for it—though I don't know what would happen to sandlot sports in this country without the local business sponsor.

Commercial sponsorship is sometimes too commercial. A friend of mine lives in a town where the local Babe Ruth League tied a fund-raising deal in with a newspaper's circulation promotion. The last two years running the paper's solicitor phoned him to say that if he would subscribe, it would help the ball team. Each time my friend said he didn't want the paper, but would be glad to send a contribution to the team if the newspaper would tell him who to send it to. To this day he hasn't been told. The interest of the solicitor is in newspaper circulation, and plainly not in the ball team.

If we had a solid, national plan to develop sports programs, as many lesser nations do, perhaps men like Joe Yancey or clubs like the Grand Street Boys wouldn't be necessary. Or perhaps they could achieve a great deal more with the backing of a national fund.

They fit into our most powerful amateur sport—men's track and field. Did you ever wonder how some of our track stars manage to keep in training after college (if they went to college); who coaches them; where they run or jump in practice; who enters them in meets and sees that they have uniforms; how they travel to meets? Remember, if they aren't well-to-do, they have to go to work at something else.

For some it is easy. They live near their old college, perhaps, or they are graduate students, and their old coach welcomes them. They are invited to join one of the prosperous clubs, such as The New York AC, or the Los Angeles Olympic Club.

But not all of them. In New York there were so many fine athletes of poor origins that a group of prominent citizens formed the Grand Street Boys many years ago to sponsor good athletes who needed help if they were to stay in training and get to meets without hitchhiking, sleeping in flophouses and nibbling potato chips on the eve of a national championship. The Grand Street Boys have sponsored many an athlete who would otherwise have had to quit.

Then, 30-odd years ago, the New York Pioneer Club came into existence in New York. Its strong point is coaching good athletes who are no longer in school. You can look all over New York and you won't find the New York Pioneer Club anywhere. It is Joe Yancey, a Negro employee of the Internal

Revenue Service. Yancey is a crackerjack track coach. He gathered in many of the graduated trackmen of N.Y.U., Manhattan and other city colleges, and many non-college runners, and established the Pioneer Club. The club is wherever Joe is standing on the running track in McCombs Dam Park, N.Y. In winter, he disperses his teams to the armories or the board tracks of the city's colleges. Some of his athletes, picked off the streets, won college scholarships after he developed them. Joe works full time for a living, but so do most of his athletes, so the Pioneer Club gets into swing at the end of New York's business day. Yancey's men have won national crowns for him and international crowns for America. He has put together some fearsome relay teams—which his athletes, on their own, could hardly have done. This year New York's Mayor Lindsay has named him to coach New York's entry into the U.S. Youth Games in August.

New York is my city. I haven't the least doubt that the story of the Grand Street Boys and the Pioneer Club could be repeated in Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles and elsewhere.

What such individuals and groups have done is inspiring. But the situation that leaves it up to them hardly reflects well on such a great country as ours. Nor are they able to do more than scratch the surface. Thousands of youngsters in the United States who aren't lucky enough to get the minimum opportunity to develop as champions in many sports are as frustrated today as were youngsters in my youth.

For many years requests for me to help young skaters, to speak to sporting groups, or to lend my time and my Olympic reputation to fund-raising activities and charity affairs kept me from having dinner with my family more than two nights a week. I've had thousands of requests to coach youngsters, and though I'm a fulltime businessman I do what little I can. I finally had to discourage requests for public appearances by charging \$100—to go to charity. I had no other choice if I were to have any private life at all. Occasionally, I go on TV to talk to boys and girls about skating. Then floods of letters pour in from parents whose children have interest and ability but nobody to guide them. I'm only in a minor sport. Imagine what the demands are on the big name athletes in the major sports.

What could we do in the United States to assure our Olympic and Pan-American Games teams of all expenses, without begging and commercialization of amateur sports, and at the same time find more money for the development of young athletes? I am sure we don't want to professionalize our amateur sports, and I am equally sure that we don't want Uncle Sam to run our sports programs the way the Communist governments do. I think we have already gone too far, for to me it is repulsive that the Olympic Committee is in the business of soliciting corporations for help and giving them exclusive advertising endorsements in return.

The answer can surely be found right at hand, by simply adapting a financial principle laid down years ago for the disposal of any profits from the Olympic Games themselves. Such profits "must be applied for the promotion of the Olympic movement, or for the development of amateur sports."

I would like to see a fund, easily paid for by sports fans in a systematic way, to support our Olympic and Pan American games, and at the same time further the development of amateur athletics in the United States.

Call it anything you want, but "ASDOF" would do for now. (American Sports Development and Olympic Fund.)

It would be sustained by a cut from the gate and from TV receipts in all U.S. sporting events, amateur and professional. For all

I care—if it were so administered as to prevent cheating—it could be a small surtax added to ticket prices, so that no promoter could cry that he couldn't afford it. The whole American sporting public could quite painlessly foot the bill—and gladly, I think.

In WW2, a 10% tax was slapped on sporting goods and amusements. Now, 22 years after the war's end, we're still paying some of those taxes. ASDOF could put millions of dollars into the support of amateur athletics, from Olympics to sandlot, with far less.

I've thought of 1% or 2% for ASDOF. Perhaps it would be more convenient to think of a flat nickel for ASDOF for each paid admission of \$1 or more to a sporting event—with a nominal cut on some other basis from TV too.

What a wonderful feeling it would be to know that every time you go to a sporting event you'd be helping your country's amateur program. When I pay \$6 to see a track meet at Madison Square Garden, I'd cheerfully pay an extra 5¢ ASDOF "tax" when I buy my ticket. What a relief if they should interrupt the program not to beg, but to announce: "Attendance tonight is 15,875. Your gate receipts have provided \$793.75 for amateur sports in America."

They wouldn't need more than that small sum from a Garden audience at a track meet, a hockey or basketball game, or a boxing match. If there were a 5¢ ASDOF "tax" on all sports admissions *everywhere*.

Last year there were 135 million admissions to college and pro football, pro baseball, horseracing and trotting. Simply from those three, a 5¢ ASDOF contribution per admission would yield \$6,750,000 a year. In the four-year Olympic span that alone would provide \$27 million painlessly.

Throw in auto racing, boxing, track, hockey, basketball, swimming, skiing, skating, golf, dog races, jai alai, and so on, and there would be millions more. We'd never have to prostitute our Olympics to advertising again or pass the tin cup around.

The cost of our last Olympic and Pan American teams was \$1,398,115.30—a huge amount under our present horse-and-buggy funding, a drop in the bucket under the ASDOF idea.

We should then immediately spend *more* on the Olympics, for we should never again fail to send full squads. We have entered full squads in Olympic games held here, but we have never sent full squads abroad, when travel costs became an important item.

The squads are usually cut in our weaker events, where it can be said that those we leave home wouldn't have much chance anyway. That's one of the things that keeps us weak in them. There is little incentive to train for a spot on an Olympic squad if the position isn't assured even if you qualify. Once full squads are guaranteed—as ASDOF could easily guarantee them—you can expect fiercer competition and better performance in the *many* Olympic events in which we are weak.

Over each four-year period an ASDOF surtax, if it were 5¢ a paid admission, could probably raise more than \$30 million *above* what our Olympic and Pan American teams need. That would put muscle in the late President Kennedy's dream of a national physical fitness program, where now there is only paper and talk.

ASDOF could help support any local group that would meet specified conditions to operate various sports programs—making it easier to provide facilities, equipment, supervision, coaching and tournaments.

ASDOF could start spotting major facilities around the country—such as all-year running tracks; Olympic skating rinks and bobsled runs; gymnasia equipment and space for wrestlers, gymnasts, etc., in addition to our present wealth of basketball playing space.

Probably our great weakness in the Olym-

pic distance running events can be blamed on the unavailability of thousands of existing running tracks to trackmen except for a few weeks of the year. Outside of parts of the South and West, our vast investment in local school tracks is largely closed to trackmen in the fall by football, in winter by snow and in summer by the grounds-keeper. The waste of these facilities lying idle is enormous. ASDOF could help keep some of them open and in good shape in the summer, wherever a local group would assume supervisory control and responsibility—and organize activities.

Short-distance runners carry over useful training from football and basketball, and can come close to their peak in the brief school track season that we allow them. But our typical short school training season is of little use to distance runners. The natural result of locking them out for most of the year is reflected in our record in Olympic distance races. We absolutely dominate the shorter runs and most field events in the Olympics, and we have won more than our share in the Olympic half mile (800 meters.) But we haven't won an Olympic mile (1,500 meters) since Mel Sheppard turned the trick in 1908. In 70 men's Olympic races longer than a mile that have been run since 1896, we have won five—and two of them before 1912.

Gymnasts and wrestlers are given a short season in our school programs too, where there is any program for them at all. Typically, they have to move out when basketball moves in, and most gyms are closed to them for the summer. Few school systems can afford to keep gyms open when school is out. Typically, they lie idle while we wonder what to do with boys in the streets. Most high schools have no program at all for gymnasts, few have any for wrestlers or fencers. Rowing is for the rich and the colleges.

Our whole school varsity athletic program—the best sports program that we have—is the very opposite of a national physical fitness program. It is chiefly an attrition program which favors the few natural athletes and quickly cuts the rest from the squad, or benches many of the candidates even in practice. The nature of varsity programs permits nothing else. A few students in a large student body get all the practice. They get the best benefit of the coaching, and they dominate the use of the facilities. ASDOF, by broadening the facilities and the teaching, could give the slow learner a chance. Many of our great champions have been slow learners, eventually surpassing some of the natural athletes on their own initiative, in private struggles against the present system.

ASDOF could provide more opportunities for the school dropout, for the college graduate, for the kid on the street who yearns to excel in something but finds most doors closed.

ASDOF could send top coaches around the country in their off-seasons to hold clinics for youngsters who don't know what to do with their right foot or their left hand—as touring coaches, sponsored by the government, do in Canada.

There are associations governing or promoting most sports that could spell out far more that could be done to widen opportunity and develop amateur activities in their fields, if a fund such as ASDOF offered them a running start.

I would like to hear our top skiing leaders say what they would do with a share of such a fund for development. After 52 skiing contests for men in Olympic history, we are still looking for our first gold medal. Only two Americans hold Olympic skiing gold medals, both women. Since Gretchen Fraser and Andrea Lawrence won slalom races for us in 1948 and 1952, German, Swiss, French and Canadian women (but no American women) have come along to improve on their winning Olympic times.

A few things about such a fund as ASDOF.

It certainly should be run by a top board of outstanding citizens who are not part of any sports association, to keep it above such senseless quarrels as the AAU and the NCAA are now waging. It should be as far above suspicion as Caesar's wife. A nation that can run a Red Cross or a March of Dimes has the management savvy to make it work. Sports fans, I think, would be delighted to support it.

Sports promoters who pay professional performers and entertainers have been taking in big gates for amateur sports for years, without doing very much for amateur sports in return and—of course—without paying the performers.

Most of our professional sports feast off amateur sports. We are all familiar with pro football and pro basketball divvying up the top college stars among them every year. Probaseball scouts tour the country looking for amateur talent. To them the best amateurs are found gold. It is time they cooperated to help develop the talent that is the source of their riches. And it would be good business, too.

Television's sports shows are its best drawing card. TV too should be very happy to make a contribution to the development of its most attractive performers.

The greatest value of ASDOF would not lie in Olympic medals. They would simply be the frosting on the cake. By far its chief importance would lie in the opportunity it could provide for all the boys and girls who want to achieve something, but whose elders say they "can't afford" this and "can't afford" that. It would also lie in the help it would give to those volunteer adults who are bucking "the system" in trying to do what they can for such boys and girls.

You take it from there.

NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. PICKLE. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce a bill to provide for a National Visitor Center to be located in the present Union Station. As a member of the National Visitors Center Commission, I have been meeting and inspecting various sites over the past year, with a view toward solving the problems of congestion for tourists in the Capitol and at the national museums and monuments on the Mall.

The bill authorizes the General Services Administration and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a lease agreement with the Washington Terminal Co., the present owner of Union Station. Prior to the lease, the Terminal Co. is to remodel the station, making it suitable for use as a visitors' center, and build a new 4,000-car parking facility. The estimated cost of this work is \$19½ million, and all of it will be financed by the Terminal Co.

On its part, the Federal Government will take a 20-year lease on the station and parking facility, at annual lease payments which are not to exceed \$2,935,000. No rental payments will be due until the United States has taken possession after the remodeling and construction, and it is expected that most or all of this expense can be recouped from parking fees and sale of goods and services.

In addition to the Visitors' Center contemplated in the bill, the Commission proposes that bus service will be available every 5 minutes to the Capitol and around the Mall.

I believe this proposal represents a solid step toward providing the convenient service needed for our tourists. It will solve the problem of congestion in the streets and public facilities, and will make the tourists' visit and impression of the Nation's Capital much more enjoyable and profitable. While I am primarily interested in improving the conditions in the Capitol itself, the bill introduced today is a good beginning.

WHY NOT A U.S. AIRSHOW?

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks 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 damp but enthusiastic crowd which attended the airshow at Dulles International Airport 2 weeks ago graphically demonstrates again the general public's interest in aviation.

The more than 75,000 persons—15,000 cars—who visited this 1-day, jet-aged version of a flying circus support my general feelings that this country could and should sponsor an international air exposition.

In most quarters, American aviation is acknowledged to be superior to other countries, and yet, the most prominent air show staged on a regular basis is held in France.

It seems a bit ironic that the country which is the birthplace of Wilbur and Orville Wright, the world's foremost pioneers of flight, does not sponsor a major air exhibit.

The American aviation industry must travel halfway around the world to show its goods. Likewise, only on rare occasions such as last weekend's show at Dulles and during such exhibits at the International Exposition of Flight, which was staged in Las Vegas this past spring, does the American public have the opportunity to view the newest or best-known creations of American aviation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that FAA and CAB officials, and other officials of this Government and aviation leaders take positive steps to consider the sponsorship of an International Air Exposition here in America for 1968 or 1969—and I would think that Dulles International Airfield would be the ideal site.

OUR ELECTION OBSERVERS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the

U.S. team has today departed to observe the Vietnam elections. While the members of this team are only to view the elections and not to interfere in their conduct, I believe their appointment and dispatch by the President is highly questionable and not in the best interests of either the United States or the Government of Vietnam.

We are supposedly in Vietnam to assist the Vietnamese people in protecting their freedom and independence. Over the past year or so, we have been urging the Vietnamese to hold elections in order to demonstrate and encourage this freedom and independence. Now that elections are going to be held, however, we turn around and send a team of observers to report on the conduct of these elections. This seems to me to be antithetical to the very concept of freedom and independence. Our presence there in this capacity constitutes a form of colonialism, in my opinion, and is destructive of the initiative and self-reliance we are seeking to develop in Vietnam.

That the elections in Vietnam may not be as free and honest as we would like is beside the point. The principle is what we should be seeking to establish. Sending a team of observers there tends to undermine this principle. My guess is that the sending of the team of U.S. observers next year than with the elections in Vietnam this year.

And, while on the subject of free and honest elections, do we have that much to be proud of ourselves in certain parts of the U.S. Reports from Chicago, Philadelphia, Mississippi, Boston, and even parts of Texas and elsewhere in past elections have raised serious questions in this regard.

Since our own house is not always in order, I think it only fair and reasonable that in our 1968 presidential elections, we should rightly expect and perhaps invite the Government of Vietnam to send a team of officials to observe our elections.

THE WARREN REPORT—V-VI

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, following are the fifth and sixth installments of the transcript from the CBS television documentary entitled, "CBS News Inquiry: The Warren Report":

PART V

CRONKITE. For two nights we have been looking for answers to major questions concerning the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Sunday night we asked: Did Lee Harvey Oswald take a rifle to the Book Depository Building? Our answer was yes. Where was Oswald on the day President Kennedy was shot? In the building on the sixth floor. Was Oswald's rifle fired from the building? Yes. How many shots were fired? Most likely, three. How fast could Oswald's rifle be fired? Fast enough. What was the time span of the shots? At least as large as the Warren Com-

mission reported? Most likely the assassin had more time, not less.

And so, we concluded Sunday night that Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots at the motorcade. And then, last night, we began to look into the question of conspiracy. Were there others also firing at the President? We interviewed eyewitnesses. They told conflicting stories. We tested in our own investigation the critical single bullet theory and found one bullet might well have wounded both men. Captain James Humes, who conducted the autopsy on the President, broke a three-and-a-half-year silence to report that he has re-examined the X-rays and photographs and stands firm that the shots came from behind. We heard Governor Connally and heard that his recollections conform with our own reconstruction of the assassination. And we concluded that there was no second gunman.

Tonight, we look further into the question of conspiracy. Was Oswald acting alone, or was he the agent of others? Was the assassination the sole work of a twisted, discontented man, seeking a place in history? Or, were there dark forces behind Oswald?

Continuing to seek an answer to the question of whether Lee Harvey Oswald was involved in a conspiracy leads us to a second murder. Oswald was taken into custody in a movie theatre at 1:50 PM, 80 minutes after President Kennedy was shot. But he was first charged, not with the murder of the President, but with the murder of Dallas police officer, J. D. Tippit.

Our next question: Could Oswald have made his way to the scene of Officer Tippit's murder?

RATHER. To solve the Tippit killing, it is vital to reconstruct Lee Harvey Oswald's actions from the moment of the assassination to the moment of Tippit's death. Yet for three and a half years, all news media have been barred from the Texas School Book Depository where the first critical few moments of Oswald's flight occurred. Depository officials have agreed to lift the ban for these special broadcasts and so, for the first time, we have been able to follow the path of Oswald's movements from his sniper's nest on the sixth floor.

Taking his rifle with him, Oswald went between the stacks of book cartons to the opposite corner of the sixth floor. He tucked the rifle down between stacks, and at this point probably discovered that the elevator could not be brought up, that Charles Givens, eager to see the parade, had forgotten to close the gate. So Oswald turned to the stairs and went down four flights to the second floor and to the lunchroom there, where he was next seen at about 12:31 PM, barely a minute and a half after his third shot.

In front of a coke machine a policeman at gunpoint actually stopped Oswald. But Depository Superintendent Roy Truly told the officer Oswald was an employee, and Oswald was released. Free to go, Oswald apparently crossed the second floor through this office, went down the front stairs, perhaps three minutes after the assassination, and continued out through the glass front door, well before police sealed off the Depository building.

CRONKITE. Here is how the Warren Commission reconstructed Oswald's movements after he left the Depository. He walked seven blocks down Elm Street, then took a bus on Murphy, headed for Oak Cliff. But the bus quickly became tangled in the traffic jam caused by the assassination itself. And Oswald got off, walked two blocks to Lamar, then took a cab several blocks past his rooming house on Beckley.

The Commission believes he then walked back to his apartment picked up a revolver and a lightweight jacket, and set off on foot down Beckley.

POLICE RADIO. Attention all squads. Attention all squads. The suspect in the shooting at Elm and Houston is reported to be an un-

known white man, approximately 30, slender build, is possibly armed with what is thought to be a 30 calibre rifle. No further description at this time, or information. 12:45 KTB.

CRONKITE. During this period, the Dallas police radio broadcast a description of a suspect, and critics have made much of the speed with which it was sent out—just 15 minutes after the shots were fired. It asked officers to be on the lookout for a white man, slender, weighing about 165, standing about 5 feet 10 inches, in his early 30's.

Well, how did police get the description on the air in 15 minutes? Critics have questioned both the source of the description and the speed with which it was sent out. The Warren Commission admitted the source could only be guessed at. Its own guess was that it came from Howard L. Brennan, an eyewitness. The critics doubt Brennan had a good enough view of Oswald in the window to arrive at a good description. They also doubt he passed the information on to a Secret Serviceman within 10 minutes, as he later claimed.

At 1:15 PM, 45 minutes after the assassination, the Commission Report says, Officer Tippit stopped Oswald, whether because of the description or not will never be known, and was shot down. But did Oswald have time to get to Tenth and Patton in time for the fatal encounter with Tippit?

RATHER. A CBS newsman, following the Warren Commission blueprint, found that 45 minutes was ample time.

CRONKITE. The answer is yes. He could have made his way there.

(Announcement.)

CRONKITE. Why was Officer Tippit in Oak Cliff off his normal beat? Those who believe there was a conspiracy involving the Dallas police force have maintained that the meeting between Oswald and Tippit was not an accident, that Tippit may have been looking for Oswald or vice versa. They say Tippit should not have been where he was and should not have been alone in the squad car. Eddie Barker talked to police radio dispatcher, Murray Jackson:

BARKER. Officer Jackson, a lot of critics of the Warren Report have made quite a thing out of the fact that Officer Tippit was not in his district when he was killed. Could you tell us how he happened to be out of his district?

MURRAY JACKSON. Yes, sir. I have heard this several times since the incident occurred. He was where he was because I had assigned him to be where he was in the central Oak Cliff area. There was the shooting involving the President and we immediately dispatched every available unit to the triple underpass where the shot was reported to have come from.

I realized that we were draining the Oak Cliff area of available police officers, so if there was an emergency such as an armed robbery or a major accident to come up, we wouldn't have anybody there that would be in any close proximity to answer the call. And since J. D. was the outermost unit—actually I had two units: 87, which was Officer Nelson, and 78, which was Officer Tippit.

BARKER. Well, now, is—you got down to the time when Officer Tippit met his death. What transpired right prior to that? Did you—were you aware of where he was all the time?

JACKSON. No, I asked him once again what his location was sometime after and to determine that he was in the Oak Cliff area, he said he was at Lancaster and Eighth, which is on the east side of Oak Cliff, on the—in the main business district. And I did ask him once again, a few minutes later what his—I called him to ask him his location so I could keep track of him, where he was, in my mind, but he didn't answer.

BARKER. When did you realize that he was dead?

JACKSON. We had received a call from a citizen. They called us on the telephone and

the call sheet came—came to me and there was a disturbance in the street in the 400 block of East Tenth. And I had called. I said, "78," and he didn't answer. And almost immediately to this, a citizen came in on the police radio and said, "Send me some help there's been an officer shot out here." And knowing that J. D. was the only one that should have been in Oak Cliff, my reaction was to call 78, and, of course, J. D. didn't answer. So, we asked the citizen to look at the—the number on the side of the car. This was the equipment number that determined which car, which patrol car, was to be on each assigned district, and they said that it was number 10. And since I had worked with J. D. in this particular car, well, I determined to myself that with him not answering, and the equipment number, that this was Officer Tippit.

CRONKITE. The answer to this question is that he had been sent to Oak Cliff by the police dispatcher. Opponents of the Warren Report maintain that Officer Tippit was shot, not by Oswald, but by others. Who shot Officer Tippit? Eddie Barker talked to two witnesses who were on the scene of the Tippit murder. First, Domingo Benavides, who was at the wheel of a truck across the street from the scene.

DOMINGO BENAVIDES. As I was driving down the street I seen this police car, was sitting here, and the officer was getting out of the car and apparently he'd been talking to the man that was standing by the car. The policeman got out of the car and, as he walked past the windshield of the car, where it's kind of lined up over the hood of the car, where this other man shot him. And, of course, he was reaching for his gun.

And so, I was standing there, you know, I mean sitting there in the truck, and not in no big hurry to get out because I was sitting there watching everything. This man turned from the car then, and took a couple of steps and, as he turned to walk away I believe he was unloading his gun, and he took the shells up in his hand, and as he took off, he threw them in the bushes more or less like nothing really, trying to get rid of them. I guess he didn't figure he'd get caught anyway, so he just threw them in the bushes.

But he—as he started to turn to walk away, well, he stopped and looked back at me and I don't know if he figured, well, I'll just let this poor guy go, or he had nothing to do with it, or, you know, I'm not out to kill everybody, just, you know, whoever gets in my way, I guess. I gave him enough time to get around the house. Thinking he might have went in the house, I set there for maybe a second or two and then jumped out of the truck and run over. As I walked by, I didn't even slow down, I seen the officer's dead. So I just walked on—got in the car and I figured that would be the fastest way—in fact, I don't know why I called him on the radio. I just figured now that it was the fastest way to—to get a police officer out.

POLICE RADIO: Hello, police operator (STAT-IC), go ahead. Hello, we've got a shooting out here. Where's it at? This is the police radio. What location is it at? Between Marsalis and Beckley. It's a police officer. Somebody shot him. What—what—it's in a police car, Number 10. Hello, police operator, did you get that? Police officer, 510 East Jefferson. Thank you. 35, assist the police. . . .

BARKER. Well, now, did several other people come up later?

BENAVIDES. Immediately afterwards. I mean, it was just—all I had to do was—people I asked a block away like Mr. Callaway, he come up and he says, let's go get him, or something. And then this cab pulled up right afterwards, and so Callaway went over and took the guns—the officer's gun out of his hand.

BARKER. Callaway did go after him, did he?

BENAVIDES. Yeah, Callaway took off to go try to catch him.

TED CALLAWAY. Well, Eddie, I was standing on the front porch of the used car lot that

I worked on here, and all of a sudden I heard some shooting.

In fact, I heard five shots coming from the direction behind the lot, out on Tenth Street there. Well, I come running off the side of the porch and out to the sidewalk here, and I looked up the street and I saw this man run through this hedge up here on the corner. And I saw right away that he had a gun in his hand. And he continued across the street coming in this direction. So when he got right across from me over here, just, oh, about 30 yards or less, why, I called to him and just asked him, "Hey, man, what the hell's goin' on, fella?" That's just exactly what I wondered. I didn't know who it was at the time, of course. And he looked in my direction and paused, almost stopped, and said something to me but I couldn't make out what he said. But he had this pistol in his hand, carrying it in what we used to call in the Marine Corps a raised pistol position, and then he slowed down and started walking.

Then, I ran to the corner of Tenth and Patton, and when I got there, I saw this squad car parked near the curb. And then I walked around in front of the squad car and this policeman was lying in front of the squad car.

BARKER. Dom, what about those expended shells?

BENAVIDES. Well, they were looking all over the place for evidence, I guess, and taking fingerprints and what have you. So, I guessed they was going to walk off and leave them, you know, not knowing they was there. And seeing that I knew where they was at, I walked over and—and picked up a stick and picked them up and put them in a waistcoat pocket. I think I picked up two and put them in a waistcoat pocket and then, as I was walking up, I picked the other one up by hand, I believe. And I picked them up with a stick, you know, to keep from leaving fingerprints on them, because I figured they might need them.

CRONKITE. The cartridges that Benavides picked up were positively identified as being fired in Oswald's revolver. But, only one of the four lead bullets removed from Officer Tippit's body could be positively identified with that revolver by Illinois ballistics identification expert, Joseph Nicol.

NICOL. In the examination of the projectiles, the tests and the—and the evidence projectiles were not easily matched because of a certain mechanical problem with the weapon. The—the barrel was over-sized for the size of the ammunition used, since this was a weapon originally intended for British use and it was reimported into America.

This means that the bullet, instead of touching on all surfaces going down the barrel, actually wobbles a little bit as it goes through the barrel. As a consequence, it is difficult to have it strike the same places every time that it goes through the barrel. So that the—the match on the—on the projectiles was extremely difficult.

I did find, however, that on the driving edge of the lens there were certain groups of lines which I could match on one bullet. I wasn't able to identify the others, although there was nothing to exclude them insofar as the class characteristics. All of them could have been fired in that particular weapon.

CRONKITE. One of the bullets that killed Officer Tippit was fired in Oswald's revolver. The other three could have been, according to the ballistics identification experts. Ted Callaway went to the police station that night and made a positive identification of Oswald in a line-up. But Mr. Benavides did not do so. Eddie Barker asked him if he were sure Oswald did the shooting.

BARKER. Is there any doubt in your mind that Oswald was the man you had seen shoot Tippit?

BENAVIDES. No, sir, there was no doubt at all. I could even tell you how he combed his hair and the clothes he wore and what

have you, all the details. And if he had a scar on his face, I could probably have told you about it, but—you don't forget things like that.

CRONKITE. The answer to this question, despite the problem of the ballistic evidence, is that Lee Harvey Oswald shot J. D. Tippit.

What of the theory that Tippit actually knew Oswald? It's not easy to prove that someone did not know someone else. But every attempt to pin down the rumor that the two men knew each other has ended in failure. There is nothing in the circumstances surrounding Tippit's death to suggest any kind of conspiracy.

Mrs. Tippit says flatly that neither she nor her husband knew Oswald. Officer Jackson was among Tippit's closest friends and had been for years. Eddie Barker put the question to him.

BARKER. Do you have any reason to believe that Officer Tippit knew Lee Harvey Oswald?

JACKSON. I don't believe there is a possible connection at all. No. I don't think that he knew Oswald.

BARKER. Did you know Oswald?

JACKSON. No, I didn't either.

RATHER. Thirty-five minutes after Officer Tippit's murder Oswald was captured in the Texas Theatre. Johnny Brewer, a shoe clerk, had spotted him in the doorway, and watched while he slipped into the theatre. Brewer spoke to the cashier. She called police.

The next 48 hours were filled with confusion. An army of newsmen jammed into the Dallas Police Building. Oswald was paraded through the halls, to and from questioning sessions.

Police Chief Jesse Curry and District Attorney Henry Wade said repeatedly they expected to prove Oswald guilty, although he maintained to the last he was not.

No record was made of his interrogation.

Sunday, November 24th, the mob scene continues, as Oswald is brought into the basement of the Police Building for transfer to the jail. And then, in full sight of millions of television viewers, a man named Jack Ruby surges through the crowd and shoots Lee Oswald dead.

CRONKITE. Why? A fateful meeting of de-ranged minds? Or some twisted conspiracy? Why did Ruby kill Oswald?

RATHER. This is the world of Jack Ruby. A world of neon and female flesh, of bumps and grinds, and watered drinks.

Ruby operated a pair of sleazy nightclubs, The Carousel and The Vegas. In the free and easy atmosphere that seemed to characterize the boom city Ruby was also a hanger-on of the police, entertaining off-duty officers in his strip joints, often carrying sandwiches over to the Police Building for his on-duty friends.

These are some of the people of Jack Ruby's world—his roommate, a competing nightclub owner, and two of Jack Ruby's girls.

Mr. Weinstein, why do you think Jack Ruby shot Lee Harvey Oswald?

BARNEY WEINSTEIN. I think it was on the spur of the moment, that he really wanted to make himself look like a big man. And he thought that would make him above everybody else, that the people would come up and thank him for it, that people would come around and want to meet him and want to know him, "This is the man that shot the man that shot the President."

RATHER. Why do you think Jack shot Oswald?

ALICE. Oh, I think that it was mostly an impulsive act. And Jack also, I believe, felt that so many people at the time were saying, "They ought to kill him," and this and that, that he—in my personal opinion, Jack thought this would just bring him a—a sensational amount of business, and he would just really be a hero.

RATHER. Diana, why do you think Jack shot Oswald?

DIANA. I think that he came down there

just to see what was going on, and when he saw that sneer on Oswald's face—that's all it would take to snap Jack, the way Oswald's mouth was curled up, you could even see it in the picture. I think when he saw that look was when he decided to shoot him. Not when he was coming down. And I think he did it because he thought that it was a service to his country, in his way of thinking. That was the way he thought.

GEORGE SENATOR. I don't believe that Jack Ruby ever took any secrets to his grave. I've been—I've been around him too long, and I've lived with him too long. And I'm certain he told the truth right up until his death. And I'll never can be—and I'll never be convinced otherwise. There is nothing he ever hid. The public knew everything he ever said, or heard.

CRONKITE. Jack Ruby was convicted of the murder of Oswald, but the conviction was reversed by an Appeals Court which held that an alleged confession should not have been admitted.

Ruby died six months ago of cancer, maintaining to the last that he was no conspirator, that he had killed Oswald out of anger and a desire to shield Jacqueline Kennedy from the ordeal of a trial at which she would have had to appear as a witness.

Dallas police had alerted the press that Oswald would be moved to the County Jail shortly after 10:00 AM on November 24th. That departure was delayed. Yet a receipt shows that Ruby was sending a money order to one of his strippers from a Western Union office across from the courthouse at 11:17 AM, when anyone premeditating murder in the courthouse basement would already have stationed himself there. In fact, it was probably the activity around the courthouse entrance which caught Jack Ruby's eye as he left the Western Union office. Ruby was carrying a pistol because he was carrying money. He was accustomed to wander in and out of the Police Building at will.

The Oswald murder today still appears to have been not a conspiracy, but an impulse—meaningless violence born of meaningless violence.

PART VI

ANNOUNCER. A CBS News Inquiry: "The Warren Report" continues. Here again is Walter Cronkite.

CRONKITE. But the most recent, most spectacular development in the Oswald case involves the C.I.A. It involves, too, the spectacular District Attorney of New Orleans, a man they call the Jolly Green Giant. It involves an arrest, hypnotism, truth serum, bribery charges, and for the first time, an outline of a conspiracy. It certainly accounts for the recent national upsurge of suspicion concerning the conclusions of the Warren Report. And it raises a new question: Was the assassination plotted in New Orleans?

Mike Wallace reports.

WALLACE. New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison quietly began his own investigation of the assassination last fall. In a sense, he picked up where the Warren Commission had left off. Warren investigators questioned a number of people in New Orleans after the assassination, and they failed to implicate any of them. But the more Garrison went back over old ground apparently, the more fascinated he became with the possibility that a plot to kill President Kennedy actually began in New Orleans. By the time the story of his investigation broke four months ago he seemed supremely confident that he could make a case, that he had solved the assassination.

GARRISON. Because I certainly wouldn't say with confidence that we would make arrests and have convictions afterwards if I did not know that we had solved the assassination of President Kennedy beyond any shadow of a doubt. I can't imagine that people would think that—that I would guess and say something like that rashly. There's no question about it. We know what cities were involved,

we know how it was done in—in the essential respects. We know the key individuals involved. And we're in the process of developing evidence now. I thought I made that clear days ago.

WALLACE. He shocked New Orleans four months ago by arresting the socially prominent Clay Shaw, former director of the New Orleans International Trade Mart.

Garrison's charge was that Shaw had conspired with two other men to plot the assassination of President Kennedy. Garrison said Shaw had known David Ferrie, an eccentric former airline pilot who was found dead a week before Garrison had planned to arrest him. Incidentally, the coroner said Ferrie died of natural causes. But Garrison called it suicide.

He said Shaw also knew Lee Harvey Oswald; that Ferrie, Oswald, and Shaw met one night in the summer of 1963 and plotted the President's death. Clay Shaw said it was all fantastic.

SHAW. I am completely innocent of any such charges. I have not conspired with anyone, at any time, or any place, to murder our late and esteemed President John F. Kennedy, or any other individual. I have always had only the highest and utmost respect and admiration for Mr. Kennedy.

The charges filed against me have no foundation in fact or in law. I have not been apprised of the basis of these fantastic charges, and assume that in due course I will be furnished with this information, and will be afforded an opportunity to prove my innocence.

I did not know Harvey Lee Oswald, nor did I ever see or talk with him, or anyone who knew him at any time in my life.

WALLACE. A preliminary hearing for Shaw was held two weeks after his arrest. The hearing was complete with a surprise mystery witness, Perry Raymond Russo, twenty-five-year-old insurance salesman, and friend of the late David Ferrie. Through three days of intense cross-examination Russo held doggedly to his story, that he himself had been present when Shaw, Ferrie, and Oswald plotted the Kennedy assassination. Russo admitted at the hearing that he had been hypnotized three times by Garrison men.

A writer for The Saturday Evening Post said he read transcripts of what went on at those sessions. The writer suggested that Russo's entire performance at the hearing was the product of post-hypnotic suggestion. Clay Shaw was ordered held for trial. It could be months before the trial actually takes place.

Meanwhile, various news organizations have reported serious charges against Jim Garrison and his staff, alleging bribery, intimidation, and efforts to plant and/or manufacture evidence against Shaw. Last month Newsweek Magazine said Garrison's office had tried to bribe Alvin Beauboeuf, the twenty-one-year-old former friend of David Ferrie. Beauboeuf, the magazine said, was offered three thousand dollars to supply testimony that would shore up the conspiracy charge against Shaw.

Garrison promptly released an affidavit Beauboeuf had signed. The affidavit said no one working for Garrison had ever asked Beauboeuf to tell anything but the truth.

Subsequently, New Orleans police investigated the Beauboeuf charge and said Garrison's men had been falsely accused. But that was just the beginning. Three more bribery accusations have since come to light, two involving Louisiana prison inmates, one involving a nightclub and Turkish Bath operator. In each of those cases the charges that rewards were offered in return for allegedly false testimony or other help that would implicate Clay Shaw. We will hear Garrison's comment on those charges later in the broadcast.

Meanwhile, Garrison has gone on to include Jack Ruby in the alleged conspiracy involving Shaw and Lee Harvey Oswald. Garrison says Jack Ruby's unlisted telephone

number in 1963 appears in code in address books belonging to Shaw and Oswald. He says both books note the Dallas Post Office box number 11906. Ruby's unlisted phone number was Whitehall-1 5601. And Garrison furnished a complicated formula for converting PO 11906 to WH-1 5601.

Louisiana Senator Russell Long, appearing on Face the Nation a few days later, explained how the code works.

LONG. . . . so if you take the P and the O, and you use a telephone dial, P gives you seven, O gives you six. You add seven and six together and you get thirteen. Then you take the 19106, and you work on a A B C D E F—the A B C D E basis, so you put A—A falls—comes ahead of E. Then you put D behind C. And you reconstruct the numbers, and that—and then you subtract thirteen hundred, which you got for the P O, and that gives you Ruby's unlisted telephone number.

WALLACE. A Dallas businessman named Lee Odom had that Dallas Post Office box for a while in 1966. He said he didn't know how the number got in Oswald's address book, but he could explain how it got in Shaw's. Odom said he met Shaw when he went to New Orleans looking for a place to hold a bloodless bullfight.

ODOM. When I got to New Orleans, and I got there—it was late, and so I wanted to see what New Orleans—my first trip to New Orleans. And I went to Pat O'Brien's, and that's where I met Mr. Shaw. I was sitting, drinking at the bar, and he was sitting next to me, and I got to talking to him about the—if he thought a bullfight might go over good in—in New Orleans. And he said that he thought it would, and we introduced each other. He was in the real estate business, and said he might be able to help me. So the next day, why, we had lunch together, and tried to find out about a place to have a bullfight. Made two or three phone calls, and—we didn't find any place. So when I got ready to leave there, I give him my name and my box number, which I saw him write in his little book. And I never heard from him after that. But that's how the number got in the book.

WALLACE. The number 19106 does appear in Oswald's address book, although some say the letters in front of it are not P O, but Russian letters. No one knows when Oswald made the entry.

Garrison has expanded the scope of his charges to include not only a Shaw-Oswald-Ruby link, but the C.I.A. as well. Further, Garrison says he knows that five anti-Castro Cuban guerrillas, not Lee Harvey Oswald, killed President Kennedy. He says the C.I.A. is concealing both the names and the whereabouts of the Cubans.

In an interview with Bob Jones of WWL-TV, New Orleans, he discussed proof that the guerrillas were there at Dealey Plaza in Dallas.

GARRISON. We have even located photographs in which we can—we have found the—the men behind the grassy knoll, and the—the stone wall, before they dropped completely out of sight. There were five of them. Three behind the stone wall, and two behind the grassy knoll. And they're not quite out of sight. And they've been located in other photographs, by process of bringing them out. Although they're not distinct enough you can make an identification from their faces.

WALLACE. This is one of the photographs Garrison is talking about, shown first with an overlay. Those roughly-drawn figures at the bottom of the page could be the men Garrison believes he sees through the little holes at the top. Now we remove the overlay to see the photograph itself—a hazy blowup of an area from a larger picture. If there are men up there behind the wall, they definitely cannot be seen with the naked eye.

I asked Garrison if he would sort it all out, if he could summarize his investigation, and put it in perspective.

GARRISON. About the New Orleans part, I don't like to sound coy, but it is impossible to talk about the New Orleans details without touching somehow on the case. And I'm not going to take any chances about reflecting on Mr. Shaw, or this case. We've worked too hard for me to ruin it by casual comment.

WALLACE. Four months ago you said that you had solved the assassination. At that time you didn't even know Perry Russo. And yet Perry Russo, it turns out, is your main witness in the preliminary hearing.

GARRISON. Right.

WALLACE. Is he still your main witness?

GARRISON. No.

WALLACE. Are there others?

GARRISON. No. There are others, and I would not describe Perry Russo as the main witness. But let me say this, that the major part of our case, up to that time, was circumstantial. Again, I don't want to touch in any way on the case against the defendant, but we knew months before that the key people involved but there was no basis for moving at that time.

WALLACE. You say that Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President Kennedy. Who, then, did kill him?

GARRISON. Well, first of all, if I knew the names of the individuals behind the grassy knoll, where we know they were, and the stone wall, I certainly would not tell you, and couldn't here. There is no question about the fact they were there. There's no question in our minds what the dominant race of these individuals was. And there's no question about the motive. In the course of time we will have the names of every one of them. The reason for Officer Tippitt's murder is simply this: It was necessary for them to get rid of the decoy in the case—Lee Oswald . . . Lee Oswald, now, in order to get rid of him—so that he would not later describe the people involved in this, they had what I think is a rather clever plan. It's well-known that police officers react violently to the murder of a police officer. All they did was arrange for an officer to be sent out to Tenth Street, and when Officer Tippitt arrived there he was murdered, with no other reason than that. Now, after he was murdered, Oswald was pointed to, sitting in the back of the Texas Theatre where he'd been told to wait, obviously.

Now, the idea was, quite apparently, that Oswald would be killed in the Texas Theatre when he arrived, because he'd killed a "blue-coat." That's the way the officers in New Orleans use the phrase. "He killed a blue-coat." But the Dallas police, at least the arresting Dallas police, fooled them because they had apparently, too much humanity in them, and they did not kill him.

WALLACE. All right, there is Lee Harvey Oswald at the back of the Texas Theatre—then what?

GARRISON. Well, then notification is gotten to the police of this suspicious man in the back of the theatre, and you know the rest. But the—Dallas police, apparently, at least the arresting police officers, had more humanity in them than the planners had in mind. And this is the first point at which the plan did not work completely. So Oswald was not killed there. He was arrested. This left a problem, because if Lee Oswald stayed alive long enough, obviously he would name names and talk about this thing that he'd been drawn into. It was necessary to kill him.

WALLACE. That's where Jack Ruby comes into the picture.

GARRISON. That's right. It was necessary for one of the people involved to kill him.

WALLACE. Mr. Garrison, obviously you're not going to try the case of Clay Shaw here on television, but some people, some journalists and others, have charged that you have tried to bribe, to hypnotize, to drug witnesses in order to prove your case against Shaw.

GARRISON. That's right. I understand that

the latest—latest news by a New York Times writer is that we offered an ounce of heroin and three months' vacation to one—as a matter of fact, this is part of our incentive program for convicts. We also have six weeks in the Bahamas, and we give them some LSD to get there.

This—this—this attitude of skepticism on the part of the press is an astonishing thing to me, and a new thing to me. They have a problem with my office. And one of the problems is that we have no political appointments. Most of our men are selected by recommendations of deans of law schools. They work 9:00 to 5:00, and we have a highly professional office. I think one of the best in the country. So they're reduced to making up these fictions. We have not intimidated a witness since the day I came in office.

WALLACE. One question is asked again and again: Why doesn't Jim Garrison give his information, if it is valid information, why doesn't he give it to the Federal Government? Now that everything is out in the open the C.I.A. could hardly stand in your way again, could they? Why don't you take this information that you have and cooperate with the Federal Government?

GARRISON. Well, that would be one approach, Mike. Or I could take my files and take them up on the Mississippi River Bridge and throw them in the river. It'd be about the same result.

WALLACE. You mean, they just don't want any other solution from that in the Warren Report?

GARRISON. Well, isn't that kind of obvious? Where do you think that pressure's coming from, that prevents witnesses and defendants from being brought back to our state?

WALLACE. Where is that pressure coming from?

GARRISON. It's coming from Washington, obviously.

WALLACE. For what reason?

GARRISON. Because there are individuals in Washington who do not want the truth about the Kennedy murder to come out.

WALLACE. Where are those individuals? Are they in the White House? Are they in the C.I.A.? Are they in the F.B.I.? Where are they?

GARRISON. I think the probability is that you'll find them in the Justice Department and the Central Intelligence Agency.

WALLACE. You're asking a good many questions, but you haven't got the answers to those questions. You have a theory as to why indeed the President might have been assassinated by a group of dissidents. . . .

GARRISON. No. Your statement is incorrect. We have more than a theory. We have conversations about the assassination of the President of the United States, and it does not include only the conversation brought out at the preliminary hearing.

We have money passed, with regard to the assassination of the President of the United States. We have individuals involved in the planning. And we can make the case completely. I can't make any more comments about the case, except to say anybody that thinks it's just a theory is going to be awfully surprised when it comes to trial.

WALLACE. Garrison says Clay Shaw used the alias Clay Bertrand, or Clem Bertrand. At Shaw's preliminary hearing Perry Russo testified that Shaw used the name Clem Bertrand the night of the alleged meeting to plot the assassination. It was obviously a crucial point in Garrison's presentation at that hearing.

But a week ago NBC said it has discovered that Clay Bertrand is not Clay Shaw. NBC said the man who uses that alias is a New Orleans homosexual, whose real name—not disclosed in the broadcast—has been turned over to the Justice Department.

CRONKITE. Garrison's problems multiplied yesterday. His chief aide, William Gurvich, who conferred recently with Senator Robert Kennedy, abruptly resigned.

Gurvich was questioned by Bill Reed, News Director of WWL-TV, New Orleans, and CBS News reporter Edward Rabel.

RABEL. Mr. Gurvich, why did you resign as Mr. Garrison's chief aide in this investigation?

GURVICH. I was very dissatisfied with the way the investigation was being conducted, and I saw no reason for the investigation—and decided that if the job of an investigator is to find the truth, then I was to find it. I found it. And this led to my resignation.

RABEL. Well, what then is the truth?

GURVICH. The truth, as I see it, is that Mr. Shaw should never have been arrested.

RABEL. Why did you decide to see Senator Robert Kennedy?

GURVICH. Ed, I went to Senator Kennedy because he was a brother of the late President Kennedy, to tell him we could shed no light on the death of his brother, and not to be hoping for such. After I told him that, he appeared to be rather disgusted to think that someone was exploiting his brother's death, and—by bringing it up, over and over again, and doing what has been done in this investigation.

REED. There's been talk of allegations, of wrong-doing, of coercion, of possible bribery on the part of investigators—of certain investigators for the District Attorney. To your knowledge, are these allegations true?

GURVICH. Unquestionably, things have happened in the District Attorney's Office that definitely warrants an investigation by the Parish Grand Jury, as well as the Federal Grand Jury.

REED. Would you say these methods were illegal?

GURVICH. I would say very illegal, and unethical.

REED. Can you give us any specifics?

GURVICH. I would rather save that for the Grand Jury, Bill, if I may.

REED. Is this on the part of just one or two investigators, or does it involve the whole Staff, or perhaps Mr. Garrison. . . .

GURVICH. It involves more than two people.

REED. More than two people. Do you believe Mr. Garrison had knowledge of these activities?

GURVICH. Yeah—of course, he did. He ordered it.

REED. He ordered it?

GURVICH. He ordered it. Yes, sir.

RABEL. Why did he feel it was necessary to order such activities?

GURVICH. That I cannot explain. I am not a psychiatrist.

REED. Mr. Garrison said the C.I.A. has attempted to block his investigation. . . .

GURVICH. His purpose for bringing the C.I.A. in, Bill, is this: As he put it, they can't afford to answer. He can say what he damn well pleases about that agency, and they'll never reply.

CRONKITE. Mr. Garrison is the only critic who has been in a position to act on his beliefs. He has brought Clay Shaw before the courts of Louisiana, and until that case is tried we cannot, with propriety, go deep into the details of the evidence, or reach any final conclusions concerning the case or the allegations concerning Clay Shaw.

Mr. Garrison's public statements, however—and there's been no shortage of them—are fair targets. They have consistently promised startling proof, but until the trial Mr. Garrison's promises remain just that, and cannot be tested.

But the whole atmosphere of his investigations, and the charges that have been made by news organizations concerning it, are not such as to inspire confidence. It may be that Garrison will finally show that there was a lunatic fringe in dark and devious conspiracy. But, so far, he has shown us nothing to link the events he alleges to have taken place in New Orleans, and the events we know to have taken place in Dallas.

Those events, events surrounding the assassination itself, we have now examined to the best of our ability. On Sunday night we considered whether Lee Harvey Oswald had shot the President. We concluded that he had. Last night we asked if there was more than one assassin. We concluded there was not, and that Oswald was a sole assassin.

Tonight we've asked if there was a conspiracy involving perhaps Officer Tippit, Jack Ruby, or others. The answer here cannot be as firm as our other answers, partly because of the difficulty, cited in the Warren Report, of proving something did not happen. But partly, too, because there remains a question as to just what Jim Garrison will produce in that New Orleans courtroom.

But on the basis of the evidence now in hand at least, we still can find no convincing indication of such a conspiracy. If we put those three conclusions together, they seem to CBS NEWS to tell just one story—Lee Harvey Oswald, alone, and for reasons all his own, shot and killed President Kennedy. It is too much to expect that the critics of the Warren Report will be satisfied with the conclusion CBS NEWS has reached, any more than they were satisfied with the conclusions the Commission reached.

Mark Lane, for example, the most vocal of all the critics, has a theory of his own.

BILL SROUT. If you would give us, briefly, Mr. Lane, your version of what happened there that day.

LANE. Well, I think—if I can use this model, I think the evidence indicates—of course, the car came down Main, up here, and down to Elm Street, and was approximately here when the first shot was fired. The first shot struck the President in the back of the right shoulder, according to the F.B.I. report, and indicates therefore that it came from some place in the rear—which includes the possibility of it coming from the Book Depository Building.

The second bullet struck the President in the throat from the front, came from behind this wooden fence, high up on a grassy knoll. Two more bullets were fired. One struck the Elm—the Main Street curb, and caused some concrete, or lead, to scatter up and strike a spectator named James Tague in the face. Another bullet, fired from the rear, struck Governor Connally in the back. As the limousine moved up to approximately this point, another bullet was fired from the right front, struck the President in the head, drove him—his body, to the left and to the rear, and drove a portion of his skull backward, to the left and to the rear. Five bullets, fired from at least two different directions, the result of a conspiracy.

CRONKITE. An even more elaborate account is given by William Turner, a former F.B.I. agent, who has become a warm supporter of District Attorney Garrison.

TURNER. Now, what happened there was that the Kennedy motorcade coming down there, the Kennedy limousine—there were shots from the rear, from either the Dallas School Book Depository Building, or the Dell Mart, or the courthouse; and there were shots from the grassy knoll. This is triangulation. There is no escape from it, if it's properly executed.

I think the massive head wound, where the President's head was literally blown apart, came from a quartering angle on the grassy knoll. The bullet was a low velocity dum-dum mercury fulminate hollow-nose, which were outlawed by The Hague Convention, but which are used by para-military groups. And that the whole reaction is very consistent to this kind of weapon. That he was struck, and his head—doesn't go directly back this way, but it goes back and over this way, which would be consistent with the shot from that direction, and Newton's Law of Motion.

Now, I feel also that the escape was very simple. Number one, using a revolver or a pistol, the shells do not eject, they don't even

have to bother to pick up their discharged shells. Number two, they can slip—put the gun under their coat, and when everybody comes surging up there they can just say, "He went that-a-way." Very simple. In fact, it's so simple that it probably happened that way.

CRONKITE. In the light of what we have exposed over the past three evenings, it's difficult to take such versions seriously. But unquestionably there are those who will do so, and it is their privilege.

Our own task is not yet over. We must still ask whether the Warren Commission did all that was asked of it, whether other arms of the government acted as they should have acted, whether another commission might cast new light upon the assassination. We must ask also whether there are fundamental and profound human reasons for the aura of disbelief that surrounds the Warren Report. We will deal with all those matters tomorrow night, in the last portion of this inquiry.

But this is a natural moment to pause, and to sum up what we think we have learned.

Dan, you were in Dealey Plaza on the day of the assassination. You've been back there several times since, when we did the first Warren Report, and now in recent days to prepare this report. You've been up in that window. We've looked out that window with you. But, subjectively, what is the Oswald-eye view of the assassination site?

RATHER. It was an easy shot. A much easier shot than even it looks in our pictures. The range was such, the angle was such, that it did not take an expert shot, one man, to do what the Warren Commission says was done from there.

CRONKITE. Eddie, as News Director of our esteemed affiliate, KRLLD-TV in Dallas, you've been right in the vortex of this thing since the moment of the assassination. What about the people of Dallas themselves? Do they agree with the Warren Commission Report?

BARKER. Walter, I think that on a cross-section basis, the percentage that had some doubt about it would be about what it would be across the country. Certainly there are people who have some doubts about it. But most of the doubters, I think, are those who come to Dallas, and who come into our newsroom, as a matter of fact. They bring a lot of questions. But so far none of them have brought any answers.

CRONKITE. That's the problem we all have, isn't it? And let me ask each of you in turn this question: Are you contented with the basic finding of the Warren Commission?

RATHER. I'm contented with the basic finding of the Warren Commission, that the evidence is overwhelming that Oswald fired at the President, and that Oswald probably killed President Kennedy alone. I am not content with the findings on Oswald's possible connections with government agencies, particularly with the C.I.A. I'm not totally convinced that at some earlier time, unconnected with the assassination, that Oswald, may have had more connections than we've been told about, or that have been shown. I'm not totally convinced about the single bullet theory. But I don't think it's absolutely necessary to the final conclusion of the Warren Commission Report. I would have liked more questioning, a more thorough going into Marina Oswald's background. But as to the basic conclusion, I agree.

CRONKITE. Eddie?

BARKER. I agree with it, Walter. It's too bad, of course, that Oswald didn't have his day in court. But I felt the night of November 22nd that he was the one who had shot the President, and nothing has come to light since then to change my opinion a bit.

CRONKITE. It is difficult to be totally content. Yet experience teaches all of us that any complex human event that is examined scrupulously and in detail will reveal improbabilities, inconsistencies, awkward gaps in our knowledge. Only in fiction do we find all the loose ends neatly tied. That is one

of the ways we identify something as fiction.

Real life is not all that tidy. In 1943 Lieutenant John F. Kennedy came under enemy fire behind Japanese lines in the Pacific. His PT boat was destroyed. His back, already weak, was re-injured. Yet he swam three miles, towing a wounded shipmate, found shelter on an island, escaped Japanese search, encountered natives who carried messages back to American forces, crossed undetected through enemy waters as enemy planes hovered overhead, and survived to become President.

The account of his survival is full of improbabilities, coincidences, unknowns. So is the account of his death. So would be the account of your life, or mine, or the life of any one of us.

Concerning the events of November 22nd, 1963, in Dealey Plaza, the report of the Warren Commission is probably as close as we can ever come now to the truth. And yet if the Warren Commission had acted otherwise three years ago, if other government agencies had done differently then, would we today be even closer to the truth?

Tomorrow we will consider not the assassination, but the work of the Commission that was appointed to study it. For the first time a member of that Commission, John J. McCloy, will publicly discuss its work and its findings. Members of the Commission staff, and one of the Commission's most persuasive critics, Edward J. Epstein, will be heard. And we will ask, although we may not be able to answer, two last questions:

Should America believe the Warren Report?

Could America believe the Warren Report?

SCORE ONE FOR THE GOOD GUYS

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a refreshing article has come out of London via the Christian Science Monitor, to the effect that—

Politicians and bureaucrats who think that official status puts them above the law have heard some straight talk from three judges . . .

The article is an account of the citizen winning a skirmish with the bureaucracy over local control or Government control and which side has the say in determining the shape of the school system. But more importantly, the article notes that in Britain, as here, persons "are deeply concerned over what they consider Labor—liberal party—intolerance of checks or balances to the exercise of the power of bureaucracy."

Change for the sake of change, "without adequate preparation," and without the consideration of the persons involved, has for once got stopped in its tracks, if only momentarily.

It is important that "the appeal judges were not concerned with the rights or wrongs of comprehensive education. Neither were they concerned with the wisdom of the changeover. Their duty was to pass judgment on whether the law had been fulfilled," and they concluded that "It is essential that bureaucracy should be kept in its place."

For those who, like these citizens, see too often instances of the "continuing

erosion of freedom by socialist theories," I include the news article in the RECORD. Those who do not see the washout at their feet, but should, are also welcome to read it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 28, 1967]

SCHOOL BALK: BRITISH PARENTS WIN TILT
(By Melita Knowles)

LONDON.—Politicians and bureaucrats who think that official status puts them above the law have heard some straight talk from three judges in the Court of Appeal here.

The reverberations are spreading across the country.

"It is essential that bureaucracy should be kept in its place," Lord Justice Danckwerts said.

Lord Denning, Master of the Rolls, Lord Justice Diplock and Lord Danckwerts had spent two days considering the case of eight Borough of Enfield ratepayers and a parents association.

The parents want to retain the present character of education in this north London borough—primary, secondary, and grammar schools.

The borough wants to switch to a different system—comprehensive (nonselective) schools. And it hoped to complete part of the changeover by Sept. 7, the start of the new term.

INJUNCTION GRANTED

But the parents won their case. A temporary injunction—previously refused by the High Court—to delay the changeover was granted against the borough council. It remains in force until there can be a full trial.

The appeal judges were not concerned with the rights or wrongs of comprehensive education. Neither were they concerned with the wisdom of the changeover. Their duty was to pass judgment on whether the law—the Education Act of 1944—had been fulfilled. They concluded that the council had acted illegally on several counts.

The case, however, has fanned out far beyond the issue of comprehensive schools.

The eight Enfield ratepayers are being hailed as champions of liberty. For the countrywide drive to change over to comprehensive schools, with the consequent disappearance of grammar schools, is seen by many as one more step in the continuing erosion of freedom by socialist theories.

PREPARATION STRESSED

Liberal-minded Britons are deeply concerned over what they consider Labor intolerance of checks or balances to the exercise of the power of bureaucracy.

Even some advocates of comprehensive education regret the tendency on the part of local authorities—urged on by the Department of Education—to change their whole education setup without adequate preparation.

Edward Heath, Conservative opposition leader—a consistent critic of councils which establish comprehensive schools in unsuitable buildings and without adequate thought—was quick to react to the injunction against Enfield.

Mr. Heath instructed the Tory Central Office to contact leaders of Conservative groups throughout the country. They were to examine, he said, all socialist schemes for secondary-school reorganization.

RETHINKING NEEDED

The local associations were to ask: Have parents been given a chance to raise objections?

Can they prevent "ill-thought-out" schemes going into effect?

The Tory Central Office also announced that it did not believe the Enfield ruling afforded justification for the Secretary for Education to introduce new legislation to

supplant the Education Act of 1944. This is being pressed by supporters of comprehensive education.

FAVORABLE EDITORIAL COMMENT FOR DEESCALATION

Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I continue to call the attention of the House to the favorable editorial comment that the July 10 gradual, reciprocal deescalation of the conflict in Vietnam put forward by the eight Republican Members has received around the country.

Today I include for the RECORD, editorials from the Kerrville, Tex., Times, the Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Evening News, the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard, the Portland Oregon Journal, the Klamath Falls, Oreg., Herald & News, and the Coos Bay, Oreg., World:

[From the Kerrville (Tex.) Times, July 19, 1967]

DEESCALATE?

"We are winning the war—but . . ." was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisors only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme for a de-escalation of the war that would steer a middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representative Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Mosher of Ohio, Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Stafford of Vermont propose a halt to all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with a similar de-escalatory step, such as dismantling major supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down in five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitation, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st

parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly don't know.

Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in the belief that the best chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quietly, that make the position of each side credible to the other.

[From the Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Evening News, July 28, 1967]

ESCALATE OR DEESCALATE?

(By Don Oakley)

"We are winning the war—but . . ." was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number, we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisors only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

McNamara described more than the immediate situation when he said at Da Nang: "Our casualties are high but we have also inflicted high casualties on North Vietnamese army units."

What he described was the situation as it was in 1965 and 1966 and as it is likely to be in 1968. Only the numbers have been changed—for the higher.

It is often forgotten that escalation is not the prerogative only of this country. Options open to the Communists include a step-up of terrorist bombings in Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in even greater numbers of the large North Vietnamese standing army; the use of Communist "volunteers" from other countries; the opening of diversionary action in Korea.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme for a de-escalation of the war that would steer a middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representatives Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Mosher of Ohio, Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Stafford of Vermont propose a halt to all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with a similar de-escalatory step, such as dismantling major supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down in five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitations, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly don't know. Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in

the belief that the best chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quietly, that make the position of each side credible to the other.

That we are willing to invest another 100,000 men in Vietnam is probably quite credible—and acceptable—to Hanoi. That we are ready to de-escalate by small steps, however, is something that does not seem to have been made as credible to them as it might be.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard, July 7, 1967]

STOPPING THE BOMBING BY DEGREES

Congressman John Dellenback dropped in the other day to talk about war, peace, politics, the price of groceries and other matters that concern a congressman. Uppermost in his mind was Vietnam. In his customary way he rejected the easy answers such as "victory," "pull out" and "negotiate," knowing that under present conditions none is a real answer. But negotiation, he feels, is the eventual answer—if that can be achieved.

Many advocates of peace in Southeast Asia seem to feel that if only the United States would stop bombing North Vietnam, peace feelers would go out, Hanoi's diplomats would show up with their briefcases and talks could begin. The hang-up comes in North Vietnam's reported insistence that the stopping of the bombing be "unconditional." That's an unrealistic demand. There must be a condition in any agreement. In this case the condition is that the stopping of the bombing result in some show of conciliation on the other side. If that condition is not imposed, then the "unconditional" stopping of the bombing is simply an open invitation to North Vietnam to ship down more ordnance for use against American boys.

The Congressman came up with an idea to test North Vietnam's willingness to negotiate. It would also test the validity of the theory that only a stopping of bombing stands between war and negotiation. He recommends stopping the bombing by degrees.

Announce, he says, that the United States will not bomb north of a certain point. But keep the heat on territory to the south of that point. This would end the punishment of one strip of territory while still preventing the movement of war materiel into the South. Wait for a hint that negotiations might be forthcoming.

If that doesn't work, move the line farther south, agreeing not to bomb an even larger area. But keep the heat on south of that point.

If that doesn't work, try again.

And again.

Meanwhile, though, don't let the North Vietnamese move arms and equipment into the South.

But suppose America drops its line south the whole way to the so-called demilitarized zone and Hanoi still shows no signs of negotiations?

Mr. Dellenback's answer is substantially that of George Mitrovich, a field worker for Negotiation Now, a group dedicated to bringing the war to the conference table. Mr. Mitrovich, when he was in Eugene six weeks ago, pointed out that if North Vietnam would not negotiate under any conditions, then the world would at least know who was blocking negotiations. (As if the world should not know already.) Presumably, Mr. Mitrovich said, the war would go on. Mr. Dellenback sadly agrees.

But, the Congressman said, this dropping back and thus sparing much of North Vietnam can show American good faith in wanting to negotiate. And it can't hurt the war effort if, at the same time we keep bombing the neck of the bottle, where the supplies flow into the South.

Mr. Dellenback's idea has merit. It would not doom American troops to facing more armor from the North. Yet, it would show our good faith and give the North Vietnamese a chance to show theirs.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard, July 13, 1967]

DELLENBACK'S PLAN

When Congressman John Dellenback was in Eugene a week ago, he spoke of a forthcoming plan for gradually reducing the bombing of North Vietnam, in return for some show of interest by Hanoi. That plan took shape in Washington Monday in a declaration by eight Republican congressmen, including Mr. Dellenback.

The Republicans would have the bombing stop at the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would spare Hanoi, but not Haiphong. If North Vietnam responded with de-escalation of its own, the line would be drawn at the 20th parallel, south of Haiphong, for 60 days. Continued North Vietnamese interest in scaling down the intensity of the war would result in a further pulling back of American planes.

However, Mr. Dellenback explained from Washington, he would not favor a continued curtailment of the bombing unless Hanoi were to respond favorably. "That would just be playing into their hands," he said.

The eight Republicans agreed that the plan is no panacea for settling the war. But it is a fresh idea, and fresh ideas are in short supply. And it would test the good faith of North Vietnam. It is not the "unconditional" halting of the bombing that Hanoi says it wants. But it could easily become that—if North Vietnam is interested enough to stop its pressure on the south.

[From the Oregon Journal (Portland), July 14, 1967]

THE TUNNEL IS STILL DARK

There was not much ground for optimism in the public statements of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as he finished his ninth inspection trip to Vietnam this week.

He said he thought the military operations there were going very well, but that the pacification effort is moving very slowly and is not likely to make dramatic progress in the future. Since pacification—the attempt to protect South Vietnamese villages from attack and to build up their self-government and economic strength—is the whole purpose of the Vietnam war, that is hardly cheerful news.

Back in Washington, McNamara conferred with President Johnson and then announced that 20,000 to 30,000 more U.S. troops will be sent to Vietnam in the next 90 days, to join the 464,000 already there. This is a lot less than the 100,000 additional men the generals reportedly have been asking for, but McNamara didn't say, either, what might happen after 90 days are up.

There is nothing in all this to change the prospect that the Vietnam war will be long and increasingly costly—both in blood over there and in higher taxes back here in the United States. The one thing that might change it would be development of some kind of peace negotiations, with or without a cease-fire. Lately the Johnson administration has given no public indication of new initiatives to bring about peace talks, having been rebuffed by North Vietnam in previous attempts. But a number of efforts to prod the administration into new initiatives are being heard.

One, called Negotiation Now! is a nationwide campaign to gather citizen signatures on a petition the heart of which urges the United States to halt unconditionally its bombings of North Vietnam. Another is a call recently put out by eight Republican members of the House of Representatives, including Rep. John Dellenback of Oregon, urging a gradual rollback, of the bombing from north to south in North Vietnam, provided the North Vietnamese government responds with corresponding reductions in its war effort.

Both of these movements are responsible

in that they do not suggest one-sided U.S. abandonment of South Vietnam, and they recognize that the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front have some de-escalating to do, too. The petition of Negotiation Now! fails to answer the point made, by President Johnson that each of the five bombing halts we have tried so far has been used by North Vietnam to increase its flow of men and supplies to the south, and so to increase the danger to American troops there. The Republican congressmen's proposal for the gradual withdrawal of bombing, parallel by parallel, better meets this objection.

There is no reason to doubt that if President Johnson knew of a way to bring about honorable negotiations, he would do so. He has every personal and political motive to end this war, which is crippling his domestic administration, endangering world peace and curdling his evident dream of becoming a much-loved president. Nevertheless, someone in Congress or the public may yet come up with a new idea for triggering peace talks which could work, and they should be heard. If nothing else, the advocates of negotiation help offset the reckless strain in public opinion which holds that the way to end the war is to blow North Vietnam off the map.

[From the Klamath Falls (Oreg.) Herald & News, July 16, 1967]

WHAT NEXT: WE ARE WINNING THE WAR—BUT

"We are winning the war—but . . ." was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number, we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisers only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

McNamara described more than the immediate situation when he said at Da Nang: "Our casualties are high but we have also inflicted high casualties on North Vietnamese army units."

What he described was the situation as it was in 1965 and 1966 and as it is likely to be in 1968. Only the numbers have been changed—for the higher.

It is often forgotten that escalation is not the prerogative only of this country. Options open to the Communists include a step-up of terrorist bombings in Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in even greater numbers of the large North Vietnamese standing army; the use of Communist "volunteers" from other countries; the opening of diversionary action in Korea.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme for a de-escalation of the war that would steer a middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representative Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Mosher of Ohio, Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Stafford of Vermont propose a halt to all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with

a similar de-escalatory step, such as dismantling major supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down in five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitation, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly don't know. Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in the belief that the best chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quietly, that make the position of each side credible to the other.

That we are willing to invest another 100,000 men in Vietnam is probably quite credible—and acceptable—to Hanoi. That we are ready to deescalate by small steps, however, is something that does not seem to have been made as credible to them as it might be.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World,
July 18, 1967]

TO ESCALATE OR DEESCALATE?

"We are winning the war—but . . ." was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number, we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisors only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

McNamara described more than the immediate situation when he said at Da Nang: "Our casualties are high but we have also inflicted high casualties on North Vietnamese army units."

What he described was the situation as it was in 1965 and 1966 and as it is likely to be in 1968. Only the numbers have been changed—for the higher.

It is often forgotten that escalation is not the prerogative only of this country. Options open to the Communists include a step-up of terrorist bombings in Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in even greater numbers of the large North Vietnamese standing army; the use of Communist "volunteers" from other countries; the opening of diversionary action in Korea.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme of de-escalation of the war that would steer middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representatives Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Mosher of Ohio, Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Stafford of Vermont proposed a halt to all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 28th parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with a

similar de-escalatory step, such as dismantling main supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 28th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitation, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly don't know. Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in the belief that the only chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quickly that make the position of each side credible to the other.

That we are willing to invest another 100,000 men in Vietnam is probably quite credible—and acceptable—to Hanoi. That we are ready to de-escalate in small steps, however, is something that does not seem to have been made as credible to them as it might seem.

THREAT TO SHOE INDUSTRY

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported legislation which would protect domestic industries from unfair, low-labor-cost foreign imports. I favor increased and improved foreign trade, but only on a fair and orderly basis.

One domestic industry which has been particularly threatened by imports is the shoe industry. I was deeply concerned to receive a letter from the president of a shoe company in my district which said simply, "We need help and much support."

I have introduced in this and previous sessions legislation such as the Orderly Marketing Act of 1967 which is aimed at providing such help. The majority leadership apparently does not see the need for this protection and the administration has failed to live up to its promises of much-needed regulations of unfair trade.

Consequently the problem has worsened. Lloyd M. Hampton in his column "Washington: Inside Out" of August 12, 1967, lists the sobering facts of the threat to our domestic shoe industry. I would like to include some excerpts from his column in the RECORD.

Mr. Hampton points out that many of the foreign shoe imports come from behind the Iron Curtain, particularly Czechoslovakia. If it is difficult for our domestic industries to compete with low-labor-cost free countries, it is virtually impossible for them to compete with Communist countries "where costs are ignored in the drive to export merchandise for dollars."

I have consistently opposed increased trade with Communist countries in light of the fact that they are supporting North Vietnam with whom we are at war. I also oppose such increases because they represent unfair competition.

As the following excerpt makes clear, the situation in the shoe industry is critical. I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking rapid action to meet this urgent need.

The excerpt follows:

The shoe producer's case for insisting on import quotas is an impressive and valid one. To fail at this particular time to plead for relief via the Congressional route could be a sizable mistake in judgment, say sources not only in and out of Congress, but among trade officials, as well.

Sobering facts: From 1955 to 1966, footwear imports have upped 1500 percent . . . from 8 million pairs to 132 million pairs. At present rate, imports will reach 200 million pairs by 1970 . . . conceivably higher under concessions we made in the Kennedy Round; figures for '66 show imports accounted for 16.3 percent of our domestic production of 809 million pairs. Study of 1955-56 period reveals that U.S. footwear exports have fallen 37 percent . . . shipments to other countries now come to about 3 million pairs annually; data for first two months of 1967 disclose imports were 22.8 percent of all U.S. production for that period but as high as 94 percent for women's casuals; the domestic footwear industry is particularly vulnerable to the increasing flow of imports from behind the Iron Curtain. Since 1959, Czechoslovakia has stepped up its imports to the U.S. by over 900 percent, from 192,600 pairs in 1959 to 1.7 million pairs in 1966; imports from state-controlled enterprises—where costs are ignored in the drive to export merchandise for dollars—present extremely unfair competition, says NFMA.

THE TAX DEBATE

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed tax increase is now before the House Ways and Means Committee. Several high-ranking administration officials have attempted to present the economic rationale behind the requested tax hike.

They have failed, Mr. Speaker, because there is no sound economic justification for this proposal. An editorial in the New York Times of Thursday, August 17, attempts to explain why the administration has failed to make a case.

While I do not fully agree with some of the points in the editorial, I do support its major premise—that the real reason for the requested increase is political. The administration has consistently deluded itself and the American public by asserting that virtually any problem can be solved by creating more agencies and spending more money. With such an unrealistic attitude, it is little wonder that the administration is running a huge deficit. Now it has requested a tax hike to combat this deficit. If Congress does

not adopt this increase, the administration will, no doubt blame Congress for the \$29 billion deficit. I find a bit of irony in a Democratic administration using a heavily Democratic Congress for its whipping boy.

The New York Times editorial, which follows, explains why the economic reasons for the tax increase are not valid, thereby making it clear that the political reasons—which are hardly commendable—are the true ones.

The editorial follows:

THE TAX DEBATE

The testimony of top Administration officials before the House Ways and Means Committee has failed to make a case for the proposed increase in taxes.

It is easy to understand the political argument for a higher levy. President Johnson does not want to go into the 1968 campaign defending a \$29 billion deficit. But the economic arguments are unpersuasive.

The Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production rose last month for the first time in seven months. Corporate profits improved slightly in the spring quarter. But these mildly bullish developments provide no basis for fear that heavier military spending for Vietnam confronts the nation with the imminent threat of breakneck inflation.

A much more valid fear, in our judgment, is that higher taxes will stifle the incipient boomlet and topple the country back toward recession.

What is wrong with President Johnson's budget is not so much the size of the deficit as the upside-down priorities it expresses. The unending escalation of the war in Vietnam reduces the chances of a negotiated peace and thus represents a wasteful diversion of national resources. But, even with escalation, the President would be on more reasonable ground if he proposed financing the additional Vietnam expenditures by cutting back on the space program and on agricultural subsidies and by deferring the supersonic transport and other less urgent projects.

By refusing to take the lead in those reductions, Mr. Johnson has simply invited the mounting Congressional pressure to slash funds for the antipoverty program, model cities and other urban programs vital to America's welfare—pressure not likely to be turned off by his letter to Senator Mansfield calling for an "all-out commitment" to the solution of domestic problems.

A tax fight centering on the as yet ill-demonstrated peril of inflation and inducing further neglect of urban programs is a disservice to the national interest.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] for his scholarly attention to the problem of effective legislative oversight and for the recommendations which he advances in the hope of exacting a better performance by the Congress in this critical area of congressional responsibility.

Certainly, oversight of the administra-

tion of our laws is equally important to making the laws. Somehow, this continues to be overlooked or misunderstood by a great many people. We do need, as the gentleman says, to "break down the all too prevalent notion that Congress is a mere 'bill factory.'"

In his opening statement as a member of the newly established Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress early in 1965, our colleague, the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], warned against:

False measure of the effectiveness of Congress (which) is suggested by some whose knowledge—of congressional problems is superficial; namely, the rate of speed of enacting laws, especially measure recommended by the executive branch. Making a law is not the same business as making an automobile.

Most of the recommendations contained in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, touch on the question of legislative oversight in one way or another. Our recommendations for more committee staff, for beefing up the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, for better fiscal controls—these and more, if enacted, should enable the Congress to perform its function of oversight more effectively. In addition, we made several recommendations under the specific heading of "Legislative Review," which I will include later as a part of my remarks.

In underlining the critical importance attached to this problem by the joint committee, I would like to quote the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma who, as a Member of the House, cochaired the first Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress 20 years ago and had this to say during the course of our hearings in 1965:

One of the most important aspects of the Reorganization Act of 1946 seems to me the concept which was voiced for the first time—it has always been the responsibility of Congress—and that is the duty of oversight of Congress.

We are so busy breaking new ground that we do not have time to go back over the ground that was broken by the preceding Congress and take a look and make an examination of how the programs we passed in the yesteryear are working this year.

We tried to create the Government Operations Committee in both Houses, which have done a reasonably good job within the limits of their power and within the limits of their personnel, but it seems to me that this is still one of the great gaps in government. The jurisdiction which was passed to the Government Operations Committee was not so broad that they would have sole oversight responsibility. The committees having the proper cognizance under their jurisdictions should examine each year the Government departments which they were apparently permitted to pass legislation to supervise.

But we find ourselves bogged down in an impossible situation where this regular committee oversight of the bureaus and departments under its jurisdiction is not carried out to any degree whatever.

Again, I commend my colleague from Wisconsin for his searching inquiry into this problem and the carefully thought-out suggestions he has advanced for our consideration.

And again I call attention to the failure of the House Rules Committee to

report S. 355 to the floor after the bill passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote on March 7, nearly 6 months ago. Although far from perfection, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 is a significant step forward in modernizing Congress to do a better job in many ways, including its legislative review function.

I here append the recommendations referred to above:

[From the Final Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, July 28, 1966]

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

The responsibilities of Congress extend beyond the passage of new legislation. One of the most important of these is to scrutinize continuously existing programs to determine whether they are being administered in accordance with congressional intent, whether amendments are desirable, or whether the program has outlived its purpose. No agency is likely to volunteer that its objective could be accomplished in another manner—or that it is no longer needed. These determinations must be made by Congress.

The 1946 act recognized the need for such a continuous review. Section 136 provided:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress . . .

This provision has failed to achieve the desired result. It is a statutory admonition without means of implementation. Although some standing committees have carried on extensive "oversight" activities, most are preoccupied with new legislative programs.

1. The activity commonly referred to as "oversight" shall be redesignated as "review" so that there will be a better public understanding of the function.

Supervision of program administration was referred to in the 1946 act as legislative "oversight." The public is confused by this term. The term "review" is more accurate with respect to the obligation to oversee the performance of the laws. Its use would enable a greater public awareness of this congressional responsibility.

2. In addition to the permanent professional staff otherwise authorized, each standing committee shall be entitled to one additional permanent professional staff member who shall be designated a review specialist and who shall be assigned exclusively to performance of review (oversight). He shall be selected by the chairman with the concurrence of the ranking minority member. The review specialist shall be directed to carry out review projects, or to supervise the same, contingent upon the approval of such projects by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee.

Some committees have created permanent investigating subcommittees to perform the review function. This normally results in the earmarking of staff who are not immersed in the preparation of new legislation or other committee responsibilities. Others have divided the review function among a number of subject-matter subcommittees. They have not found it desirable to assign review responsibility to a single subcommittee because of greater expertise of the subject-matter subcommittees and their staffs.

Because of these differences, it is desirable to provide maximum flexibility to each committee in the way it performs this func-

tion. However, each committee should have at least one staff member with the full-time responsibility of implementing the review policies of the committee. If the committee has a permanent investigations or oversight subcommittee, the review specialist may be assigned to that subcommittee. If such a subcommittee does not exist, he would be a member of the staff of the full committee.

It is extremely important that the review specialist be selected on a nonpartisan basis. He is to assist the committee in determining that existing programs are being efficiently administered in accordance with congressional intent. He should be selected and supervised by both the chairman and the ranking minority member.

One important function of the specialist should be the inspection and analysis of GAO reports delivered to the committee. He should be directed to report to the committee each year on his activities.

3. Each standing committee other than the Appropriations Committees shall file an annual report on the review activities of the committee during the year. The report shall include an evaluation of programs under the jurisdiction of the committee, an assessment of the quality of administration of agencies investigated during the year, and recommendations as to organizational and program changes and/or the elimination of unnecessary activities under the committee's jurisdiction. The reports shall be delivered to the majority and minority leadership of both Houses and by the leadership to the President, with a copy to the Bureau of the Budget.

The review function is a statutory obligation of the standing committees. The membership of both Houses and the public are entitled to know how well the function is being performed. Annual review reports would permit Members to determine whether the review capacity of various committees should be strengthened. They would call attention to the need for investigations or other activities in the Member's particular field of interest. They would also disclose unnecessary duplication of effort.

The reports should be delivered to the President and the Bureau of the Budget so that the executive branch could consider their findings in subsequent program planning and budget requests.

4. The legislative committees should hold hearings on major reports required of the Executive.

5. The legislative committees should review reports required by law of the executive departments and agencies to determine whether the reports perform a useful function, should be reoriented, or are no longer necessary.

Many statutes require periodic reports to Congress from the agency or department. Some reports—such as the President's Economic Report—are the subject of important hearings. But many other important reports by the Executive go unnoticed because the committee with jurisdiction takes no action. Hearings should be held on major reports in order to direct attention to any specific problems raised in them. The result of such hearings would be a more regular dialog on major public policies.

Each committee should also review all reports required by existing laws to determine if they still fulfill a useful function. At present, a total of 639 annual reports is required of various executive departments and offices. This is a burdensome and useless practice to impose on administrative agencies if it does not actually inform the committee or if the subject matter is so trivial that no attention will be given to it.

HISTORY REPLAYED

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, 1967, a member of the Iowa General Assembly, State Representative Stanley Shepherd, gave the speech at the Civil War observance held each year at Croton, Iowa.

The speech replays important parts of American history in a moving and sensitive manner. It reflects a great deal of research and hard work.

I commend its reading to my colleagues, as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure and honor to be with you today. There is so much to be thankful and most of all is pride and pleasure of knowing that from the beginning of this country, and this State your ancestors played a most important part in laying a foundation that has stood throughout the years. . . . It is part of our inheritance.

My desire today is not to give you a complete history of one event. I would like to lead you along the path of a number of heroic and historical incidents that occurred through the years and to leave you with the feeling that leads you to place a higher value upon the privilege of citizenship of this great State and country of ours. It is important to keep alive the memory of those pioneers and settlers of this State and country whose achievements and wisdom served us well. From the very beginning of the making of this country many men, women and children have paid dearly for the freedom we have today.

Independence Day July 4, 1776, was one of those days that meant tragedy, poverty and broken hearts for many.

Have you ever wondered what happened to those men who signed the Declaration of Independence?

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors and tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Continental Army; another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds of the Revolutionary War.

What kind of men were they? Four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well-educated. But they signed the Declaration of Independence knowing full well that the penalty would be death if they were captured. They signed and they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their honor.

Carter Braxton, of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the seas by the British Navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts and died in rags.

Thomas McKeam was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family constantly. He served in the Congress without pay and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him and poverty was his reward.

Vandals, soldiers or both looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge and Liddleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr. noted that the British General Cornwallis had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters. The owners quietly urged General George Washington to open fire which was done. The home was destroyed and Nelson died bankrupt.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bed-

side as she was dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, returning home after the war to find his wife dead, his children gone. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and a broken heart.

Morris and Livingston suffered similar fates. Such were the stories and sacrifices of the American Revolution. These men were no wild-eyed, rabble-rousing ruffians. They were soft spoken men of means and education. They had security, but they valued liberty more.

Standing tall, straight and unwavering, they pledged: "For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance of the protection of the divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

They gave to us an independent America to keep.

The years pass and Iowa was formed and it's early progress was made possible by the rivers, especially the Des Moines River, which lies just beyond us.

The Des Moines River, rich in fur-bearing animals, was profitable territory for trappers and hunters.

At the first trading posts the Indians exchanged skins, and pelts for firearms, blankets, ornaments and whiskey. The American Fur Company of St. Louis was influential in founding a number of posts in Iowa that later developed into towns. Among them was the city of Keokuk. Later the Des Moines River region became the center for the Iowa fur trade, which in 1809 was valued at \$60,000.00. Among the best known fur traders was Maurice Blondeau who opened a trading post on the Des Moines River, under the auspices of John Jacob Astor.

Pioneer Iowa's population growth and economic stability depended greatly upon her early forms of transportation. The first settlements were made along the rivers and streams denoting waterways as important avenues of transportation. St. Louis was a thriving city and the city of Keokuk was becoming an important trading center and was known as the Chicago of the Mid-West, and the northwestern fur trading enterprise was successfully launched. But the steamboat, so important in a later transportation era, was still a rarity. Pioneer Iowans depended upon more primitive form of water transportation.

One type of river craft, the bull boat, made of Buffalo hides sewed together and stretched over a frame-work of poles, was being used on the plain rivers. Propelled by poles and paddles, fur traders transported their pelts and equipment in it. Carrying capacity was limited, however, because it sat low in the water, leaked badly and water logged easily. At night bull boats were dried by the fire or propped over the voyagers as a tent to be dried by the wind.

Dug-out canoes appeared on the river as a simple means of transportation. Constructed by hollowing out a tree log, these canoes could be paddled against the current and were light enough to be carried across the portages. Limited in space, they were open to the weather and easily capsized in rough water. Canoes enlarged by using logs with planks between them were the forerunners of flatboats, mackinaws and rafts. These crafts, propelled by poles, oars or rudders and sometimes sails, transported produce down river but seldom traveled against the current.

Keelboats, as the name implies, were built upon a keel which extended along the entire bottom of the vessel and had sides of planks laid upon supporting ribs. These long narrow boats of light draft, intended for shallow water, were especially useful on the Des Moines River.

A wider, heavier craft of the same type of construction was called a barge, keelboats and barges usually contained a cabin or cargo box, the most important boats on the

Des Moines River before the steamboat. Keel-boats carried a large cargo and could be moved against the current. They were propelled by poles placed on the bottom and pushed by a number of men walking from prow to stern. Often supplemented with a mast and sail for broad waterways, the boat could be steered with a long oar and was directed by a captain or a helmsman who, stationed on the roof of the cabin, could see far ahead.

When a river, such as the Des Moines, was too deep for setting poles, or the bottom too soft, a cordelle or towline was used. With one end fastened to the top of the mast the other was pulled by a crew member who walked along the shore. If the shore was unsuitable for cordelling, boatmen proceeded up-stream in skiffs anchored to a snag or a tree and drew the keel-boat forward with tow-lines. This method of propulsion was called warping. When the water was too high the boat could be propelled among the trees near the shore by grabbing over-hanging branches—a progress called bushwacking.

With many perils and obstacles facing early river travel, rapids, falls, dams, continually shifting sand bars and islands, floating debris and many other menaces, the life of the boatman was rarely uneventful. They were familiar to the early pioneers in their scarlet shirts, blue jackets, Lindsay-Woolsey trousers, leather caps and moccasins.

River hands were recruited from a distinct class of brawny, aggressive, rugged men, proud of their physical prowess. They labored hard but spent long, leisurely hours gambling, wrestling, singing, drinking and telling tales.

Despite its hazards, river transportation proved profitable. Rates were high but cargo was never hard to find. Passenger fares depended on types of boats, speed and accommodations supplied. Many of the boats displayed their type of ware and service and could be hailed by a dweller on the bank.

Even after the coming of the steamboat, keel-boats, barges and flatboats continued to be used many years. Demands for boating increased rapidly enough to use all types of crafts.

The Des Moines River served the founders of the Des Moines Valley faithfully and well from the time the earliest fur traders ascended the rivers of Iowa to trade with the Indians, by the laborious process of poling these slow-moving crafts, well laden with beads, blankets, ammunition, looking glasses, war paint, and perhaps carefully hidden away, a supply of "fire water" of the fighting brand, to the year of 1862, when the rapid development of our railroad system caused steam-boating to become unprofitable. From the year of 1837 to 1862, 41 steamboats plied the Des Moines River.

It was in 1847, the year of the great famine in Ireland, that several flatboats loaded with corn for St. Louis was confronted with a serious situation here at Croton and Athens. At the Athens mill the dam was eight feet high and the mill owners had a wooden lock 25 feet wide, but the gates had been broken out by the ice. Under those circumstances to run the chute left open was rather a precarious situation but passage was made a number of times. There were dams at Farmington, Bonaparte and Keosauqua, as well as Bentonsport.

Time does not permit me to go into detail of this part of our local history.

Had it not been for Iowa's navigable streams and rivers and these primitive water crafts, frontier settlement would have been seriously handicapped and economic livelihood impaired. The romance of river boat life and adventure added a colorful chapter to Iowa's early history.

This section of the State had seen many conflicting events with the State of Missouri before Iowa became a State. When Governor Lucas entered upon the duties of his office he found a serious dispute on his hands.

The issue at point was the northern boundary of Missouri or the southern boundary of the Iowa Territory. Before he was in office 2 years, Iowa and Missouri militia were opposing one another, ready to engage in battle. The land along the border, in question, was then in possession of the Indians, but as soon as the Indian title expired Missouri took steps to establish her exact limits. So here was ground for stubborn argument. To increase the difficulties and confusion, the southern part of the Wisconsin territory, now Iowa, was defined by Congress as the northern boundary of Missouri. Thus Missouri claimed a strip of land some 13 miles wide, now forming Iowa's southern border. The people living in southern Wisconsin (now Iowa) and northern Missouri were rough and impulsive, ready with the rifle, and awed but little by law. When a Missouri sheriff tried to exercise his duties in what he considered northern Missouri, the settlers there asserted that he was out of his jurisdiction, and they refused to recognize his authority. . . . He was arrested. . . . Names were called and threats were made, the dispute was fiercest on the border of Clarke County, Missouri, and what is now Van Buren County and parts of western Lee County where we are today. The clerk of Clarke County attempted to levy taxes in Iowa, and was resisted. He then appealed to Governor Boggs of Missouri. This executive ordered out 1,000 militia to uphold the dignity of the State.

Governor Lucas, of Iowa Territory, already had passed through a similar contest, when he was Governor of Ohio, between Ohio and Michigan Territory. He at once called for Iowa's militia to keep back what promised to be an invasion by Missouri.

The settlements in Iowa Territory at that time, the later part of 1839, were scattered, and the militia was poorly organized. But within a short time after the call to arms, 500 Hawkeyes, under orders from Major General Jesse B. Brown, were encamped in Van Buren County in this vicinity. Directly opposite were 1,000 Missourians under General Allen. The two forces were glaring at each other, anxious for a fracas.

Fortunately no fighting occurred. A peace commission was sent into Clarke County. This resulted that the order for levying of taxes was withdrawn. General Allen withdrew his troops. The Iowa Legislature assented to a treaty of peace. The valiant Iowa Militia was dismissed.

The boundary dispute was not settled. Although war was averted, it was not until January 3, 1852, when the Supreme Court made a final decree and Iowa won. The question was decided just in time. Missouri was a slave State . . . Iowa a free State . . . and a tract such as this, if in dispute could have caused most serious trouble. The land involved was for the most part heavily wooded, and rich in bee trees. On this account the quarrel was termed the "Honey War." Many jokes were made about the contest, frontier poets even wrote verse about it. A Missouri wag composed quite a poem, which had a very wide and heavy circulation about the two States and the settlements. It began as follows:

"Ye freeman of his happy land,
Which flows with milk and honey.
Arise! To Arms! Your Ponies Mount!
Regard not blood or money,
Old Governor Lucas, tiger like,
Is prowling around the borders,
But Governor Boggs is wide awake—
Just listen to his orders.

Three bee trees stand about the line
Between our state and Lucas,
Be ready all these trees to fall
And bring things to focus.
We'll show old Lucas how to brag,
And seize our precious honey!
He also claims, I understand,
Of us three bits on money."

One of the results of the "honey war" was the first review of the Iowa militia. The troops were armed with rifles, shotguns, pistols, and other fire-arms of a variety of forms, some of the officers had trailing dragoon swords: some had straight dress swords, some had no swords. No two men were attired or armed alike, the Iowa territorial militia of the winter of 1839-40 was a strange sight. Actually 1200 men enlisted under Governor Lucas' proclamation, yet this militia never was paid for its services. Neither were the persons who furnished supplies recompensed for their efforts.

Not too many years in the future Iowa's army proved that they were among the best in the Union.

Although the battle for Croton and Athens in the year of 1861, was not a major battle, in the Civil War, a number of lives were lost and many soldiers were injured. However, it played a very important part in Iowa's participation in the war. A loss by the Union soldiers could have meant an invasion of Iowa by the Confederate troops. At that time in the State of Missouri both Union and Confederate recruits were being enlisted, for the Missourians were pretty well divided on the question of the war.

"Sesesh" was the popular name for the Confederates, because they favored session, or the withdrawal from the Union by the Southern States. On account of both parties in the war having adherents in good numbers in Missouri, collisions between armed bodies of men were frequent.

If the town of Athens located just across the river and twenty miles northwest of Keokuk, on the right bank of the Des Moines River, in Clarke County, Missouri in July and August 1861 was Colonel David Moore with about five hundred volunteers—mostly the First Northeast Missouri Regiment of volunteer home guards.

The "Sesesh" had quarters at the town of Cahoka, about ten miles south of Athens and Croton. A number of skirmishes had occurred between recruiting details, and between detachments enlisted on the two sides. Home guards had been formed on either side on the boundary line between Iowa and Missouri.

August first, thirty-five tons of provisions were sent to Athens via Croton on the Des Moines Valley Railroad, where it was ferried across the Des Moines River. At the same time a quantity of muskets and ammunition. The Confederates heard of this, and determined to attack Athens and capture the supplies. August second, messengers arrived at Athens, bringing news of the plans of the "Sesesh" and Sunday evening August fourth another messenger came with word that the onslaught was to be made the next day.

Colonel Moore prepared to give the enemy a warm reception. At the same time much excitement was occasioned in Iowa, for if Athens was taken, the Confederates might cross the river and pillage the country side. The report got abroad that the Confederates were determined to attack and sack Keokuk itself. In Farmington, Keokuk, Croton and other towns in Lee and Van Buren Counties, there was scurrying to and fro, to be ready to repel the invasion.

Here in Croton quite a large throng assembled to watch the battle. The bluff on this side of the Des Moines River furnished a fine amphitheater.

The "Sesesh" were under the command of Martin E. Green. As most of the soldiers on either side were Missourians and recruited from northern Missouri, families were divided: Brother was arrayed against brother, father against son. . . . Under Colonel Green was Captain Moore, the son of Colonel Moore of the Union volunteers. While the Confederates were on the march one officer remarked, in the hearing of Captain Moore: "Oh, we will take Athens easy enough, Old Moore won't fight." Don't fool yourself, spoke

up the son, "I know Dad, and he'll give you all the fighting you want." He did too.

The morning of August fifth broke clear and bright and the bluffs behind Croton was filled with spectators . . . men, women and children, and as usual a good assortment of dogs. Colonel Green had planted two cannon on the bluff behind Athens, and at five-thirty these opened fire, while the infantry attacked the Moore forces. The cannon balls flew high. . . . Instead of hitting the enemy, they passed over the heads of the Union soldiers, crossed the river, and struck the Croton bluffs.

The women, children and dogs, here scattered and hid in the ravines. It was also reported that one cannon ball hit the depot roof at Croton and another went through the Joe Benning home in Athens, known as the "Old Cannon Ball House."

The greater part of the fighting took place in the corn fields around Athens. Under Colonel Moore were forty sharpshooters from Farmington. At the depot in Croton a body of Croton home guards and Keokuk volunteers had been stationed. The inaccuracy of the Confederate soldiers, who manned the two cannons from the Athens side, no doubt saved the lives of many of the soldiers stationed at the station or depot. With their wives and children watching on the bluffs this could have been a very sad day for them.

During the battle these troops were marched into a sugar camp on the river bank. From there they fired across the river into the Confederates in a corn field, and inflicted considerable loss. Colonel Green had promised his men: "We breakfast in Athens, dine in Croton and sup in Farmington". But they didn't for in an hour and a half they were defeated and retreating.

The Union troops pursued them a short distance, and then returned to Athens . . . The Confederate sympathizers in Athens had prepared to welcome Colonel Green's command. Chickens had been roasted, and pies and cakes baked. These with other goodies had been laid away in the cellars until the victory had been won.

But Colonel Green's men did not stay to taste these delicious foods. Instead, the northern Missouri regiment of volunteer home guards, the Farmington sharpshooters, the Croton home guards and the doughty Keokuk volunteers fell to and celebrated at the expense of the unlucky "sesesh" women. Colonel Green and his forces were heading in the wrong direction.

It is said the Union loss in the battle of Athens and Croton was four killed. Three wounded badly, twenty wounded slightly, and the Confederate loss was much greater. However, figures in different accounts differ greatly.

Colonel Moore captured thirty horses, and one of the cannon left behind in the bushes.

While the struggle was in progress a number of frightened and wounded Union soldiers fled across the river. Some of these were so demoralized that they cried to all they met: "Look out, the rebels are coming. The rebels are coming."

A few ran clear to Keokuk and Montrose, spreading the tidings that Colonel Moore had been defeated, and that the Confederates were right at their heels.

So the battle ended on that day, August fifth, 1861, on the very ground where we are gathered today to honor those men who fought to preserve the ideals of freedom.

In ending I would like to state that the great Commonwealth of Iowa sent forth 80,000 of her sons to do battle for the Nation. The story of her heroism is told over and over again. She thought no sacrifice too great, whether of blood or treasure, in defense of the flag and in maintaining the integrity of the Union.

Tempered and welded by the flame of battle, she emerged from the Civil War period to take her place among the foremost States forming the United States.

The character of the citizenship which they

attain will be also the character of the State. On the stone which contributed to the Washington Monument, and on the face of the soldier's monument at Des Moines is this inscription: may it be as true as it is today: "Iowa . . . her effectiveness like the rivers of her borders, flow to an inseparable Union."

REPORTED BUILDUP OF SUPPLIES AND SANCTUARY OF ENEMY TROOPS IN CAMBODIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss the continued reports appearing in the press about the buildup of supplies and sanctuary of enemy troops in the country of Cambodia, whose border is adjacent to South Vietnam. I particularly raise a question as to the use of the Mekong River and what commerce destined for Cambodia or coming from Cambodia is moving along this waterway.

The Mekong River is one of the major waterways of that area of the world, and flows for countless miles across the Southeast Asian peninsula emptying into the South China Sea. It runs across all of South Vietnam, after winding its way through Cambodia. It is sometimes overlooked and rarely mentioned that the Mekong River has the status of an international waterway with freedom of navigation for the benefit of the signatory parties, one being Cambodia. In 1955, there was signed a Mekong Convention which was a convention for the purpose of regulating maritime and inland navigation on the Mekong and inland navigation on the approach to the Port of Saigon. The State Department has furnished me a copy of this convention, as well as pointed out that the Government of the Republic of South Vietnam has sought to impose a number of regulations on the river traffic. The signatory nations were Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. Article 2 of the protocol to the convention provides as follows:

Navigation throughout the course of the Mekong, its tributaries, effluents, and navigable mouths, must conform to the requirements prescribed by the riparian States, particularly in sanitary, police and customs matters and with respect to the maintenance of general security.

A reference to the book entitled "Cambodia's Foreign Policy" by Roger M. Smith, published by the Cornell University Press in 1965, touches on the circumstances leading to the agreement on the use of the Mekong River and also discusses certain differences involving the Port of Saigon. The author points out on pages 157 and 158 the construction of the port at Sihanoukville in 1959 has apparently diverted a substantial amount of traffic bound for Cambodia via the Mekong River.

Today serious questions are being raised by continued arms shipments into Cambodia. Although these apparently are coming in principally through the Port of Sihanoukville, nevertheless, I believe a question should be raised as to what part, if any, the Mekong River might have, in the course of infiltration or distribution of these supplies.

In the August 28 edition of U.S. News & World Report, at page 25, there appears an article that discusses the entry of supplies for Vietcong and North Vietnamese through Cambodia. Set out below are the pertinent portions of this article:

Shipments are coming into Cambodia directly from Soviet Black Sea ports and Communist Chinese ports on ships of Russian, Soviet-bloc, Chinese and Hong Kong registry. Cargoes move by road and barges to the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops.

U.S. naval sources have become deeply concerned over the tremendous overall increase in international shipping into Cambodian ports, which has grown despite the fact that Cambodia's economy is nearly bankrupt after the breaking off of American aid three years ago and the expulsion of French and other traders when export-import firms and banks were nationalized.

One official American source reports that there is no question that Russian and Chinese shipping into Sihanoukville and elsewhere in Cambodia is bringing in ammunition.

Press accounts such as this raise a question to me as to the extent to which the Vietcong and North Vietnamese may be receiving substantial supplies via a Mekong River route ostensibly intended for peaceful commerce with Cambodia.

It has become necessary to look closer at the role of Cambodia in this war, and recent reports and news accounts indicate Cambodia is playing a significant part in resupplying and providing a sanctuary for enemy troops.

I point out that I do not desire any information of a military nature which might jeopardize our forces or those of our South Vietnamese allies.

I might add that I am not familiar with the nature of cargo that moves on the Mekong River to or from Cambodia, nor do I have any idea as to what type of vessels carry these cargoes. However, I would be interested in knowing:

First. How much shipping travels up and down the Mekong River to or from Cambodia through Vietnam?

Second. Why, if this is regular commercial cargo, is it necessary to move these vessels in escorted convoys? I would point out that the State Department has furnished me information in reference to shipping on the Mekong River that "in November of 1966, shipping bound for Cambodia was being escorted in convoys up the Mekong River."

Third. Do we know just what is in each cargo moving up the Mekong to Cambodia?

Fourth. Are cargoes of obvious military use to our enemies turned back or confiscated?

The continued reports of Communist resupply operations in Cambodia may point to stricter measures for policing the use of the Mekong River.

It does not seem to be in the best interests of the American serviceman, nor our effort in South Vietnam, to per-

mit travel through the heart of the battle ground over a main artery of trade items of war which will be used against our own troops.

TAX REFORMS NEEDED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 of this year, President Johnson proposed a 10-percent surtax on Federal income taxes. One of the most important results of this proposal is that it has stimulated great discussion on our existing tax structure and, in my view, increased the possibilities for tax reform.

I have received hundreds of letters from citizens of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey, who feel as I feel that this additional tax burden should not be imposed until we have a system whereby the tax load is shared on a basis of relative equality.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by a tax system where an underemployed person in Jersey City pays 14 percent of his net income and on the other hand, oil companies who in 1965 earned almost \$6 billion in profits, paid only 6.3 percent in taxes. Surely there is something inherently wrong about this kind of a system.

Mr. Speaker, while the oil depletion allowance is the most glaring weakness in the Internal Revenue Code there are others too which, while smaller, deserve equally to be plugged up.

As a responsible Member of this Congress, I cannot vote for governmental programs without voting to raise the revenue. And, with domestic programs already cut to the quick, the only other possibility is to deny our fighting sons in Vietnam the supplies they need to sustain themselves or for this Government to renege upon obligations it has assumed either for our veterans of earlier wars or the debt which has accrued from these wars. None of these courses is acceptable for me.

Thus, I have posed a nine-plank program which I think will raise enough revenue to obviate the necessity for imposing new personal income taxes.

According to the very knowledgeable gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], my good friend and colleague, these nine steps would enable this Government to raise \$4.3 billion with no new taxes. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today deserves a good hard look by this Congress.

I would like at this time to explain the major provisions of my bill to all Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the single loophole in the law which screams to heaven for adjustment is the oil depletion allowance which allows oil companies to deduct 27.5 percent of their income before they even start to pay taxes. The apologists for this loophole would have us believe that this deduction is necessary to enable the small wildcat driller to obtain the oil which is necessary to keep this Nation functioning. In practice, however, it has enabled the largest oil companies in the world to avoid paying their fair share of the tax load.

Mr. Speaker, consider these figures. In 1965, the 20 largest oil companies paid corporate taxes of 6.3 percent on earnings. Other less favored corporations paid the corporate tax of 48 percent. The largest oil company, Standard of New Jersey, paid \$82 million or a rate of less than 5 percent. The poorest taxpayer in the 14th District of New Jersey or anywhere else in America paid at a rate of 14 percent or more. Surely before we saddle the small taxpayer with an additional burden we have a duty to go after the big fellows who are getting off so lightly.

Mr. Speaker, the mineral depletion allowance gambit has gone on too long and now is a time for this House and the other body too, to take a hard look at the whole Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Speaker, I do not come before this body as a great tax expert, but my years as an attorney and as a magistrate have equipped me to seek equity and it is for this reason that I have drafted a bill which I think will serve as a rough guideline for action along these lines by the Congress to raise needed revenue without imposing the 10-percent surtax on our middle income citizens.

Section 2 of the bill would enable the Government to realize \$2.5 billion by closing up the capital gains loophole. Under present law, if a person sells a capital asset, he is taxed at 25 percent, the capital gains rate. Yet, if he dies before selling or transferring the asset his estate pays no tax at all. This section would permit the taxation of such property at the standard capital gains rate.

Section 3 of my bill would end the unlimited charities deductions which permits millionaires to deduct up to 90 percent of their income for charitable donations while the ordinary taxpayer is limited to 30 percent of his income. How this works is that there is a special provision in the code which permits a taxpayer who has given away or paid in State and local income taxes 90 percent of his taxable income in 8 out of 10 years to deduct up to 10 percent. This loophole permits the man with a large income from municipal bonds or through capital gains to pay virtually no tax at all. Second, I might point out at this point that the present tax law allows another little gimmick designed to aid our rich taxpayers. The United Auto Workers Report in its July 17, 1967, edition points out that a person wishing to give away a work of art valued at \$50,000 can have a strawman offer him \$150,000 for it. After turning down the offer he then gives it away and deducts the puffed up price of \$150,000.

Section 4, Mr. Speaker, would end the stock option provision in the code which permits highly paid corporate executives to exercise an option to buy tomorrow at today's prices, large chunks of their companies' stocks and thus pay taxes at a rate of 25 percent rather than the steeper rates which they would normally have to pay.

Section 5 would repeal the \$100 dividend exclusion which permits a taxpayer to pay no taxes on the first \$100 of dividends at a cost of the Treasury and to the six out of seven taxpayers who do not have dividend income, of some \$200 million annually.

Section 6 deals with the multiple corporate dodge which permits the division of a single business entity into several units permitting the separate units to be taxed at the rate of 22 percent which is assessed against the first \$25,000 of corporate income rather than the 48 percent which is assessed after the first \$25,000 of income.

Section 7 would forbid the financing of plants owned by private industry by municipal governments who are able in this way to aid the corporations by financing this plan by tax-free municipal bonds. This provision in the code ostensibly written into the law to aid depressed areas has resulted in great abuses. Ending this device alone would bring in \$50 million a year.

Section 8 would lower the oil depletion to 15 percent. Very frankly, I would prefer a lower figure but I think 15 percent would be a start in the right direction. In this section the depletion allowance for other minerals which is presently 23 percent would be cut to 15 percent as well.

Section 9 would establish the same rate for gift and estate taxes. Under present statutes, \$3,000 a year can be given to a single individual with no imposition of a gift tax. Beyond this, \$30,000 can be given away during a person's lifetime without any gift tax being imposed. In addition, any taxable gift is assessed at a rate three-fourths of that for the prevailing estate tax. This action of my bill would set a rate of 25 percent for both taxable gifts and property which pass as a result of death.

Mr. Speaker, under present law estate taxes may be paid in Government bonds which are redeemed at par value. This loophole costs the Government another \$50 million a year—a not insignificant sum. Section 10 of the bill I have introduced today would end this device frequently employed by the very wealthy to avoid payment of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this bill is the final word but it is my hope that it will provide a rallying symbol for those Members of this House who share my reluctance to further tax our middle and lower income citizens who, as I see it, are paying more than their share of the total tax load of this Nation, Federal, State, and local.

I have read very carefully the superb material put forth by my capable colleagues, Congressman REUSS and my good neighbor from New York [Mr. TENNER], from whom I have drawn heavily for their good ideas expressed in recent weeks on this House floor. It is my hope that we can produce an alternative to the plan suggested by President Johnson, which will meet the very elementary test of fairness to all.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a few minutes ago, out of the fiscal crisis of 1967 may come something more important than just raising needed revenue—a tax code which is fair to all.

The people of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey like taxes no better than other people in these United States but they recognize, as do all sensible people, the inevitability of the taxation process. When all is said and done the people of Hudson County are willing to do their share of the responsibilities that go with citizenship. Yet, to ask these

people to bear an extra load in order to permit those more financially capable to escape their share is a policy which cannot be supported at any time.

I am not sure my bill is the final answer or whether it is an answer at all, but I do know that it is a possibility and it is a possibility worth considering. And if in any way it has helped this Nation to move toward tax reform, then I feel satisfied that I have served my people and all the overburdened middle-income taxpayers of America as I would wish to do so.

As a people, we admire justice and fair play and it is my belief that our tax laws should reflect these principles.

THE AMERICAN FARM PROBLEM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in his last press conference, the President of the United States made some comments of great significance to the American farmer. They were so revealing that the Members of Congress, the American public, and most of all, the man who makes his living from the soil, should have these comments reemphasized.

President Johnson began by saying:

I do think the farmers are on the short end of the stick.

So far so good, but if we go no further, we miss the real kicker. The President went on to say:

I do know people are leaving the farms by the thousands and going to the cities. It is creating a very serious problem for us.

That, my colleagues, is the key to the problem right there. This administration appreciates the farm problem alright, but not until it sees the farmer, forced from his land, come into the city.

Further proof that the Johnson administration sees the farm problem only as a factor in one of its other higher priority concerns is a statement made by Orville Freeman in Des Moines earlier this month. He urged the farmers not to lose their "cool." Now, I ask you, who does he think he is talking to? Secretary Freeman talks to Iowa farmers like they were a bunch of "hippies" on Dupont Circle in Washington, D.C. We are not worried about losing our "cool" as much as we are of losing our shirts.

Most Americans have been under the impression that there is a farm program designed to help provide the farmer with a fair shake. But for those who have not already decided otherwise, the President certainly set the record straight. He said:

This Government should give very serious consideration to evolving some kind of a program that will give the farmer an equity of fairness . . .

You better believe it should, Mr. President. My colleagues, this man has been in office for 4 years, and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has been here for 7, and now they have the nerve to say:

Serious consideration should be given to evolving some kind of a program that will give the farm an equity of fairness . . .

Mr. Speaker, we have moved through the New Deal, and a series of other deals, to what Agriculture Secretary Freeman refers to now as the New Era farm program. Today I propose a change. We have heard a lot of talk in these Halls about forcing everybody else to stick to the facts—so we have such proposals as truth in lending and truth in packaging. I can see no reason why the administration should be immune from this cleansing. Therefore, I am asking President Johnson and his Agriculture spokesman to change the name of the farm program from the New Era to the "raw deal", which comes about as close as you can get in describing the facts. Mr. Speaker, limburger cheese wrapped in angel food cake is still limburger cheese.

Let us look for a moment at some of the elements of the "raw deal." I had occasion recently to refer to many of them when I called for Orville Freeman's resignation. Most of them I will not repeat, but as he is still in the saddle, we need to keep up to date.

It is a "raw deal" when the administration asks the farmer to grow more food for the President's war against hunger, and then does nothing to assure him of a fair price for his efforts.

It is a "raw deal" when the farmer is asked to produce more wheat for the President's food-for-peace program, and then when he comes through with what is expected to be a bumper crop, 15 percent above last year, nothing is done to keep the bottom from going out of the market.

It is a "raw deal" when 5 years of Kennedy round negotiations in Geneva result in a "sell out" of American agriculture. The American farmer can well ask what he got in exchange for the 60 percent cut in our tariff on swine. He can also ask why we failed to shake the Europeans loose from their variable import levies, and why we had no success in lowering the trade barriers on such agricultural products as wheat, feed grains, rice, meats, dairy products, poultry, and eggs.

It is a "raw deal" when the errors by the USDA's Statistical Reporting Service appear to have contributed to the loss of millions by the American farmer. The cost of crop and livestock estimating portions of this program have risen from \$7,470,000 in 1961 to \$12,658,000 in fiscal 1967. Mr. Freeman has now indicated he will ask for an additional million next year to improve this program. While we are pleased that the Secretary sees the need to eliminate these costly errors, the record of this program does not convince me that more money is the answer. We will offer legislation that will actually cut the present appropriation.

My colleagues, it is a "raw deal" when we cannot schedule hearings on permanent dairy and meat import legislation because the Ways and Means Committee has to spend its time on a tax increase bill which would not be necessary if the administration had held the line instead of encouraging wasteful and extravagant nondefense spending.

It is a "raw deal" when 43.4 percent of our farms in 1966 earned an average of only \$796 apiece. I will say one thing for

Orville's new era farm program—the administration is certainly keeping on schedule with that portion designed to drive the little guy off the farm. As an example, Freeman's program is designed to eliminate 43.8 percent of the farms in my congressional district. My neighbors are wondering who will be next, and my colleagues, I will bet some of yours are too.

Mr. Speaker, it is a "raw deal" when the farmer who receives only 38 cents out of each food dollar is blamed by the American consumer for high food prices. Something is wrong when a finger is pointed at the guy who gets only 2.8 cents for the corn in a 30-cent box of cornflakes; 3 cents for the wheat in a 22-cent loaf of white bread; 59 cents out of each dollar spent for choice beef; and 24 cents from each half gallon of milk. Something is wrong when the farmers have a Secretary of Agriculture who cannot seem to set the record straight.

Something is wrong when the price of corn continues to drop in spite of the fact that Government owned and controlled stocks are supposedly only about 20 percent of their 1961 levels. We have been led to believe that the end of the surplus would bring better prices. Mr. President, the American farmer wants to know, "Just what is going on."

It was a "raw deal" when the farmer in mid-July found wheat prices down 37 cents, soybeans down 71 cents, and corn down 20 cents from last year's mid-July levels. It would take a 6-percent jump in farm prices by the end of August to equal prices of a year ago.

It is a "raw deal" when the President asks for a 10-percent increase in taxes for 1967 at the same time the farmer is being told his income is already down 11 percent from last year. Who else in this country is willing to take an 11-percent pay cut? No one. Not the Congressman, the teacher, the businessman, the union leader, the laborer, the professional, or anyone else, and the farmer does not like it either.

Mr. President, the farmer cannot afford the pay cut, nor can he afford your tax increase either.

And while we are looking at pay cuts Mr. President, Iowans would like back the \$350 million you took from them last year in inflation, and they wish, although they know better, that they were not going to lose even more this year.

And what is the administration's answer to the plight of the farmer? Well, last week the USDA recommended that he keep his corn on the farm and wait for higher prices. But early last spring when we asked the administration to rescind its callup order on 1962-63 sealed corn, the answer was "no dice."

The newest idea being promoted is referred to as a "strategic commodity reserve." Under this program, sponsored by the Department of Agriculture and the President, the Government would buy up crops to bolster prices. Sound familiar? It sounds to me like they have just changed the name of the song, but the tune is still the same. Sure, while the Government buys, prices may go up or fall more slowly, but what happens when the Government decides to sell? And it

will, because it has. Furthermore the decisions will be made by Mr. Orville Freeman, the same guy who is known the country over for his past recommendations on such matters. No—this man has not proven that his decisions reflect the best interests of the American farmer.

I might add that apparently Mr. Freeman regards the "strategic commodity reserve" as the solution to his Department's production estimating difficulties as well. Recently in Des Moines, Iowa, Freeman said:

With a strategic grain reserve program . . . this problem of estimating would vanish.

Yes, I guess it would, but that is not the only thing that would vanish.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's farmers are in trouble. In spite of the fact that our overall national income went up 223 percent from 1947 to 1966, the net income from farms was down from \$17.114 billion to an estimated \$14.5 billion for 1967. That is a "raw deal" if I ever heard of one, and until we have some changes around here, I think we had better face the facts and call it what it is, a "raw deal."

Mr. Speaker, there are some who take out their frustrations on society by rioting, looting, burning, and destroying the property of others. We all know this is one way to attract attention. The American farmer, angered because of Government policies which prevent him from reaping a fair return for his labor and investment, could probably do the same to dramatize his plight, but he will not. His way of life has caused him to respect the rights of others and to realize that nothing can be gained by such wanton destruction. The question remains, however, "What has the farmer done that he should deserve this kind of treatment? Why is he penalized?"

Although he now numbers less than 6 percent of the Nation's population, the farmer does ask that he be treated fairly and that he not be written off by the very Government he labors to support. He also asks that the policy of that Government be designed to provide him with the opportunity for a fair return for the contribution he is making to the American way of life. This is not asking too much.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to compliment the gentleman for his remarks. I was in my district, which is country Illinois, last weekend, and had the opportunity to talk firsthand with a number of farmers. I find they are almost in a state of despair over the decline of prices they are receiving and the increase of prices they have to pay.

I am sure the gentleman noticed last month the figures issued by the Department of Agriculture, which showed that the July 15 index of prices received by farmers was down 11 points compared to a year earlier, whereas the index of prices paid was up 11 points.

I am sure the gentleman is aware also that the parity ratio is at the lowest point since the depression 1930's, at 76. In 1960, in the campaign, we heard a lot from the Democratic side about 90 percent of parity as being the objective farmers

could reasonably look forward to if they put Democrats in power in this country. Well, today the parity ratio is not 90 percent, and it is not 100 percent; it is 76.

I believe it is well worth noting that the parity ratio has declined substantially from the 81 parity ratio, where it stood when Republicans last were in charge in the White House.

Mr. SCHERLE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who is very well informed and knowledgeable on the subject of agriculture.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I would be happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] for the excellent statement that he has made and say to the gentleman that I concur wholeheartedly in those statements.

It was only a couple of weeks ago that 35,000 farmers assembled at Des Moines, Iowa, demonstrating positive, living and breathing proof of the anger of the midwestern farmers at the treatment that has been accorded them in the economic scheme of things in this country.

I would only say by way of conclusion that if President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman are unable to pull some kind of a rabbit out of some kind of a political hat between now and next summer—if they are unable to do that, they are going to be in deep and dire trouble politically next fall.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCHERLE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, for whom I have the greatest respect, and for his outstanding service here in the House of Representatives to all America.

FARMERS NOT RECEIVING FAIR SHARE OF NATIONAL INCOME

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have today received some very revealing income statistics from 223 farmers in one of the better agricultural counties in Minnesota, and a county that ranks in the top 100 agricultural counties in the United States.

This county is Renville, located in the Sixth Congressional District in the State of Minnesota. According to the Secretary of Agriculture, 1966 was the best income year that agriculture has ever had.

These averages are from full-time farmers—not corporations, and not so-called subsistence farmers where most of their gross income is derived from off-farm employment.

The average net taxable income average was \$3,847. In the total 223 returns, only 30 were entitled to contribute the maximum under the social security program, while 99 had incomes of under the national poverty level of \$3,000.

Mr. Speaker, such figures clearly show

that farmers are not receiving anywhere near their fair share of the national income. A prolongation of this state can only mean a rotting away of the growth base for our country. As more and more foreign agricultural goods are imported at a world price level, fewer and fewer farmers can compete or exist.

BURIAL OF GEORGE LINCOLN ROCKWELL IN NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, every red-blooded American shuddered with dismay at the prospect of George Lincoln Rockwell being buried with military honors in a national cemetery if he were dressed in a Nazi uniform and his casket carried by so-called storm troopers.

I directed a telegram to both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, protesting this kind of burial, and because I want to have it documented as to how I felt on the matter, I insert into the RECORD at this point the text of my wire. It follows:

AUGUST 28, 1967.

HON. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary, Department of the Army,
At the Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly object to burial of George Lincoln Rockwell in a National Cemetery with full military honors if he is garbed in a Nazi uniform and borne by a replica of Nazi storm troopers. Do not object if he is buried with military honors minus the Nazi paraphernalia. Burial in Nazi regalia would act to honor that evil which American soldiers of World War II fought, died, and bled to destroy.

Congressman GEORGE A. GOODLING,
19th Congressional District,
Pennsylvania.

THE VIETNAM STORY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, when the East-West conflict became a military issue in Korea, not much was known about that far-off land; however, the name Korea became a household word before the fighting was over. Similarly, with the passage of time, Vietnam promises to take on the same significance in the minds of Americans. This Vietnam story will attempt to retrace the history of our involvement, clarify confusion, and evaluate our present prospects in the area.

After World War II our Government adopted a policy of containment of Communist aggression wherever it might exist. This applied to Asia as well as Europe. In 1950, when China was overrun and lost, our Government was faced with the problem of redefining our primary strategic interest in the area. Southeast Asia was chosen as the area to defend, with Indochina, now known as Vietnam,

as the forward barrier to contain further advances. The French were already there trying to retain their historical colonial status against emerging independence movements led by the Communists. When it was evident the French were having a trying time, and might not linger long, the United States, as a stop-gap measure, adopted a two-pronged assistance program to: First, provide economic assistance to improve the welfare of the non-Communist elements; and second, grant military supplies to strengthen the defenses of the area opposing the Communists.

By the spring of 1954, the Communists had escalated their strength to over 500,000 well-trained and well-armed troops, with supporting artillery and other heavy weaponry. French military fortunes worsened, and climaxed by the disastrous defeat at Dienbienphu. In Paris cabinets changed. Mendes-France was elected Premier on the pledge that he would seek a peaceful solution to the fighting in the area.

The Geneva Convention was convened to bring about a peace settlement. France, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, Communist China, the Hanoi regime, the State of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia participated. During the course of negotiations, the United States privately expressed apprehension over Communist demands; however, the Geneva Convention ultimately concluded its business on mainly the following conditions:

First. Laos and Cambodia to be left as separate and independent states;

Second. Vietnam to be divided by a 17th parallel, the north under Communist control, and the south to remain free;

Third. Troops or guerrilla forces under Hanoi's control in south Vietnam to be recalled north; and,

Fourth. An International Control Commission, composed of representatives of India, Poland, and Canada to police the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

The United States refused to join the Geneva Declaration on the grounds that it had not been a belligerent and the agreement contained features inadequate to insure peace. The United States stated, however, that it would abide by the terms of the Geneva agreement, but warned that it would view with grave concern any renewal of aggression in violation of the agreement and as a serious threat to peace.

It was not long before the agreement of Geneva was no more than a mere scrap of paper. Hanoi forces in South Vietnam were not removed. They became stronger through further aid from North Vietnam. The 17th parallel became meaningless. The Communist chose to use a route of conquest into South Vietnam through Laos and Cambodia. And the International Control Commission was ineffectual. Hanoi violations of the Geneva Agreement became rampant. In effect, the Geneva Convention brought no peace to Vietnam. At best it was a temporary truce until such time the Communists chose further escalation.

With the passage of time the increasing guerrilla activity in South Vietnam appeared to the United States to be part of a planned campaign by Hanoi to bring

about a Communist revolution. At this stage Hanoi had formalized the designation of their guerrillas as the Vietcong, and announced the formation of a political front known as the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam. The Vietcong disrupted lines of communication in South Vietnam and through general terrorism were affecting the economic and political stability of South Vietnam. The State Department took note of this situation with its report entitled, "A Threat to Peace—North Vietnam's Effort To Conquer South Vietnam." This report concluded:

The Communist program to take over South Vietnam has moved into a new and more dangerous phase. . . . It is impossible to look at South Vietnam today without recognizing the clear and present danger of Communist conquest.

Therefore, token U.S. assistance increased in 1962 with the establishment of a military mission in Vietnam to help plan, train, and equip South Vietnam forces. Simultaneously, economic aid was intensified.

By 1964 the pattern of outside aid on the part of Peking and Moscow to Hanoi was obvious. Peking had been giving North Vietnam tactical combat personnel to undertake specialized duties with North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops. The Soviet Union, the greater contributor, was extending a large volume of material aid in the form of advanced weaponry, jet aircraft, and nuclear devices. This known trend was heightened and sharpened by the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

On August 2, 1964, three North Vietnamese torpedo boats attacked a U.S. destroyer, the U.S.S. *Maddox*, which was on routine patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin, some 30 miles off the coast of North Vietnam. Two days later the *Maddox* along with another destroyer, the *C. Turner Joy*, was again attacked by torpedo boats resulting in an exchange of fire. The United States drew attention of these attacks to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Security Council, without a vote, agreed to invite North and South Vietnam to provide information. Although South Vietnam indicated its acceptance, North Vietnam refused, issuing a statement that the Geneva conference powers, not the United Nations, had the right to examine the dispute. After considerable deliberation President Johnson delivered a message to Congress asking for a resolution expressing the unity and determination of the United States in supporting freedom and in protecting peace in Southeast Asia. A joint resolution was passed on August 7, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 2 in the Senate, and 416 to 0 in the House, and became law—Public Law 88-408—on August 10, 1964. It resolved:

That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression;

The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia . . . the United States is . . . prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, in-

cluding the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

This period is extremely important to those who might be unclear as to the manner in which the issues were joined in Vietnam.

In addition, some explanation is necessary regarding the authority of the President to conduct war in Vietnam.

Whether or not the President has the constitutional authority to conduct the war in Vietnam without an actual declaration of war by Congress depends on one's interpretation of the President's power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States and his duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

According to the administration, the President's authority and duty to conduct military operations in Vietnam stem from the following: Our commitments under the Southeast Asia Treaty, the pledges to the Republic of South Vietnam made by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson; assistance programs annually approved by Congress since 1955; declarations issued at the SEATO ministerial council meetings of 1964 and 1965; the joint congressional resolution of August 6-7, 1964, and the supplemental defense appropriations for Vietnam operations of May 7 and September 17, 1965.

As a treaty in force the Southeast Asia Treaty is a law of the land to which the United States is bound as a sovereign nation with rights and duties under the law of nations. The treaty is designed to protect its members, and any of the three non-Communist states growing out of former French Indochina which asks for protection, against "Communist aggression." Those arguing the case for presidential prerogative point out that Congress has passed no specific restrictions on the President's execution of American responsibilities under the treaty other than that the "aggression" referred to under article IV of the treaty be "Communist aggression." They further point out that economic and military aid to South Vietnam began in 1954 under President Eisenhower, and that since 1955 Congress has annually approved overall economic and military assistance programs in which the continuation of major aid to South Vietnam has been specifically considered.

The Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization issued communiques on April 15, 1964, and May 5, 1965, concluding that:

The defeat of this Communist campaign is essential not only to the security of the Republic of Vietnam but to that of Southeast Asia.

Later, in describing the intensified situation in Vietnam, the State Department released a white paper entitled "Aggression From the North" referring to the conflict in Vietnam as a new kind of war, in which a Communist government had "set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring State" using every resource in a "carefully planned program of concealed aggression." Communist forces were attacking civil and military installations in South Vietnam

at will. The toll of American noncombatants were numbered in the hundreds; terrorism against the apathetic South Vietnamese people was alarming. Hence, in February 1965, U.S. escalation countered North Vietnam escalation with the use of combat troops in the area, and the commencement of air strikes against targets in the north. Since that time our combat troops in South Vietnam have increased to approximately 550,000.

At this juncture it is necessary again to dwell on the subject of Soviet aid to the North Vietnam theater of operations. It was expanding and developing as a significant factor in the Vietnam war. This aid was very much like the pattern used in assisting the enemy during the Korean war. Incidentally, it was only after it was known that Soviet aid was creating an entirely new military situation or threat did we bomb targets in North Vietnam. Now it can be said that most of the automatic weapons we capture are of Soviet manufacture, and most of our plane losses have resulted from the use of Soviet anti-aircraft guns, missiles, or Mig jet aircraft. Of particular devastating effect in Vietnam are the employment of the unprecedentedly large mortars of Soviet manufacture with a range of 7 miles.

While our actions in Vietnam are generally reported in the context of escalation, the fact of the matter is that the nature of Chinese-Soviet aid has enabled the enemy to first escalate. Soviet aid is more important than most people realize in the actual operation of a war. There are now over 100,000 tons of Soviet supplies being landed monthly at the port of Haiphong, which makes this center more of a strategic target than Hanoi. It is said that the Soviets with an investment of less than \$2 billion a year, and no real loss of life, are helping to force the United States to wage war that now has taken over 12,000 lives, and costing us directly over \$24 billion a year.

At present no one can predict an early cessation of the fighting with victory on our side. The war in Vietnam is certainly not tailored to our likes, or to our methods of combat control. There is no common front to enable our commanders to engage the enemy at any given point with maximum resources. The enemy chooses to fight an Indian-type warfare utilizing the cover of jungles, and their more familiar knowledge of the paddyland. Consequently, the accepted method is to "search and destroy" wherever the enemy can be found or trapped, be it in small numbers at times. Nevertheless, there is a gradual upturn in our fortunes in Vietnam. The phase now ending was marked by the American buildup in Vietnam, and by the use of bombing in North Vietnam for the dual purpose of destroying enemy bases and bringing the other side to the peace table. One thing is now certain, a Communist military takeover of South Vietnam is out of the question, unless we lose it through the Communist method of exploiting a cease-fire or truce, or at the conference table.

Winning the war by cease-fire is a familiar Communist tactic. This was clearly demonstrated in China, thence Korea, and now possibly in Vietnam. On the last occasion of an extended period of

cease-fire or truce in Vietnam we agreed to a temporary cease-fire on humanitarian grounds to enable the Vietnamese people to enjoy a respite or a relief from the fighting during their New Year's holidays. Needless to say, our decision to agree to the truce was also based on a desire to demonstrate to the Communists of Hanoi our willingness to ultimately seek an end of the fighting in Vietnam, providing an honorable peace could be assured the Vietnamese people.

Apparently our good intentions were not rewarded, for under the cloak of this cease-fire, the enemy moved more troops to the forward areas, and generally improved its military position as a result of the truce.

Before we leap headlong into peace negotiations with the enemy in Vietnam, probably it will best be for us to take a hard look at the enemy's intentions in violating cease-fire agreements because their practice of violating a formal cease-fire agreement might well weaken our position at the conference table while discussing peace.

Let us review and clarify our attempts at peace. This too is a subject much debated and confused. After we explore all channels in search of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam, the Communists have come back stating the following four points as the basis for peace talks:

First. The United States must end its policy of intervention and aggression in South Vietnam. It must withdraw all troops and weapons of all kinds, dismantle all military bases, and cancel its military alliance with South Vietnam.

Second. Pending the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries.

Third. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by Vietnamese people themselves with the Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Vietcong).

Fourth. The peaceful reunification of Vietnam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without foreign interference.

In turn our Government has made known its following views as a basis for a peace settlement:

First. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 are an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia;

Second. We would welcome a conference on Southeast Asia or on any part thereof;

Third. We would welcome unconditional discussions;

Fourth. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions;

Fifth. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose;

Sixth. We want no U.S. bases in Southeast Asia;

Seventh. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured;

Eighth. We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice;

Ninth. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the

Vietnamese through their own free decision;

Tenth. The countries of Southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral if that be their option;

Eleventh. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of Southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least \$1 billion;

Twelfth. The President has said:

The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem.

Thirteenth. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

In assessing the two opposing views on a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam we find that Hanoi's conditions display considerable intransigence, and if accepted, they would lay the basis for rapid subversion and takeover of South Vietnam, if not leave implications of our ultimate complete withdrawal from mainland Asia. In addition, Hanoi now insists that we cease bombing North Vietnam as a pre-condition to peace talks. As a matter of fact bombing of targets in North Vietnam which include mainly their lines of communication or transportation is the only defense we have against their continued buildup, or their continued efforts at escalation. In view of these Hanoi peace tactics, it is possible their motive is to extend the war, hoping we will be frustrated by attrition, and a divided homefront will force us to a peace conference in a mood of surrender.

A measure of the confusion and controversy surrounding the Vietnam war and the American role can be seen in words of titles of books written about it, such words as nightmare, quagmire, lost revolution, mission in torment, and the like. Debate still flourishes. Many who originally supported the President, giving him authority to act after the Gulf of Tonkin incident, have now recanted. These individuals believe it to be more of a civil war in Vietnam than an act of external aggression, and they are not convinced that U.S. vital interests are involved in preventing a Communist takeover of South Vietnam. Needless to say, these views do not take into account the proof of external aggression covered by this Vietnam story, and the prospect of an eventual takeover of all of Southeast Asia, if the Communists overrun South Vietnam.

As already stated in the opening remarks of my Vietnam story, one of the main principles of our foreign policy since World War II, has been to contain or prevent expanding Communist aggression in the world, whether it be in Europe or Asia. This policy has been bipartisan. To accept defeat in Vietnam will entail a complete review of our traditional foreign policy, and a recogni-

tion of the consequences. We live in a world fraught with danger.

Despite our persistent efforts to conclude a disarmament treaty with the Soviet Union, and other methods "to build bridges to peace," we are faced with a new crisis in the world. In many respects the world crisis of today has more sinister aspects than any international development in the last decade. America's intervention either by diplomacy or military steps in Greece, the Suez controversy, and the Congo have been a preventive to a larger war. The U.N. acted promptly in the Korean crisis in 1950. Except for the readiness of this country to take action then, all of Korea would now be in Communist hands. The Communist game seems to involve the United States in other areas in the hope that America will get out of Vietnam soon and, shortly thereafter, from the Western Pacific, leaving the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, India, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Korea, Taiwan, and perhaps Japan to get along as best they can.

A crisis of the utmost gravity today confronts the world. The United States, as the leader of free nations of the globe, cannot afford to falter, or give up its objective or yield to Communist pressure.

THE ELECTION FRAUD IS IN HANOI, NOT IN SAIGON

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there is going to be a vital election in the Republic of South Vietnam in the next few days.

The United States has a stake in it because the lives of our fighting men have made it possible, and the efforts of our diplomats and technicians have helped it along.

Yet, there are some who are apparently trying to annul the effects of the election before they take place by crying "fraud," or "foul."

The world press—including the American press—seems to have discovered the election and its problems just a few weeks ago.

The truth of the matter is that President Johnson and the United States have been urging free and honest open elections in South Vietnam for the past 2 years. And the reason why we are so interested is that we have had no small a role in encouraging the growth of representative institutions in that country.

In addition, President Johnson's decision to send a team of independent and bipartisan American observers is a further indication of our concern in the basic democratic process.

We have reports of charges and countercharges in the press, that the Vietnamese election is one thing, or another thing, or rigged, or controlled, or that we are overly intruding.

But what I see is a free-wheeling, American-type election in which speakers on the stump are engaging in a little bit of campaign boasting or exaggeration, and where candidates occasionally

take the gloves off in talking about their opponents.

Is this "fraud?"

Is there going to be fraud when the Government of South Vietnam itself invites the world press, foreign observers, American observers, and the United Nations?

The only thing that is missing to observe the election is a TV monitor in each voting booth.

But we do not have that in the United States. So let us not expect the Vietnamese to be more pure than Americans when they vote.

I would say that the fight against communism and for freedom and independence in South Vietnam is paying off.

It is paying off militarily because we are hurting the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

It is paying off in the civilian sector because this threatened nation is now able to hold an open election.

It appears it will be an open and successful election—and maybe that is what hurts a lot of our doubters or dissenters. And an open election is more than the Communists in the North would do.

Those ready to holler "fraud" ought to send their comments special delivery to Ho Chi Minh who is an expert in "unanimous" elections.

I say, let us wait for the dust to settle in South Vietnam and see who has won and who has lost.

Let us see if the South Vietnamese who often brave death to cast a simple vote will not make their democracy something new in Southeast Asia.

I have faith in the people, and I think they are going to show us something special in days ahead.

STUDY OF ORGANIZED CRIME AND THE URBAN POOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] is recognized for 30 minutes to include charts, tables, and extraneous matter.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months 22 of my colleagues here in the House have worked with me on a study of one of the most serious problems in the United States today, the problem of organized crime and the urban poor. Today we have released the results of that study.

In bringing the subject matter to the attention of the House and the country, I wish to express my appreciation to Congressmen CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., CHARLES A. MOSHER, HOWARD W. ROBISON, ROBERT TAFT, JR.; and to Congressmen MARK ANDREWS, ALPHONZO BELL, WILLIAM T. CAHILL, JOHN R. DELLENBACK, MARVIN L. ESCH, PAUL FINDLEY, PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, JAMES HARVEY, FRANK HORTON, F. BRADFORD MORSE, OGDEN R. REID, HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, FRED SCHWENGEL, GARNER E. SHRIVER, ROBERT T. STAFFORD, J. WILLIAM STANTON, and CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

I commend the study of this paper to all of my colleagues here in the House. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I now append the text of that paper to my remarks.

THE URBAN POOR AND ORGANIZED CRIME

INTRODUCTION

All Americans are concerned with the continued rise in the nation's crime rate. The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act was proposed and came on the national scene at a time when it led many to think that it was a complete and comprehensive answer.

The fact is that the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act as offered by the Administration proposed to do little or nothing about organized crime! Nor is a meaningful approach offered by any other Administration proposal. This leaves a serious question whether the Administration is waging any worthy fight at all against organized crime.

Ordinary street crime is a national problem—but one which can and should be solved at the local level. But organized crime is a national problem which requires a national solution—and none has been offered by this Administration.

Fred Vinson, Jr., Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Criminal Division, appeared before a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee on April 13, and agreed that the heart and soul of organized crime is "gambling on a national level, all interstate, interlocked, and directed."

This emphasizes that only a nationally-directed effort can control organized crime.

Furthermore, much street crime has its origin in the workings of organized crime. It has been estimated that fully half of the street crime of New York City is committed by narcotics addicts in search of money for drugs. The drugs are distributed and peddled by organized crime.

Not only has the Administration offered no substantive legislation on organized crime to accompany the Safe Streets Bill, but it has allowed the Kennedy Administration's war on organized crime to grind to a virtual standstill. The record is overwhelming to support this contention; that record is documented in this report.

The language of the report of the National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, issued in February 1967, put the problem of organized crime in its proper perspective:

"In many ways, organized crime is the most sinister kind of crime in America. The men who control it have become rich and powerful by encouraging the needy to gamble, by luring the troubled to destroy themselves with drugs, by extorting the profits of honest and hardworking businessmen, by collecting usury from those in financial plight, by maiming or murdering those who oppose them, by bribing those who are sworn to destroy them. Organized crime is not merely a few preying upon a few. In a very real sense it is dedicated to subverting not only American institutions, but the very decency and integrity that are the most cherished attributes of a free society. As the leaders of Cosa Nostra and their racketeering allies pursue their conspiracy unmolested, in open and continuous defiance of the law, they preach a sermon that all too many Americans heed: The government is for sale; lawlessness is the road to wealth; honesty is a pitfall and morality a trap for suckers.

"The extraordinary thing about organized crime is that America has tolerated it for so long."

The picture of organized crime seen by the American public has been painted by spectacular Congressional investigations and by occasional television and newspaper accounts. It is a picture of a network of wealthy and well-dressed criminal bosses operating legitimate businesses with illegitimate funds. It is a picture of disreputable gangsters increasingly achieving reputable positions in their local communities. It is a picture of men who lead double lives—the prominent lawyer who is secretly also the boss of the local syndicate. If the picture shows brutality or violence it is generally

the brutality of one segment of the underworld attacking another.

The picture is not inaccurate, but is sadly incomplete. It omits the really important reasons why our society must wage war on organized crime. The picture shows the profits of organized crime, but it does not show the victims.

THE VICTIMS ARE THE URBAN POOR

The victims of organized crime are the urban poor. A society concerned about poverty must be concerned about organized crime—for while Federal money is poured into the urban poverty areas, organized crime siphons money out of the same areas. Badly needed funds from welfare programs go to the urban poor and organized crime takes money from the urban poor. Continued indifference to organized crime threatens to turn government welfare and anti-poverty programs into a subsidy for society's most notorious predator. Dedicated local officials are largely helpless in tackling problems of such magnitude.

We support efficiently administered welfare, training and anti-poverty programs. We wish that they could be made more effective. To do so requires a serious and comprehensive attack on organized crime.

The proof is evident in a quick look at the major sources of income for organized crime.

THE NUMBERS GAME

This racket "game of chance" has little or no appeal to the comfortable within our society—to the rich, to the educated, to the well-employed. It appeals to those who are desperate to improve their lot in life, who are looking everywhere for a quick way out—in short, to the urban poor. It is merely a polite form of extortion. Like a leech, organized crime, through the numbers racket, sucks the life blood of the urban poor from them by offering them the illusion of a chance for great wealth. Even where the game is "honestly" run, the odds against winning are generally a thousand-to-one and the payoff only five hundred-to-one. The Administration quotes as a "very conservative estimate" a \$20 billion annual gross intake for organized crime from gambling and numbers games alone—and a \$6 billion annual profit—and most of it comes from those who can least afford to pay. The money can only come at the expense of the health, food, clothing, shelter or education of the poor. The Administration has asked Congress for \$2.06 billion for the War on Poverty in Fiscal 1968; the profits of organized crime from gambling will be three times larger for the same period.

NARCOTICS

The use of narcotics is largely concentrated not among the affluent but among the poor, where drugs seem to represent one of the few means of temporary escape. Again, it is organized crime which is responsible for preying on the misery of the poor by offering them the illusion of escape—which too often results in permanent desperation. Those who can least afford it, both psychologically and financially, become narcotics addicts, who find only mounting desperation as they seek the money to feed their habit. As the Crime Commission attested:

"More than one-half the known heroin addicts are in New York. Most of the others are in California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Texas, and the District of Columbia. In the States where heroin addiction exists on a large scale it is an urban problem. Within the cities it is largely found in areas with low average incomes, poor housing, and high delinquency. The addict himself is likely to be male, between the ages of 21-30, poorly educated and unskilled, and a member of a disadvantaged ethnic minority group."

It has been estimated that fully 50% of the street crime in major urban centers—such as petty theft, assault and robbery, prostitution—is the product of narcotics ad-

dition which forces its victims to find drug money anywhere they can. The warlords of this cycle of poverty and crime are the organized crime racketeers. If their activities could be curtailed, the growing crime rate would be dramatically reduced, and the War on Poverty might have a better chance to succeed. The Administration spent \$352 million on Project Head Start in Fiscal 1967 to give a chance to the children of the poor; the minimum estimates place organized crime's narcotics "take" at \$350 million, almost all of it from the poor.

LOAN SHARKING

The affluent can almost without exception find trustworthy lending institutions which will extend them funds at standard rates of interest when they need it. But those who are poor and desperately need money quickly frequently can borrow it only at exorbitant interest rates (e.g. 20% a week) from the loan-sharking outfits of organized crime. And when the victims cannot repay they are threatened with violence unless they will resort to criminal activity or permit the organized crime network to take over their business. The small marginal local businessman in the concentrated areas of the urban poor is a principal victim of organized crime loan-sharking. Again, the victims of organized crime are the urban poor. In Fiscal 1967 the Small Business Administration loaned \$50 million under the anti-poverty program of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to small businessmen in need of help to start or continue their operations; organized crime takes over \$350 million a year from America's poor through loan-sharking alone.

The affluent have one picture of the problems confronted by the poor—but the poor have another. Recent studies in Harlem and Watts show the picture:

"... when people talked about 'problems of Harlem' or even 'problems in my block,' the mention of integrated schools, busing, police brutality or some other problems . . . just don't get much attention or mention."

"... they chose to talk about inadequate housing, and the problems which are offspring of that major problem, such as crime, dope addiction, winos, and inadequate police protection."

It is the height of hypocrisy for government to extend to the poor a promise of help but to give only lip-service to an all-out war on organized crime.

THE PRICE THE URBAN POOR PAY IS NOT ONLY IN MONEY

The urban poor are the victims of organized crime in at least three ways. First, it is their precious money which provides the basic income for organized crime's growing network in "legitimate" business. Second, when the rate of street crime rises, as the victims of organized crime seek the quick money they need to meet the demands of organized crime, street crime is perpetrated against all segments of society including the urban poor. When a narcotics addict needs money to feed his habit he takes it where he can find it—from the affluent and the needy, from the rich and the poor. But it is the final price paid by the urban poor which may in the long run be the most insidious cost of organized crime. That price is society's lack of respect for law, order and authority—the by-products of corruption.

Organized crime cannot flourish without corruption. It is impossible for a giant narcotics ring to operate successfully without knowledge and the indifferent acquiescence, at least, of some local officials. It is impossible for organized crime to take over 20 billion dollars from America's urban poor through the numbers racket without the knowledge and the indifferent acquiescence, at least, of some local officials. It is impossible for a brutal system of loan-sharking and "protection" to flourish without the knowledge and the indifferent acquiescence, at least, of some local officials.

It is small consolation to the urban poor that most public officials at the local level are honest and incorruptible. It takes only a few corrupted by a bribe and a few more who practice the corruption of indifference to allow organized crime to thrive.

As the role and size of government continues to grow in today's society, corruption on the local level can be widespread even within the most virtuous of city administrations. The President's National Crime Commission states the case:

"All available data indicate that organized crime flourishes only where it has corrupted local officials. As the scope and variety of organized crime's activities have expanded, its need to involve public officials at every level of local government has grown. And as government regulation expands into more and more areas of private and business activity, the power to corrupt likewise affords the corrupter more control over matters affecting the everyday life of each citizen."

Assistant Attorney General Vinson has gone even further: "... where organized crime flourishes, you can be assured there is some corruption. I think that is really the pervasive danger of organized crime. That is, its effect on law enforcement and the local power structure."

And he went on to admit that the Department of Justice "very occasionally" has information brought to its attention with respect to corruption in State and local agencies.

A war on organized crime is inseparable from a war on political corruption. In this fact may lie hidden the reason why it is so difficult for political leadership to wage a comprehensive war on organized crime—for to do so would be to risk severe political consequences.

A tacit alliance between organized crime and some local public officials has a far more devastating effect on society and the urban poor than merely permitting organized crime to practice its vices. In the broader sense corruption of local public officials inevitably results in a breakdown of public respect for authority.

In recent years—indeed recent weeks—much has been said about a deplorable loss of morality among segments of the urban poor in America's cities. But to whom are the people to look for standards of honesty and virtue if they cannot look to their local public officials? What is the lesson taught to today's young men and women when members of their local public community choose to cooperate with (or choose conveniently not to see) organized crime? Frederic Milton Thrasher, a noted social worker among urban youth groups of a generation ago, once described the process:

"When a noted criminal is caught, the fact is the principal topic of conversation among my boys. They and others lay wagers as to how long it will be before the criminal is free again, how long it will be before his pull gets him away from the law. The youngsters soon learn who are the politicians who can be depended upon to get offenders out of trouble, who are the dive-keepers who are protected. The increasing contempt for law is due to the corrupt alliance between crime and politics, protected vice, pull in the administration of justice, unemployment, and a general soreness against the world produced by these conditions."

When a "general soreness against the world" erupts into massive violence in America's cities there are many causes—but a principal catalyst is a disrespect for authority bred by corruption in public officials. The willingness of many more local and national public officials to be indifferent toward it inevitably feeds the sense of desperation of the urban poor.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD

It is to the credit of the Kennedy Administration that, despite the potential political consequences, in the early sixties a beginning

was made to a vigorous effort to fight organized crime. The Congress passed helpful legislation, much of which was drafted in the Eisenhower Administration. And under the approving eye of the Attorney General, the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Criminal Division in the Department of Justice was steadily expanded and steadily expanded its efforts. These efforts resulted in a substantial number of cases brought to trial in 1963.

The record of the Johnson Administration speaks for itself:

1. *The President promised the 89th Congress legislation to fight organized crime, but no such legislation ever appeared.* In his 1965 message to the Congress on crime the President promised:

"I am calling on the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the other heads of the Federal law enforcement arms to enlarge their energetic effort against organized crime. The Department of Justice will submit legislative proposals to the Congress to strengthen and expand these efforts generally."

But the legislative proposals were never seen. In fact, during the Johnson Administration only two bills to help the fight against organized crime have been sponsored by the Administration. Both came in this Congress: the first related to immunity of witnesses; the second proposed to provide additional protection to a potential witness by making it a crime to threaten or coerce him. Both bills found their origin in legislation sponsored by former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

2. *The number of man days in the field of personnel of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department has decreased by over 48% since 1964.* (During the same period FBI reports show that the national crime rate has increased by over 22%.) The investigative activities of the Section grew steadily under the Kennedy Administration to a high point of 6699 man days in the field by Section personnel in Fiscal 1964. The corresponding figure for Fiscal 1966 was 3480 man days in the field. And there was no significant change in the first eight months of Fiscal 1967.

3. *The number of man days before grand juries by personnel of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department has decreased by over 72% since 1963.* (During the same period FBI reports show that the national crime rate has increased by over 38%.) The efforts to secure indictments rose steadily under the Kennedy Administration to a high-point of 1353 man days before grand juries by Section personnel in Fiscal 1963. The corresponding figure for Fiscal 1966 was 373 man days before grand juries. And there was no significant change in the first eight months of Fiscal 1967. The figures are, of course, fully consistent with the corresponding decline in man days in the field.

4. *The number of man days in court by personnel of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department has decreased by over 56% since 1964.* (During the same period FBI reports show that the national crime rate has increased by over 22%.) The efforts to secure convictions rose steadily under the Kennedy Administration to a high-point of 1364 man days in court by Section personnel in Fiscal 1964. The corresponding figure for Fiscal 1966 was 606 man days in court. And the trend continued downward further in the first eight months of Fiscal 1967. These figures are, of course, fully consistent with the corresponding decline in man days in the field and before grand juries.

5. *The number of District Court briefs prepared or reviewed by the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department has decreased by 83% since 1963.* (During the same period FBI reports show that the national crime rate has increased by

over 38%.) This index of effort increased steadily under the Kennedy Administration to a high-point of 339 district court briefs prepared or reviewed in Fiscal 1963. The corresponding figure for Fiscal 1966 was 59 briefs prepared or reviewed. These figures are, of course, fully consistent with the corresponding decline in man days in the field, before grand juries, and in court.

(NOTE: We are aware that the Administration quotes ever-climbing numbers of indictments and convictions relating to organized crime. The record above belies these claims. The truth is that the indictment and conviction record claimed for the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department includes cases relating to a broad number of areas over which the Section has "supervisory jurisdiction" but which have little or no relation to organized crime—such as violations of the Indian liquor laws, interstate liquor traffic laws, the criminal provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, etc. In other words, the Section "maintains supervisory jurisdiction over statutory violations involving areas often related to organized crime activity. . . . In this way, the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section is able to insure uniform standards even though many of the cases do not involve organized criminal groups." The quote is from 1967 Congressional testimony by Assistant Attorney General Vinson and it's tantamount to an admission that the statistics on indictments and convictions under the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section are meaningless as a measure of the Administration's fight against organized crime.

(It is true that there has been a recent increase in Section personnel after a severe cut took place when the Johnson Administration came to power. The question should never be how many men are there, but what are they doing. The per-capita effort and performance of Section personnel—compared to the Kennedy Administration—would make the downward trend cited above even more apparent and alarming.)

6. *The National Crime Commission was influenced to reverse an earlier recommendation for wiretap legislation at the urging of Attorney General Clark, former Attorney General Katzenbach, and Leon Jaworski, a Texas attorney.* When the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was first appointed, no plans existed to consider organized crime. After objections it was agreed to treat the subject, but the effort was given a minimal budget: In November 1966, the full Commission met and agreed to recommend that Congress authorize wiretapping and eavesdropping by Federal law enforcement officers under strict safeguards and only with court approval. A majority of Commission members endorsed the view that the use of wiretap and eavesdrop devices was necessary in the fight against organized crime. Only two members of the nineteen man Commission voted to drop the eavesdrop recommendation. At a subsequent meeting on December 30, 1966, the Commission voted to replace its earlier recommendation with one which simply recommended that Congress consider new eavesdrop legislation without suggesting what its substance should be. The vote came after long sessions at which a Commission member, Leon Jaworski, a Texas attorney, who had not been at the earlier session, warned that, if the earlier recommendations were not dropped, he would file dissenting views alleging that the Commission had acted without sufficient facts. Attorney General Clark had opposed the Commission's recommendation adopted in November. Former Attorney General Katzenbach, who was Chairman of the Commission, argued for the change at the December meeting.

7. *Organized crime would be a principal beneficiary of President Johnson's bill to abolish all use of wiretap and eavesdrop devices except in national security cases.* In his 1967 State of the Union Message, the Presi-

dent proposed legislation to ban all use of wiretapping and eavesdropping by anybody except in national security cases under his direction. The bill would place the President under no scrutiny in his use of eavesdropping devices in national security cases—a questionable feature from a civil liberties perspective. But it would prohibit all use of eavesdropping equipment to fight organized crime. It would bar Federal officials from its use, and it would make void all State laws which permit law enforcement personnel under court order thus to seek evidence against or information about organized crime. It would rule out any law, for example, such as New York State has had for many years, to permit eavesdropping by authorized law enforcement personnel under court control. (The United States Supreme Court recently struck down the New York law as lacking sufficiently stringent controls, but it strongly implied that permissive Federal or State wiretap laws would be constitutional if adequate safeguards were built into them. The States affected by this ruling are already attempting to rewrite their laws in light of the court's decision; but all such laws would be voided by passage of the President's legislation.)

Attention to the right of personal privacy requires restrictive legislation to prevent abuse in the use of wiretap and eavesdrop devices. But it appears an indisputable fact that the one really valuable tool of law enforcement against organized crime is the eavesdropping device. Nonetheless, the Administration insists it is of no real value at all. Attorney General Clark has said: ". . . in fact there are only a small proportion of all crimes where it could be utilized at all, and as to these it would not be a significant investigative device."

Assistant Attorney General Vinson, on the other hand, when asked what the principal problem was in the Justice Department's efforts against organized crime replied: "Evidentiary problems, basically."

According to the *New York Times*, James Gale, in charge of the FBI's efforts against organized crime, says that wiretapping and eavesdropping are useful investigative tools.

According to the *New York Times*, Cartha D. DeLoach, Assistant to The Director of the FBI, says that the Bureau would be handicapped in fighting organized crime unless eavesdropping was legalized.

Frank Hogan, the District Attorney of New York, told the President's Crime Commission that electronic surveillance is:

"The single most valuable weapon in law enforcement's fight against organized crime. . . . It has permitted us to undertake major investigations of organized crime. Without it, and I confine myself to top figures in the underworld, my own office could not have convicted Charles 'Lucky' Luciano, Jimmy Hines, Louis 'Lepke' Buchalter, Jacob 'Gurrah' Shapiro, Joseph 'Socks' Lanza, George Scalise, Frank Erickson, John 'Dio' Dioguardi, and Frank Carbo. . . ."

The President's Crime Commission obviously agreed with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. William A. Kolar, Director of the Intelligence Division of Internal Revenue, says:

"As an investigator, I think the tool would be valuable, the ability to wiretap under let's say, strict supervision. And I say strict supervision. There is no question that it yields valuable information."

Professor G. Robert Blakey of the Law School of Notre Dame University was formerly a special prosecutor in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department and more recently a special consultant to the President's Crime Commission. In recent testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Professor Blakey cited in detail publicly reported FBI summaries (artels) of information gathered on organized crime figures in the New England area through the use of electronic surveillance. He concluded:

"From August 1960 until June 1964, I was

a special prosecutor in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Department of Justice. Nothing in the routine reports that I read from any federal agency contained data of this quantity or quality. Apparently, the Federal Bureau of Investigation was not then making electronically obtained data directly available to Departmental attorneys. I read, of course, general intelligence reports, but these seldom were on the concrete level of these airtels, and they could not be used for prosecution or investigation purposes. The investigation reports I read were the product of the use of normal investigative methods. There is just simply no comparison in the two kinds of reports. In light of this, I find it nothing short of incredible that Mr. Clark and others would seriously suggest that the use of electronic surveillance techniques is 'neither effective nor highly productive.'

Perhaps the latest official to dispute the Attorney General's position on the value of wiretap is William O. Bittman, who was the successful government prosecutor in its cases against Jimmy Hoffa and Bobby Baker. Now in private practice, Bittman, as quoted in the New York Times, cited the controversy over FBI bugging of Las Vegas gambling figures to document his case:

"In Las Vegas, the Government learned from bugging the amount of money that was being skimmed, who was doing the skimming, how the skimming was done, who the couriers were that were delivering the money around the country, when they were leaving and who was going to receive the money.

"How can you say this was no help to law enforcement?"

If the case for the President's legislation to ban wiretapping rests on civil liberties arguments, why would it permit use of bugging at his discretion with absolutely no checks by the courts or anybody else? If the case for the President's legislation to ban wiretapping rests on its lack of value to investigating authorities, why does almost every law enforcement official disagree with him?

8. In his 1967 message to the Congress on crime, the President ignored almost every single recommendation on organized crime made by his National Advisory Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

The record of the Johnson Administration on organized crime is also cited by the President's own Crime Commission itself in a little-noticed and delicately-worded passage:

"In 1961, the OCR Section expanded its organized crime program to unprecedented proportions. In the next 3 years, regular intelligence reports were secured from 26 separate Federal agencies, the number of attorneys was nearly quadrupled, and convictions increased. Indicative of the cooperation during this enforcement effort was the pooling of information from several Federal agencies for investigative leads in income tax cases. Over 60% of the convictions secured between 1961 and July 1965 resulted from tax investigations conducted by the Internal Revenue Service. Several high-level members of organized crime families in New York City were convicted through the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

"The FBI was responsible for convictions of organized crime figures in New York City, Chicago, and elsewhere. Enactment of statutes giving the FBI jurisdiction in interstate gambling cases resulted in disruption, by investigation and prosecution, of major interstate gambling operations, including 'lay-off' betting, which is essential to the success of local gambling businesses.

In 1965, a number of factors slowed the momentum of the organized crime drive. A Senate committee uncovered a few isolated instances of wiretapping and electronic surveillance by Treasury Department agents, and some officials began to question whether special emphasis upon organized crime in tax

enforcement was appropriate or fair. The Department of Justice was accused of extensively using illegal electronic surveillance in investigations of racketeer-influence in Las Vegas casinos. Federal prosecutors in some large cities demanded independence from OCR Section attorneys and prosecutive policies. Attacks appeared in the press on the intensity and tactics of the Federal investigative and prosecutive efforts. A high rate of turnover among OCR Section attorneys meant discontinuity of effort and reduced personnel by nearly 25%.

"This combination of adverse circumstances apparently led the OCR Section to believe that it could no longer expect the high degree of cooperation it had received from some Federal investigative agencies, and the intensity of its efforts diminished."

The President's own Crime Commission has thus cited the cutback in the war on organized crime. It begs the question, however, to point to the high turnover of personnel in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department as a cause of slackened effort. The reverse is undoubtedly true—the high turnover rate probably results from low morale on the part of personnel who feel the Administration has tied their hands. Similarly, it begs the question to put the blame for diminished efforts against organized crime on legal questions over the use of wiretap and eavesdropping devices. After all, it is the Administration which has led the fight to ban their use.

That is the record. It speaks for itself—loud and clear.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are in large part based on the work of the President's own National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, whose work the Administration has apparently chosen to ignore.

1. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission recommended to the President but the President ignored, that "the staff of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section (of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department) should be greatly increased, and the section should have final authority for decision-making in its relationship with U.S. Attorneys on organized crime cases."

2. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission recommended to the President but the President ignored, that "the Department of Justice should give financial assistance to encourage the development of efficient systems of regional intelligence gathering, collection and dissemination. By financial assistance and provisions of security clearance, the Department should also sponsor and encourage research by the many relevant disciplines regarding the nature, development, activities, and organizations of these special criminal groups."

3. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission recommended to the President but the President ignored, that "Congress . . . should abolish the rigid two-witness and direct-evidence rules in perjury prosecutions, but retain the requirement of proving an intentional false statement."

4. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission recommended to the President but the President ignored, that "Federal . . . legislation should be enacted to provide for extended prison terms where the evidence, pre-sentence report, or sentence hearings shows that a felony was committed as part of a continuing illegal business in which the convicted offender occupied a supervisory or other management position."

5. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission recommended to the President but the President ignored, that "the Federal government should establish residential facilities for the protection of witnesses desiring such assistance during the pendency of organized crime litigation."

6. We recommend in depth Congressional study of the National Crime Commission's recommendation that, under appropriate conditions to safeguard personal liberties, "the Federal government should create a central computerized office into which each Federal agency would feed all of its organized crime intelligence." While centralized collection of such data would be a valuable tool for law enforcement, we believe it should be preceded by the most careful analysis of what information would be filed, who would have access to it and under what conditions.

7. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission and the Republican Task Force on Crime have recommended, that "a permanent joint congressional committee on organized crime should be created."

8. We recommend, as the President has, passage of legislation to extend Federal immunity provisions to crimes relating to organized crime and to "make it a Federal crime to coerce or threaten a person who is willing to give vital information" before a grand jury convened to hear an organized crime investigation.

9. We recommend, as the National Crime Commission originally recommended but was subsequently influenced to change its mind, passage of Federal legislation which would prohibit the use of all wiretap and eavesdrop devices by the Federal government except in cases specifically requested by the Attorney General and approved by court order. This is essentially the position advocated by most law enforcement officials; it is the position of the House Republican Task Force on Crime; it is the position of Senator Robert Kennedy, a former Attorney General. The preservation of personal liberties requires stringent legislation to limit carefully the use of listening devices; but there also can be little doubt that the price paid by the urban poor of our society would justify the court-controlled use by law enforcement officials of electronic surveillance devices to combat the activities of organized crime. Some means of electronic surveillance is particularly important as a law enforcement tool in organized crimes cases because in this area the unwillingness of potential witnesses to talk is very great. The newspapers are replete with stories of violence visited upon those who have told or are about to tell the inside story of organized crime operations. As Assistant Attorney General Vinson says, the basic problem is "evidentiary." His description of the difficulty with witnesses is testimony to the need for the use of carefully controlled electronic surveillance:

"Where we do have a willing witness, we furnish protection to the best of our abilities. We relocate them in other parts of the country, or sometimes outside the country, and establish new identities for them. It is always an ad hoc proposition. Who is going to protect them? How do we get them a job someplace else, where they cannot have references, where you cannot make inquiries at home base? And within the last year we have started working toward a more permanent solution to this sort of problem.

"We are exploring now with the Department of Defense setting up facilities in about four parts of the country where we can put these people pending trial, during trial, and where we can put assistant U.S. attorneys whose lives or whose families have been threatened."

10. We recommend, as the Republican Task Force on Crime has recommended, passage of two anti-trust bills designed to curtail organized crime. The first would prohibit the investment of funds illegally acquired from specified criminal activities in a legitimate business concern. The second would prohibit the investment in such concerns of funds legally acquired but deliberately unreported for Federal income tax purposes.

11. We recommend that the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Crim-

inal Division of the Justice Department be raised in stature to Division level where its director's appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation, its budget would be specified in Federal publications, and its operations would be more open to Congressional scrutiny.

12. We recommend that a total of \$100,000,000 per year be authorized and appropriated for the Federal government to undertake a meaningful and sincere effort to combat organized criminal activity in the United States and its impact on the urban poor. This would represent a four-fold increase over current figures. It would assume a four-fold increase in the Federal personnel assigned to the job. It would assume that overall direction of all Federal efforts to combat organized crime would be centralized in one Division of the Justice Department. It would assume that for the first time the Federal government would launch a determined effort to crack the circles of organized crime wide open. It seems a small price to pay when one remembers that the total Administration request for the War on Poverty in Fiscal 1968 is over twenty times as great—and that the War on Poverty cannot succeed with continued indifference and apathy toward the unrelenting efforts of organized crime to squeeze every available nickel out of the urban poor.

SUMMARY

There are four principal reasons for a new and real Federal war on organized crime. It could help the urban poor. It could help lower all crime rates. It could help limit political corruption in the cities. It could provide an appropriate example of incorruptible leadership at the national level.

There are many causes for poverty in the United States—inadequate education, unequal opportunity, the cycle of urban despair. It would be wrong to suggest that a war on organized crime can be substituted for the War on Poverty. But it would be equally wrong to imply that the War on Poverty could be won if no battle is ever waged against organized crime.

The seduction of the poor by the manifold vices of organized crime is a basic cause for much of the petty crime and street violence of modern America. The drug pusher, the prostitute, the petty thief, the mugger, more often than not, may be victims themselves of their desperation for money to meet the demands organized crime makes of them. An attack on organized crime is inseparable from an attack on street crime.

Organized crime cannot flourish without the knowledge and at least tacit agreement of some public officials. An attack on organized crime is an attack on political corruption.

By its indifference to organized crime the Administration is writing an unfortunate record for those who look to public officials for standards of conduct beyond reproach. Can we really expect to end corruption at the local level when the national leadership seems unconcerned about it? Mr. Justice Brandeis once wrote: "Our government is the potent, omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill it teaches the whole people by its example."

BILL WOULD PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION AND PORTION OF ROOM AND BOARD FOR GI VISITS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic War Veterans' Douglas MacArthur Post of Landover Hills, Md., is saying "thank you" to our men who have fought in Vietnam. For more than a year, this Catholic War Veterans' post has been sponsoring social and sports events for marines wounded in Vietnam and recuperating at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Last month, I attended Operation Appreciation's 27th event, a party for 120 marines at the West Lanham Hills firehouse. There, I spoke to a badly mutilated young marine who had been hospitalized at Bethesda for 2 years and had received only one visit from his family in Boston. Others spoke of the bitterness and discouragement of those whose lonely hours were unrelieved by visits from parents or wives.

Many of our young GI's come from families who cannot afford the transportation, room, and board expenses of periodic hospital visits, especially if the hospital is a long distance from home. I plan to introduce a bill to finance trips of needy relatives to servicemen wounded in Vietnam and hospitalized in this country far from their homes. Vietnam war casualties hospitalized in the continental United States grew from 1,742 on July 31, 1966, to 3,297 at the end of last June. With 32,132 men wounded during the first half of this year, the number of those hospitalized in this country will also rise significantly.

My bill would provide transportation and some portion of room and board costs for six visits a year by the two closest relatives. The Red Cross would certify the financial need.

Private hospitality and recreation programs, such as the one sponsored by the CWV, are doing much to express the appreciation of a grateful public. There should be more of these programs. But there is no better morale-booster than a family visit.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two articles from the Prince Georges County News and the Washington Star to bring the CWV's Operation Appreciation to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Prince Georges County News, Aug. 3, 1967]

LANHAM CELEBRATION: THE MARINES LANDED, THIS TIME FOR FUN (By Phyllis O'Neill)

There was a party and what a party.

Fifty attractive women marines chatted across tables, hostesses scurried about checking on last minute details inside West Lanham Hills firehouse, and others waited outside for the guests.

The Carrolltones drum and bugle corps signaled harmoniously that the guests had arrived. Indeed they had, three bus loads of them, 120 wounded marines, veterans of Vietnam now patients at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Out of the buses they came, some on crutches, some carried on stretchers, some with bandages, but all smiling. These wounded men were going to a party and they were ready.

Invited dignitaries, among the 400 persons who attended, welcomed the men and eventually everyone made their way to the room at the top of the firehouse. The fire company's Dalmatian dog greeted the men as they entered. The hall—although sparsely decorated—lacked nothing for a great party.

The deafening strains of the rock 'n roll band, "The Unknown Kind" of Seabrook, prompted gyrations and a sense of rhythm in practically everyone. Almost instantly the sporadic dancing gave way to a packed floor. Those on crutches, in casts or those confined to chairs kept the beat.

There was no end to the food or drink. Nor was there an end to the smiles.

As the pulsating beat grew, the honored guest arrived—Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, until recently commander of all marines in Vietnam; "Big Lew" as some of the men called him, the man with the sparkling pale blue eyes and the infectious broad grin.

The party was the baby of the Douglas MacArthur Post Catholic War Veterans of America called "Operation Appreciation." The party was the 27th event arranged by the Catholic War Veterans Operation Appreciation program in the past 13½ months for Vietnam Veterans at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

James E. Merna of New Carrollton, chairman of the party, decided after awhile that it was time for speeches. The tempo had caught on and everyone was swinging. Quiet finally was obtained by yelling "attention" in the microphone.

Reps. Hervey G. Machen and Charles McC. Mathias and State Sen. Fred L. Wineland began the praise for the marines. Rep. Clarence D. Long, Baltimore County Democrat, and Mrs. Long arrived a little late, they had just come from visiting their son at Walter Reed Army Hospital, where he is a patient after being wounded in Vietnam.

Rep. Long began his emotion packed address by saying, "I'm proud that you men believe in fighting for America."

He continued, "If we get out of Vietnam, our troubles will be just beginning." The men approved with thunderous applause.

We would rather fight 12,000 miles away than on the shores of the continental United States, Long remarked. With this, the marines cheered, whistled, applauded and gave the "thumbs-up."

Then Gen. Walt, the marines' marine, stepped to the mike. There was no mistake that he was the man of the hour. It was obvious that every man there would have risked his life again for his country and for "Big Lew". Mrs. Walt stood by the general's side as he welcomed his men, for he had commanded most of the 120 men in battles near the demilitarized zone.

The general began: "It's great to see you again. We are continuing to win the war—we are making headway every day and night."

Gen. Walt offered special praise for "the unsung heroes on the battlefield," the medical corpsman. Walt said he had pinned more than 15,000 purple hearts on the men in Vietnam and he heard over and over, "If Doc hadn't been there, I wouldn't be here now." As the cheers went up, a medical corpsman stood nearby with a broad smile and a nod of approval. Gen. Walt said the job "has got to be done" and that he would like to go back. He said the men in Vietnam must have the patience and the backing of those back home.

As the general and his wife stepped from the stage, a chant began—"We want Walt—We want Walt."

"Big Lew" continued, with praise for the Seabees. "God Bless them," he said. "I pinned 72 purple hearts on them in a single day."

James F. McCarthy, post commander, presented the general with a certificate of recognition—"For the love of his country, leadership and dedication." He also was presented an honorary life membership in the post.

The music and festivities continued and a large cake waited for the cutting. The red, white and blue decorations fit the occasion. Large red rosettes bordered the cake and standing in each was a tiny American flag.

Prince Georges County Commissioner Francis J. Aluisi his voice with noticeable feeling, said, "I feel grateful that there are

still people who recognize the efforts of our men who fight and give their lives for the ways of our government. People like Jim Merna who have the guts to recognize the same deserve a lot of credit."

His reference was to James Merna, chairman of the Operation Appreciation party.

Posters on the walls clearly summed up the celebration. "Thanks Vietnam Vets for a job well done."

[From the Washington Star, July 27, 1967]

VIETNAM CASUALTIES: MARINES TASTE
HOSPITALITY

(By John Gregory)

They came to the party by bus last night—nearly 120 Marines—on stretchers, crutches, in wheelchairs.

The Bethesda Naval Hospital patients, all Vietnam casualties, were greeted at the West Lanham Hills, Md., firehouse by a drum and bugle band, area members of Congress and—women.

At first, it was just another party. Outside, there were the handshakes and brief how-do-you-do encounters with the girls, the 50 women Marines recruited as hostesses for the four-hour affair, sponsored by the Land-over Hills chapter of the Catholic War Veterans.

The Marines were helped upstairs—one's leg cast breaking a window as he was lifted around a corner.

GENERAL WALT ON SCENE

At the top of the stairs were the drinks, a rock 'n roll band and Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, the man just back from Vietnam who had commanded most of the 120 men in battles near the demilitarized zone.

The mingling began, while patients described their maneuvers in combat to the ladies over the sound of the band.

Walt signed autographs on napkins or any other paper scraps that the men could find. Marines on crutches danced while those on stretchers frugged with their hands.

The music stopped and the speeches began. Applause and thumbs-up approval from the audience followed praise for the Marines by Maryland Reps. Hervey G. Machen, Democrat, Charles Mathias, a Republican, and Clarence D. Long, a Baltimore Democrat.

"I'm proud that you men believe in fighting for America," said Long, whose son is a patient at Walter Reed Army Medical Center for wounds suffered as an Army paratrooper in Vietnam.

There were cheers and whistles for other speakers, and thumbs-up for the brewery which supplied the evening's refreshments.

But the loudest applause went to Walt, who left the Vietnam command in June to become director of personnel at Marine Corps Headquarters.

"We're making headway in Vietnam every day," he said. "As long as we have the patience and backing here at home, there is no reason why we can't win."

He left the stage to the chant, "We want Walt," and one Marine broke into tears.

The music and festivities continued.

A 20-year-old corporal from Falls Church, restricted from the dance floor by the cast on his leg, said: "I'm going over there (Vietnam) again the first chance I get. I'm not serving much purpose by being in a hospital."

"Some of the men in the hospital are a little bitter and discouraged," said the corporal, John R. Lucas of 2821 Mankin Walk. "These are the ones who have lost their legs or don't have many visitors at Bethesda."

Gen. Walt said he could not detect any discouragement last night. "The spirit of these patients is tremendous, just as it is over there in Vietnam."

Over here, in the fire station, 120 Marines shook to the beat of the music as if they were in full agreement.

HYDROELECTRIC LICENSES

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend part I of the Federal Power Act to provide congressional guidance to the Federal Power Commission in the processing of expiring hydroelectric licenses and to clarify the manner in which the licensing authority of the Commission and the right of the United States to take over a project upon the expiration of any license shall be exercised.

I enclose at this point, a copy of letter of transmittal to the Speaker from Chairman Lee C. White, of the Federal Power Commission, of the draft of the bill; which letter outlines the significance of the matter being covered and the importance of developing proper procedures in the electric utility field for adequately carrying out the will of the Congress as to these hydroelectric licenses.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We transmit herewith twenty copies of a draft bill to amend Part I of the Federal Power Act. The proposed amendments would provide Congressional guidance to the Commission in the processing of expiring hydroelectric licenses.

Prior to 1920, hydropower licenses were issued by individual Acts of Congress. Then Congress delegated to the Federal Power Commission the responsibility to license individual projects, other than those owned by the Federal Government, or to recommend Federal development to the Congress. The Congress limited the maximum term of any license issued by the Federal Power Commission to fifty years and thereby preserved for the Nation, acting through subsequent Congresses, a full opportunity to reevaluate the best use of each project upon expiration of the license. We now recommend that Congress fix appropriate procedures for the reevaluation of each project in light of contemporary and prospective public needs.

Under our present procedures, the Commission will refer to the Congress each project which is subject to the Federal take-over provisions of section 14 of the Federal Power Act. The draft bill would assign to the Federal Power Commission the primary responsibility for sorting out the licensed projects. It would relieve the Congress of the necessity of reviewing each individual project where Federal ownership was not recommended (although Congress could, of course, act on its own motion in any case) and would direct the Commission to undertake relicensing, for a term not to exceed fifty years, in all cases in which the Commission did not recommend recapture. We believe such legislation would strengthen the ability of the Commission and the Congress to best exercise the responsibilities imposed by sections 14 and 15 of the Act.

THE PRESENT PROCEDURE

Sections 14 and 15 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 807, 808) provide for "recap-

ture" by the United States of licensed hydroelectric projects or, in the alternative, for relicensing to the original licensee or to a new licensee. Projects owned by a state or a municipality¹ are exempt from recapture but not from relicensing. (Act of August 15, 1953, 67 Stat. 587, 16 U.S.C. 828b.) The decision to recapture must be made by Congress. If Congress recaptures a project, the licensee must be paid the "net investment of the licensee in the project or projects taken" within the meaning of the Federal Power Act (but in any event not more than the "fair value of the property taken") plus reasonable severance damages, if any, to the remaining electric facilities of the licensee. If Congress does not act before the expiration of the initial license, the Commission may issue a new license, but the Act does not expressly state the appropriate steps to be taken if the Congress has not expressed its intentions as to a given project. If the Congress has expressed its decision and the Commission does not issue a new license, the Act directs the Commission to issue a year-to-year license to the original licensee until the project is recaptured or relicensed. The Commission strongly believes that it should not relicense projects on a long-term basis until the Congress has made known its decision either through enactments concerning specific projects or through general legislation such as we propose today.

Under the present procedure, the recapture and relicensing determinations involve a three-fold process:

1. *Notice, Review and Recommendations to Congress.* At the outset, the Commission informs the Congress and the public of all projects whose licenses will expire during the succeeding five years through notice given in the Commission's Annual Reports² to the Congress and in the Federal Register. This notice provides the following information: License expiration date; licensee's name; project number; type of principal project works licensed; location; and installed capacity. Starting five years before the license expiration date, the Commission undertakes a review of each project. As part of this review, the Commission solicits both the views of the licensee concerning its plans for future development and use of the project and the views on recapture and relicensing of Federal and State agencies which might have an interest in the recapture of the project. On the basis of information received and Commission staff studies, the Commission formulates its recommendations to the Congress and also transmits the views submitted to it by the licensee and by the interested Federal agencies. As the Commission noted in its letter of February 23, 1967 recommending against recapture of Project No. 2221 (the Ozark Beach Project of The Empire District Electric Company), this procedure does not give the Commission "the benefit of a relicensing proceeding, involving formal proposals and counter-proposals by the licensee, our staff, intervenors or others who might apply for a new license. New criteria or information uncovered in the course of such a proceeding might warrant further consideration of the recommendation reached" in the initial report. The Commission's procedure adopted in 1964 undertook to report to the Congress two years prior to the license expiration date. The Commission has fallen slightly behind in its time table in the cases of Project No. 2221

¹ As used in the Federal Power Act "municipality" means a city, county, irrigation district, drainage district, or other political subdivision or agency of a State competent under the laws thereof to carry on the business of developing, transmitting, utilizing, or distributing power. (16 U.S.C. 796 (7)).

² E.g., see FPC 46th Annual Report, 1966, at pp. 68-71. Licenses for 58 projects subject to recapture will expire during the calendar years 1967 through 1972.

and Project No. 619 (the Bucks Creek Project of Pacific Gas and Electric Company).

2. *Recapture Determination.* After the Congress receives the Commission's recommendations (or at an earlier time if the Congress so decides), the Legislative Branch must decide whether to adopt legislation to recapture a given project. Although there is no presently prescribed procedure, we assume each such matter will be the subject of legislation either on an individual or omnibus basis.

3. *Relicensing.* In those cases where Congress foregoes its right to recapture a project, relicensing procedures must be undertaken by the Commission. Relicensing would involve public notice to all interested parties, an opportunity for the original licensee and others to seek a license, an opportunity for interested state and Federal agencies to review project performance and capabilities and to recommend changes, an opportunity for such agencies and for members of the public to intervene in formal relicensing proceedings, and opportunities for formal hearings, oral argument, and judicial review of the Commission's relicensing order. Upon relicensing the Commission would not only select which applicant was to receive the license; it would also determine the conditions upon which a new license should be issued and the term of years (not to exceed 50) for which the new license should stand. The existing provisions of the Federal Power Act assign the Commission the same powers to condition new licenses issued under section 15 as it has to condition original licenses issued under section 4.

Under section 7(a) of the Federal Power Act the Commission is instructed to give preference to applications by states and municipalities in issuing licenses to new licensees under section 15. Our General Counsel has advised us that this preference applies only after it has been determined that the original licensee should not receive a new license. In those instances where the original licensee and another applicant seek a new license for the same project, the Commission believes that the new license is to be issued to whichever applicant can best meet the standards of the Act. In those rare cases where the two applicants are equally matched the Commission believes that the new license should be issued to the original licensee so long as he can meet the standards of the Act at least as well as the other applicant.

Section 15 expressly provides that in issuing a new license either to the original licensee or a new licensee the Commission may impose "such terms and conditions as may be authorized or required" under the laws and regulations in existence at the time it issues the new license. If the new license is issued to a new licensee it must be conditioned upon payment to the original licensee of the same recapture price as the United States would have had to pay had Congress decided to recapture.

THE PROBLEM

The fundamental choices upon license termination fall into these categories:

(1) Where the United States has an interest which it will want to express either by recapture or by conditions in the relicense. This interest may arise out of the federal power marketing program, but more probably out of other water use programs, such as irrigation, fish, recreation, pollution control or domestic and industrial use.

(2) Where the United States is not interested and the licensee desires a relicense, but a state or local agency or private party has an interest which it will want to express either by contesting for the new license or by conditions in the relicense. The interest in question may be either essentially in power use or in non-power use.

(3) Where the licensee wants to abandon

a project, but the public interest requires that it be maintained in whole or in part for non-power purposes.

(4) Where the United States, the licensee or any other potential licensee is not interested in the continued existence of the project.

The present three-fold procedure seems inadequate to secure the maximum advantages from the opportunities preserved by the Congress in 1920 for the present and future generations of Americans. This procedure does not facilitate systematic consideration of all the alternatives available and tends to diffuse the attentions of interested parties whereas a more concentrated procedure might be more effective in bringing to bear all the conflicting interests at a single point in time.

THE PROPOSAL

We propose that the Congress enact legislation which would:

a. Accept the standard of section 10(a) of the Federal Power Act favoring that project which "will be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway or waterways for the use or benefit of interstate or foreign commerce, for the improvement and utilization of water power development, and for other beneficial public uses, including recreational purposes". This statutory standard is understood to call for optimum development and accommodation, where a conflict arises, in terms of resource values including: water quality control; flood control; recreation and aesthetic considerations; fish and wildlife conservation and enhancement; protection of improvements along the reservoir shore line; drinking water and other domestic, municipal and industrial uses; irrigation requirements; optimum power development and coordination with other systems in light of regional power needs; hydraulic coordination with other projects on the stream; and navigation.

b. Direct the FPC, after suitable hearings and upon receiving advice as appropriate from Federal, State and interstate agencies, and from other interested parties, to make the initial determination in all recapture and relicensing cases. The proposal would limit the time within which Federal agencies must provide their advice and recommendations to the FPC, to avoid excessive delays.

c. Direct the FPC to forward to Congress, with its recommendations, all cases in which it has recommended Federal recapture. Where the FPC decides to relicense and other Federal agencies recommend recapture, the proposal would direct the FPC to stay the effect of its relicensing decision for a specified maximum time to allow those agencies to present their case to the Congress, and would further direct the FPC to notify Congress of all stays granted. We have included as a maximum stay period one full Congress immediately following the Congress during which the Commission issues a relicensing order. Alternative time periods, which the Congress may wish to consider, are a two-year period beginning on the last day of the calendar year in which the Commission issues the relicensing order, or a two-year period running from the date of such order. The latter period conforms to a similar two-year period now found in the further proviso of section 4(e) of the Act which requires the Commission to report to Congress whenever it finds that any Government dam may be advantageously used by the United States for public purposes in addition to navigation.

d. Authorize the FPC where it determines that an exclusively non-power use would best meet the standards of the Act to relicense a project which was initially subject to FPC jurisdiction to a non-power user. The non-power licensee would be required to pay the original licensee the same recapture price as the United States would have had to pay had it taken over the project. FPC would exercise regulatory supervision over the non-

power licensee on a temporary basis, until a state, municipality, interstate or Federal agency assumed this regulatory jurisdiction.

e. Provide explicitly that the amortization reserves called for by section 10(d) of the Act would continue to accumulate without interruption, suspension or revaluation.

f. Authorize FPC, notwithstanding the provision of section 6 of the Act regarding alteration of licenses, to include as a condition to issuance of a new license under section 15, a broad authority to modify the license, consistent with the other provisions of the Act, as may reasonably be required, subject to the safeguards of adequate notice, opportunity for public hearing and judicial review. This added authority would extend the Commission's rulemaking powers to modify license conditions at any time during the license term, now limited under section 10(c) to matters relating to the protection of life, health and property, to matters relating to all license conditions. It is patterned after the broad conditioning authority of section 10(g) which now authorizes the Commission to include at the beginning of any license term "such other conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act as the Commission may require."

g. Accept the present limitation of section 6 of the Act that the maximum license term is to be 50 years, with Commission discretion to prescribe lesser license terms. The Commission believes that a substantially shorter term may be appropriate where no extensive redevelopment outlay is needed. Moreover, it may prove desirable to relicense a series of related projects for varying terms so that the new licenses will expire simultaneously.

ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED

We have considered as an alternative, assignment to other Federal agencies of the primary responsibility to recommend recapture to the Congress or to instruct the FPC to relicense subject to broad guidelines. The assignment might be made either to one executive department or to a group of agencies. We believe, however, that the issues upon license expiration involve statutory policy which would best be implemented by a specialized agency with a long tradition of semi-judicial proceedings under authority delegated by the Congress.

We have considered the possibility of spelling out detailed criteria governing the decisions and recommendations of the Commission but we have concluded that the more general standard now set out in section 10(a) comprehends all of the factors which we understand to be relevant and is more suitable to the changing need of resource conservation.

Finally we have considered establishing an additional preference for the original licensee to apply in cases where a rival applicant could slightly better achieve the objectives of the Act. We believe that all other things being equal, continuity in ownership and management is a value in itself which should be recognized and is to be recognized under the present statute. However, when another applicant demonstrates a superior ability to meet the Congressional objectives, in our view no preference should assure the position of the original licensee.

CONCLUSION

We believe that our proposal would serve the public interest and trust that consideration of the proposed measure will assist the Congress in its study of the appropriate disposition of projects licensed under the Federal Power Act after the end of the initial license term.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of the bill would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Respectfully,

LEE C. WHITE,
Chairman.

NEED FOR FURTHER IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 89th Congress, I strongly supported H.R. 2580—the 1965 amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act—which was eventually enacted as Public Law 89-236. One of the purposes of this legislation was to reunite thousands of our citizens with members of their families from whom they had been needlessly separated.

While to a certain degree some American citizens and resident aliens have been reunited with their families, my files are replete with situations where brothers and sisters have been separated for many years—in some cases, for 10 years or more. Almost all of them involve persons currently registered under the fifth-preference position of the quota for Italy.

At present, visas can only be issued to persons under the Italian fifth-preference position who have "priority dates" of March 1, 1955 or earlier. Over the past 6 months, the fifth-preference position has moved forward 2 months—from January 1, 1955 to March 1, 1955—and I have been informed that approximately 100,000 fifth-preference Italians are awaiting visa issuance. Based upon information made available to me by the Department of State, Italy is the only country experiencing such a tremendous backlog.

If the present system is maintained, Mr. Speaker, these people will not be able to join their families in this country for many, many years. Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 203(a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This bill provides that any fifth-preference aliens—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens and their spouses and children—whose visa petitions were filed prior to July 1, 1966, are deemed to be immediate relatives under the provisions of section 201(b) of the act.

Not only will this legislation alleviate the desperate situation in which fifth-preference Italians now find themselves, by placing them on an equal basis with other fifth-preference aliens, but will also remove the cruel and unnecessary hardship for many of our own citizens with relatives abroad and reinforce our policy of reuniting families.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], for taking the initiative in proposing this legislation and I urge that the Committee on the Judiciary give this measure its fullest and most careful consideration.

POVERTY

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the effectiveness and the worth of the war on poverty have been questioned. There are some who deplore the existence of poverty but wish to break up the Office of Economic Opportunity and shift certain antipoverty programs to other Government agencies. There are some who charge that the war on poverty has been a total failure, that it has not cured poverty, and that it has even been a factor in causing this summer's tragic riots in some of our cities. I rise today to discuss my belief that the war on poverty has been an exciting and effective program, and to affirm my support for the present administration bill extending the authorization and operations of the antipoverty program.

Every society has been confronted with the problem of poverty. Each society has tried to deal with it in different ways. The Romans gave bread and circuses to the poor of Rome. England tried the dole and debtors' prison. But in 1964 this Nation acknowledged that the existence of widespread poverty in our rich society was politically, economically, and morally wrong, and determined to eradicate poverty itself.

The Congress therefore declared this Nation's policy to be "To eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty." To implement this ambitious policy, the Congress created the Office of Economic Opportunity, and charged it with the task of "opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity."

In declaring war on poverty, the Congress wisely rejected the counsel of those who urged that poverty could be cured by a single, simple program. Some argued that the key to eliminating poverty was to create jobs; others said that assuring every child a good education would eventually solve the problem. But it was recognized that there was not a simple panacea, that no single solution would bring the 30 million American poor into the rich society which was all around them. Instead, the Congress acknowledged what most Americans knew to be true: To be poor meant much more than just that you had no money. It also meant that you and your children probably got a second-rate education, that you were not trained for the skilled jobs which our technological economy had created, that your health care was inadequate, and that you were often denied simple justice because you did not have access to a lawyer. In other words, to be poor was to be denied most of the basic opportunities which other Americans took for granted. The OEO was therefore commissioned to proceed against poverty on many fronts simultaneously, and to involve itself with education, vocational training, health, justice, community development, and employment.

In addition to choosing to attack poverty as the many-faceted problem it is,

the Congress in the Economic Opportunity Act made another basic policy decision. Instead of creating these different antipoverty programs and assigning them to existing Government agencies, the Congress established an independent agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and assigned to it the primary responsibility for initiating and administering these various antipoverty programs.

In retrospect, this decision has been justified. Only an independent agency could have been as innovative and single-minded in dealing with an old problem in so many new ways. Only an independent agency could have spoken for the poor, the least influential of our national minorities, with a strong and single voice. The poor need this independent voice. But equally important, the Nation needs this independent voice to keep in front of it the terrible needs of the poor, and to remind its conscience that there is a large minority which has been excluded from the general prosperity. For these reasons, I urgently hope the Congress will reject any move to break up the OEO and to transfer its functions to other Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, in evaluating the war on poverty, let us not forget that less than 3 years ago there was no war on poverty, and no Office of Economic Opportunity. There was no Project Headstart, no Job Corps centers, no community action programs. Since the Economic Opportunity Act became law, a staff was assembled at OEO; programs were drawn up; local agencies were set up and staffed; programs were initiated. It is particularly important to note that the entire antipoverty administrative machinery was created out of whole cloth.

In most States and cities, there were no existing institutions which could be used to administer these programs. On the national level, there was no experience in administering a broadly ranging antipoverty program which could be used to guide the OEO. If you will, the antipoverty program was like a new industry which came into being, hired employees, drew up plans, tooled up its plant, initiated production of a complex product, and began marketing this product, all in less than 3 years, and all with little useful precedent to use as a model.

Of course, as with any new and innovative program, there have been birth-pangs. I am sure that those who oppose the antipoverty program will offer the few administrative difficulties which the OEO encountered in initiating its new programs as reasons to curtail or abolish the program. But I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that every thoughtful Member will marvel, as I do, at the impressive job the OEO has done in implementing the commission of the Congress.

Because the war on poverty has proceeded on so many fronts simultaneously, it is impossible in a brief discussion to examine all of its programs in detail. But I believe the following will give us some of the flavor of the tremendous beginning which has been made.

The Job Corps was one of the most imaginative programs begun by the OEO. This program was designed to take the hard core poor youth, most of them

dropouts, and provide them with the education they missed and train them for jobs which are needed. The 69,312 young people who have so far been enrolled in Job Corps centers for varying lengths of time have been from the most poverty-stricken segment of our society. The profile of a typical Job Corps enrollee is an American tragedy. This enrollee has been asked to leave school or has dropped out on his own. He finished 8th grade but reads on a 4th-grade level. He comes from a broken home in an urban slum. Chances are good that his family is on relief. The Job Corps has taken this young American, and given him supplemental education and job training. More importantly, in many cases it has given him hope that his future need not be one of despair and hopelessness for a better life.

The Job Corps really is a human reclamation project, an attempt to help hard core young poor get the education and training they missed. Has this human reclamation been successful? The simple answer is "Yes." As of March 31, 1967, 36,900 of the 69,312 who have been enrolled have jobs; 6,800 are in school; 5,000 are in military service. This adds up to a 70-percent success rate with a group of the most disadvantaged young people in our country.

Another program which I and many other lawyers have followed with great interest is the legal services program. Our Nation was built on the principle that a government of law must be maintained to protect the rights of all. The poor have listened for years to talk about respect for the law, but in many cases the law has appeared to them to be their enemy rather than the protector of their rights. The poor had bruising experiences with the law, with unconscionable consumer contracts, with unexplained evictions, with unjustified wage garnishments. In many cases, the poor did not have access to a lawyer, and therefore did not know their legal rights.

This deprivation mocked our society's contention that justice wears a blindfold. But the legal services program is correcting this situation; 1,200 neighborhood law offices have been created and staffed by full-time and volunteer attorneys, who are living proof to the poor that the law recognizes and protects the rights of all Americans, rich as well as poor.

Mr. Speaker, it would take hours to discuss the other programs of the war on poverty in detail. But the figures are available: 27,000 young people have been helped to fulfill their potential through the Upward Bound program; over 900,000 young people have participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, helping themselves and their communities; over 500,000 very young people have received a headstart; 6,500 VISTA volunteers have worked in our cities and rural areas; 1,050 community action agencies have helped the poor. No one will seriously suggest that the job is over. But an ambitious and a necessary beginning has been made.

Since the House Committee on Education and Labor began hearings on the

antipoverty bill, tragic riots have occurred in some of our cities. Some have charged that these riots prove the ineffectiveness of the antipoverty program. No allegation could be more erroneous. One of the chief aims of the antipoverty program is to provide traditional lawful alternatives to violence. I do not doubt that many of the poor may have in past years questioned the effectiveness of democratic processes in helping them better their lives. Life has been imposed on them from above. But the antipoverty program offers hope to the poor. It affords training so that they can get good jobs; it helps correct educational deficiencies of their children; it provides a mechanism for equalizing opportunity and attacking all of the problems associated with poverty.

Some have charged that employees of the poverty program in some cities actually participated in the rioting.

I understand that in the 27 cities where serious disorders have occurred, only six antipoverty employees have been arrested in connection with the rioting. As of this date, none has been convicted. And in many of these cities, the antipoverty workers have courageously worked to help "cool" explosive situations. Neighborhood youth corpsmen have put on armbands and walked the streets quieting tense situations; legal services offices have stayed open around the clock to protect the rights of those arrested and to serve as liaison offices between the community and the city authorities; VISTA volunteers have moved in after the riots to help rebuild the shattered community. It is not an accident that the mayors of Newark and Detroit have both recently affirmed their support for the war on poverty.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have all heard ugly hints that the antipoverty program should not be extended because to extend it will appear to "reward" rioters. This argument is hardly worth of reply. This country sends wheat to India, not because we fear riots in New Delhi, but because it is morally right to share our bounty with those less fortunate.

By the same token, it is morally offensive in this year 1967 that so many Americans do not share in our Nation's incredible wealth. Helping the poor to help themselves through the antipoverty program is not a reward for rioting, but a moral imperative.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all the Members to consider carefully the antipoverty bill that will soon be on our agenda. The last Congress declared that this Nation must eliminate poverty. The program selected to effect this policy was not a dole, not a giveaway program, but rather an intensive effort to create opportunity where none existed before. It was a program designed to enable the poor through their own personal and community efforts to join the majority of Americans in building a great society, where all could live in decency and dignity. Today we can look with pride on the beginnings of this program, and can truthfully say that an effective way has been found to help the poor of America to help themselves. I ask the Members to continue the war on poverty.

THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it will be a pleasure to lend my individual support and endorsement to the Public Broadcasting Act when it reaches the floor of the House in a few short legislative days.

I say this for several reasons.

First, the legislation embodies the full cooperation and past experience with a national network of noncommercial educational television stations throughout this country. It extends the operation of the Educational Television Facilities Act. This proposal, Public Law 87-447, has allowed many educational television stations to purchase equipment and facilities necessary to fulfill the promise and potential of educational television.

Now we add a new vista to the field of ETV.

The legislation we will soon consider includes radio as an eligible grantee for these facilities grants. Since noncommercial broadcasting should be distinguished from classroom or instructional television, the phrase "public broadcasting" has been used by the Carnegie Commission to denote this important field.

The phrase is a fortunate one for this legislation is clearly in the public interest.

One portion of the legislation will authorize the creation of a federally chartered nonprofit corporation for public broadcasting to help develop a workable system of interconnection between the educational television stations of this country.

This will mean much to local educational television stations plagued with a shortage of good programs because of chronic underfinancing. Stations on the west coast and in other parts of the Nation will be able to carry programs broadcast simultaneously in another part of the country. Or these programs could be broadcast later. Such a system, it is clear, will maintain the individual integrity and independence of local stations. They will be free to accept or reject programs either at the time they are broadcast or later.

The legislative proposal which will soon come before us carries with it an excellent opportunity for all of us to recognize the staggering importance of radio and television broadcasting in this country.

This body was far sighted in vision when it enacted Public Law 87-447, recognizing the need for facilities for educational television stations.

We have a strong foundation upon which the Public Broadcasting Act is based and we now will have a chance to prod and stimulate the natural resource of public broadcasting.

I hope that the House will lend its full support to this imaginative and highly

important proposal when it comes before us for consideration soon.

UNIVERSITY CONTRACTS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today many of our U.S. colleges and universities—124, to be exact—are working in foreign aid under contract with the Agency for International Development. Their campuses extend, literally, throughout the developing world—into southern and eastern Asia, into numerous areas of Latin America and Africa.

Faculty members and specialists from these institutions apply their particular strengths, experience, and expertise to specific problems or needs in the developing countries. AID now seeks to draw on "outside," non-Federal Government resources wherever possible to carry out a particular development task, and the work of these colleges and universities is one result.

The dimensions of this program are very broad—for the assisted country, of course, but also for AID in the most efficient use of its resources, and for the U.S. educational institution and its faculty in broadening a two-way interchange of knowledge and attitudes with the people assisted.

The fields of endeavor are varied. Our universities do not just maintain insulated relationship with the academic communities of assisted countries, although much of the universities' overseas work involves developing schools and training of teachers. At least equally important are labors with government ministries, with private organizations. They cover a range of subjects as broad as the needs of these developing societies.

The current priority of the AID program—the war on hunger—is, of course, much in evidence. In agriculture, the colleges' work ranges from research into meeting the unique problems of the developing countries, to imparting the successful methods of our own agricultural experience. The concept of the American "county agent" bringing extension services directly to the people has long been utilized in these overseas development efforts.

The current total of AID contracts with U.S. colleges and universities is \$228 million, portions of which are spent over periods of several years. In my own State of Michigan, Michigan State University has contracts totaling over \$11,-680,809 and the University of Michigan is involved in programs totaling over \$1,-694,823.

For this money, we are getting a good return. Teams from American schools are operating with one or more host institutions in 40 different selected countries. Other contracts for technical services, training, and research support de-

velopment activities in entire regions or the program as a whole.

This is a solid program, the type of aid program we strive for. Its activities are tailored to the particular needs of the countries assisted. It involves direct communication of American ideas to the people of the developing countries. It utilizes the talents and practical experience of American college and university experts. I urge the support of my colleagues for this program which so richly deserves our encouragement.

THE GIRLS FROM VISTA

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, it was inevitable that the qualities of civic-mindedness encouraged by the Girl Scouts of America would find expression in the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—program. This story has now been told in the August issue of American Girl, the official publication of the Girl Scouts of America.

The magazine article, by Carol Botwin, is entitled "The Girls From VISTA." It shows how VISTA's success lies in the profound effect the program had had not only on the poor, but on the volunteers themselves. And it attests to the suitability of Girl Scout preparation to VISTA—one of the most modern and selfless opportunities for good citizenship.

Miss Botwin's article deals specifically with former Girl Scouts who have become VISTA volunteers. She describes the experiences of five girls for whom "poverty is no longer a mass of statistics."

For example, Karen Metz, of Chittenango, N.Y., is using her Spanish language ability to help adults in the Southwest. Near Phoenix, Ariz., she helps people do simple math for the first time in their lives.

Patricia Shultz, who went after college graduation to Alaska to climb Mount McKinley, found irresistible the opportunity to work in a VISTA project in a small Eskimo fishing village on the Yukon River.

And 22-year-old Roschel Holland has opened a co-op in East Harlem where the residents of the area can buy food at prices they can afford.

Mr. Speaker, I include Carol Botwin's wonderful story of VISTA girls at work at this point in the RECORD:

THE GIRLS FROM VISTA

(By Carol Botwin)

It started with thirteen volunteers in 1965. Now V.I.S.T.A. (Volunteers in Service to America) can boast of close to four thousand dedicated people serving in slums and wildernesses, big cities and small towns all over the United States—wherever help is needed. Seventy-one percent of these are boys and girls under twenty-five. They teach the young; they help mental patients

readjust; they try to find jobs for the unemployed. As any VISTA volunteer will proudly tell you, "We help people help themselves."

What are the requirements? You have to be at least eighteen and be ready to work for a year plus a six-week training period. When their stint is up, volunteers collect fifty dollars for each month of service. By then, they have learned to live on tiny allowances in slums. They have had daily contact with heartbreaking problems. As one girl says, "Poverty is no longer a mass of statistics."

Because VISTA needs people who have a desire to serve, a willingness to learn, and the ability to work well with others, many former Girl Scouts find they are very well prepared to be volunteers. Young women like Susan Deeter, who works with migrants in Girl Scout troops in Eagle Pass, Texas, find they already know how to initiate projects and take responsibility. The fact that the five girls who are pictured here are all former Girl Scouts is no accident—there are many of them in VISTA.

Penny Arndt and her VISTA roommate decided to give a party. Their guests: students from Louisiana State University in South Baton Rouge and children from a nearby "ghetto" elementary school. It launched the highly successful "Project Buddy." Now, Penny says their biggest problem is recruiting youngsters fast enough to keep pace with campus interest which has spread across town to the big Negro university. Coeds, who signed up, entertained their new young friends, took them on outings, went to movies, bought sodas—anything to fill in the gaps that no father and a working mother can create in a child's life. Penny hopes that soon students from both universities will be working together on this project.

Karen Metz of Chittenango, New York, had almost decided to join the Peace Corps when she realized there are many poverty areas in this country where she could use the Spanish she'd learned in school. Now she's helping adults to read and do simple math for the first time in their lives, in Elroy, outside of Phoenix, Arizona. "The elderly people in the group are terrific. They never miss a class," she says. Karen also is teaching children a second language—English. She enjoys taking them on field trips to zoos and museums trying to broaden their horizons.

After college graduation, Patricia Schultz went to Alaska to climb Mt. McKinley, heard about the local V.I.S.T.A. project, and ended up in a small Eskimo fishing village on the Yukon River. She and three other volunteers traveled by bush plane to the isolated community. Patricia persuaded local authorities to test the local water supply for purity and worked with residents to get an electric generator and fish freezer for the town. Traveling around on snowshoes, she met with housewives and encouraged them to use their local crafts as a new source of income. Villagers taught Pat the art of tanning and sewing fur.

There were no streetlights in Santa Rita, Colorado, a year ago. The main street wasn't paved. With the encouragement and help of V.I.S.T.A. volunteers like Karna Clark, nineteen, the men, women, teens, and children in the community joined hands to make their town a better, brighter place to live in. "There were a few pessimists who thought that the streetlights we installed wouldn't last a week with all the BB guns around, but the people here were not about to tear down something they all worked hard to get," says Karna.

On the first and fifteenth of every month, a tiny store in East Harlem opens its doors, and customers—all members of the 117th Street Parent Association—troop in with money from newly cashed pay and welfare checks. This co-op, where they can buy food at little more than wholesale price, is the

brainchild of twenty-two-year-old Roschel Holland. When it is open, Roschel gets up at six to go to the market with the Association's President. They buy stock based on previous orders. "We don't have any refrigeration so we try to sell everything the same day." Brightening the walls are children's drawings—the results of the arts and crafts sessions that Roschel conducts there with neighborhood tots twice a week.

DEATH OF HENRY J. KAISER

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, last week death claimed one of Hawaii's most renowned adopted sons, the world-famous industrialist, Henry J. Kaiser. Although this giant among men did not come to our shores until 1954, he left an indelible mark on the face of our State with his restless energies and his boundless capacity for translating his dreams into immediate concrete realities. Starting with the construction of the magnificent Hawaiian Village Hotel, he turned his resources to the development of the \$350 million Hawaii-Kai housing and resort development, and capped his contribution to our State with the \$4 million Kaiser Foundation Hospital. A man whose achievements can be measured with such enduring and impressive monuments needs little else to mark his passing, but I would like to pay tribute to the exemplary and inspirational life of Henry J. Kaiser by setting forth his biography, the most eloquent testimonial to what he stood for that I can imagine. May others find encouragement and guidance in the inestimable success story that is the life of the man we mourn today, Henry J. Kaiser.

HENRY J. KAISER—1967 BIOGRAPHY

Henry J. (John) Kaiser was an industrialist with world-wide interests, a builder, and a founder of hospitals and a medical care program.

As an industrialist Henry Kaiser was chairman of the board of Kaiser Industries Corporation and head of the affiliated Kaiser Companies that have assets exceeding \$2.7-billion in 33 states and more than 40 countries overseas.

As a builder he constructed roads, dams, tunnels, ships and a dozen industries in a half-century.

As the founder of a medical care program in the western United States, he worked with partnerships of physicians, built hospitals and clinics, established a nursing school and contributed to medical education.

Henry J. Kaiser was born on May 9, 1882 in a white frame farmhouse at Sprout Brook, New York, one of four children of Francis J. Kaiser, a shoemaker, and Mary Yops Kaiser, a practical nurse, both immigrants from Germany.

YOUNG KAISER BUILDS PHOTOGRAPHY BUSINESS

He left school at 13 to take a job at \$1.50 a week as a cash boy in a drygoods store at Utica in upstate New York, and boosted his income by taking photographs after working hours. Despite lack of formal education, he always was learning. His restless, driving

spirit was constantly seeking new ways of doing things. Later, the same drive challenged his managers, engineers, and other employees in daring projects and new ventures.

Young Henry Kaiser traveled as a photographic salesman in upper New York. At Lake Placid, New York, he offered a Mr. Brownell, owner of a photographic shop, to work for nothing on condition that if he doubled the business in a year, he would receive a half interest. He trebled the business, became a junior partner at 22, bought out the business a year later and added new stores at Daytona Beach and Miami, Florida, and Nassau. Outside his first store he placed a prophetic sign: "Meet the Man With a Smile".

BUILDING CAREER STARTS IN WEST

Deciding to stake his future with the West, he moved to Spokane, Washington, in 1906 and was hired by a hardware company, later becoming sales manager. He went into construction in 1912 as a salesman and manager of road paving contracts in Washington and British Columbia.

It was in 1914 that he established his first company—Henry J. Kaiser Company, Ltd.—at Vancouver, B. C., and the first job was to pave a road two miles long in the Canadian city. He was then 32.

During the next seven years, he continued road paving work in Washington, Idaho and British Columbia and created a new way of doing the job by replacing mules with machinery. Doing jobs in better and faster new ways became a Kaiser trademark, and he saved his men many back-breaking hours by putting pneumatic tires on wheelbarrows and diesel engines in bulldozers.

He won his first job in California by jumping off a moving train. He wanted to bid on the job of building a 30-mile road between Red Bluff and Redding in northern California, but the train didn't stop at Redding. When it slowed down to drop off the mail, Henry Kaiser jumped off. He won the contract and in 1921 established his headquarters in Oakland, where it continues today in the 28-story Kaiser Center.

It was on this first California job that Henry Kaiser demonstrated another of his trademarks—speed. At that time the average progress for paving a road was two miles a month. Henry Kaiser tied five scrapers to a tractor, instead of one to a team of horses, and completed one mile every week.

He moved into the sand and gravel business in 1923 while he was paving a road between Livermore and Pleasanton in California. The aggregate plant developed into Kaiser Sand & Gravel, now one of the largest producers of aggregates in northern California. It was also Henry Kaiser's start in the business of mining and processing raw materials, a basic strength of the Kaiser companies today.

A CUBAN HIGHWAY LED TO WESTERN DAMS

The year 1927 was a turning point in Henry Kaiser's career when he went to Cuba to build a 200-mile, 500-bridge highway. It was a huge project for the young contractor, and the principle of teamwork learned on this job guided his future work. He conceived the joint venture concept that led to partnerships and associations of contractors for cooperative construction of projects too large for a single builder.

It was in Cuba also that Henry Kaiser realized that a growing organization must develop its management from within itself. He went into the business of hiring young talent and training his future leaders—"building people" as he described it.

The Thirties was the era of the big dams—first Hoover, 726 feet high, then Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. Hoover Dam was constructed by a joint venture combine called Six Companies, Inc., of which Henry Kaiser was elected chairman of

the executive committee. The dam was built in four years—two years ahead of schedule.

While the dams were being built, Kaiser's men were building piers for the world's longest bridge—the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, levees on the Mississippi River and pipelines in Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona and Montana. Up to the start of World War II, Kaiser and associated firms built some 1,000 projects totaling \$383-million.

Another dam started Henry Kaiser in his industrial era. Although he had no cement plant, he successfully bid to supply six-million barrels of cement to build Shasta Dam in northern California at a savings of \$1,683,866 under the next lowest bid. With the contract in hand, he built a cement plant at Permanente, California, in only seven months from start of construction to production. He also supplied 11-million tons of aggregates for the dam, and built a nine and one-half mile conveyor belt—then the world's longest—to transport the material through the mountains.

Today, Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corporation is the largest cement company in the West with annual sales of \$99-million, 43 plants and facilities and assets of \$150-million.

SHIPBUILDING WINS WORLDWIDE RECOGNITION

In 1940 when the Allies desperately needed ships, Britain called on the Kaiser "know-how" at marshalling men and materials and contracted for Kaiser to build shipyards and 30 cargo ships—thus began the shipbuilding program that won world-wide recognition.

At the peak of the shipbuilding era, Henry Kaiser and his associates operated 58 shipyards at seven yards that built 1,490 ships during World War II—roughly 30 per cent of the American production of merchant shipping in this period—plus 50 small aircraft carriers. The Kaiser shipyards established a reputation for speed, averaging one new ship a day and an aircraft carrier per week.

On November 15, 1942, the Robert E. Peary was launched—4 days and 15 hours after the keel was laid. The ship was complete with bath towels and sharpened pencils in the chart room. The Kaiser streamlined, mass production of major units and assembly line fitting of the parts into the whole.

Today, a Kaiser company, National Steel Shipbuilding in San Diego, California, continues the shipbuilding heritage and has a \$300-million backlog of work.

During World War II, Henry Kaiser also managed the largest artillery shell operation in the U.S. He built and operated two magnesium plants for the production of the light metal and "goop," the magnesium incendiary. He supplied all the bulk cement used by the United States to construct Pacific fortifications. He operated an aircraft and aircraft parts manufacturing plant.

One acute problem for the World War II shipbuilder was the availability of steel ship plate in the West, so Henry Kaiser built his own steel plant at Fontana in southern California—the first integrated steel plant in the Western United States. Today, Kaiser Steel Corporation is the ninth largest in the United States with sales of \$365-million annually.

POSTWAR PERIOD LAUNCHES KAISER'S GREATEST GROWTH

During the war, Henry Kaiser looked to the future and studied the postwar needs. He was convinced that four essentials would be in great demand—metals, building materials, homes and automobiles. He anticipated a growth period needing steel, cement and sand and gravel, and he also saw promise in another material—aluminum.

In 1946, Henry Kaiser entered the aluminum business by leasing surplus plants from the War Assets Administration. Industry sources claimed that "aluminum will be

running out of our ears"—so great had been the war-time expansion of capacity. One "expert" report listed 16 reasons why Kaiser's entry into aluminum was doomed to failure.

Within five years, Henry Kaiser and his team of energetic young managers were producing and marketing more aluminum than the entire U.S. annual output up to 1937, and in its first 20 years Kaiser Aluminum was destined to expand its capacity to approximately five times that pre-war level. How it was accomplished has been called one of America's greatest industrial success stories. Kaiser's constant search for new ideas anticipated the need for this light metal that would jump to 47 pounds per capita in 1966 from only 10 pounds in 1946. The four reduction plants in Louisiana, West Virginia and Washington have an annual capacity of 670,000 tons. Fabricating plants and rolling mills around the country serve the nation with literally thousands of aluminum products.

Also, the company is a substantial producer of industrial chemicals, refractories and agricultural fertilizers, operating nationwide. Recently, it has entered the nickel business. Its world-wide operations include primary aluminum plants in Africa and Australia, and fabricating plants in Europe, Japan, India, Australia, South America and Africa.

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation today has assets in excess of \$1.1-billion and annual sales exceeding \$781-million. The fourth largest aluminum producer in the world, it has 88 plants and 27,500 employees.

MANUFACTURE OF AUTOMOBILE BECOMES WORLD-WIDE

Believing his men, who produced ships faster and at lower cost than ever before, could make a contribution in the postwar production of automobiles, Henry Kaiser formed the Kaiser-Frazer Corporation in 1945. Starting from scratch, the auto manufacturing plant at Willow Run, Michigan, led the industry in producing the first all-new car since 1941. Pioneering the postwar styling, the new company overcame terrific shortages of materials in its first full year of operations. It produced its own engines, its own bodies, its own steering gears; it built a new dealer organization, and broke all records in the history of the industry for number of new cars produced by a starting company in a new plant.

Automobile manufacturing in the postwar period was an exceedingly competitive business. After 10 years of passenger car production in which 750,000 Kaiser cars rolled off the assembly line, Henry Kaiser withdrew from the passenger car market in the United States and concentrated on the production of the famous four-wheel-drive "Jeep" utility vehicles in this country and overseas. In the early Fifties, he started complete manufacturing facilities of motor vehicles in South America, establishing Willys-Overland do Brasil and Industrias Kaiser Argentina.

Today, Kaiser Jeep Corporation manufactures a wide variety of sports and compact cars, station wagons and "Jeep" utility vehicles in the United States and in 32 foreign countries, as well as producing numerous military vehicles. Kaiser "Jeep" sales totaled \$333-million in 1966, and the two South American companies produced 121,000 vehicles, not counting other "Jeep" affiliates in more than 30 countries.

KAISER STEEL BUILDS THE WEST

In his life-long quest to "find a need and fill it," Henry Kaiser knew that the Western United States could not reach industrial maturity and provide jobs and products for vast population growth without having its own steel industry—"Steel, the Mother of Industries." Skeptics said the West Coast had neither the raw materials nor sufficient markets to gain its independence from the Eastern steel sources.

Mobilizing private capital and the Kaiser management team, Henry Kaiser founded the West's first and only fully integrated iron and steel industry in southern California at Fontana in 1941. Its iron ore deposits are mined only 164 miles away at Eagle Mountain, and coking coal mines are in the neighboring states of Utah and New Mexico.

In its first quarter of a century, Kaiser Steel has invested \$713 million in plants, equipment and other fixed assets, expanding steadily with each peace-time year. It has reached a capacity of three million ingot tons a year, and its multiple rolling mills and fabrication facilities produce the array of products required by the industrialization of the West. In its 25-year history, Kaiser Steel has produced 35-million tons of steel, sold products exceeding \$5-billion and paid its employees \$1.5-billion in wages.

In a pioneering innovation in human relations, Kaiser Steel and the United Steelworkers of America have developed a plan of sharing cost savings that has paid participating employees \$10.9-million in cash bonuses and set aside \$8.6-million more in a wage and benefit reserve. At the same time, employees are protected against technological displacement.

Kaiser Steel is 36 per cent owner of the Hamersley Iron project in western Australia, one of the world's greatest iron ore developments. This company has contracts approaching \$1 billion for sales of ore over a 16 year period to steel companies in Japan and Europe. The rich iron ore deposits of Mt. Tom Price, named for a life-time associate of Henry Kaiser, started shipments in August, 1966. Ore is hauled to the Coast on its own 182-mile railroad and bulk-shipped in 65,000-ton ore ships.

OTHER COMPANIES GROW UNDER HENRY KAISER

Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Company has grown to the ninth largest cement manufacturing company in the United States with an annual capacity to 19.7-million barrels. Its subsidiary, Kaiser Gypsum, distributes insulating and gypsum board products in 29 states and the Pacific Basin.

Kaiser Community Homes, formed in 1945 to meet the postwar housing shortage, has built 10,000 homes in California and led to other real estate development activities.

In Hawaii since 1955, Henry Kaiser directly supervised the building of the 1,146-room Hawaiian Village Hotel (sold to Hilton); the Kaiser Foundation Medical Center; a \$13½ million cement plant; and radio and television broadcasting facilities (also sold). Kaiser is now building the new community of Hawaii-Kai at Honolulu for an ultimate population of 60,000 residents.

Kaiser Broadcasting Corporation, which grew out of the Hawaiian facilities, is now developing UHF television stations in Detroit, Philadelphia, Boston, southern California, San Francisco and Cleveland, and FM radio stations in San Francisco and Boston.

The engineers and managers who have "grown up" with Henry Kaiser and accomplished the so-called "impossible" projects operate Kaiser Engineers Division. A worldwide engineering and construction firm, it has a backlog of \$800-million of uncompleted work this year.

Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corporation develops and manufactures aircraft and missile components and electronic equipment. Its new Kaiser Flite-Path and radar converter systems promise improved safety concepts for the aviation industry.

HEALTH PLAN KAISER'S FAVORITE PROJECT

Closest to Henry Kaiser's heart was the founding of the world's largest private initiative system of hospitals and pre-paid medical care. When he was 16 years old, his mother died in his arms for lack of medical care. He resolved, if he ever could, to help others protect and maintain their health.

Kaiser's opportunity to pioneer in meeting

this great need came three decades ago when he was building pipelines and dams far removed from hospitals and doctors. The medical care program evolved from the need to provide workers and their families with health care in remote areas of the west. The plan was extended to the shipyard workers during the war, and, by public demand, was subsequently opened to other groups, industries and individuals. The program is now serving a cross-section of the public in California, Oregon and Hawaii.

The non-profit Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, emphasizing preventive medicine and comprehensive care, now has a membership of more than 1.5-million and is growing at the rate of 10 per cent a year. Facilities now include 18 hospitals, with 3,200 beds, and more than 40 medical clinics in the three western states. Professional services are provided by 1,500 doctors who conduct their own partnerships.

AWARDS ACCLAIM HENRY KAISER'S ACHIEVEMENTS

Honorary doctorate degrees conferred upon Henry Kaiser include: Hobart College, Washington State College, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, University of Nevada, Marshall College, St. Mary's College and University of California.

He has been decorated with France's Legion of Honor, Chevalier. Awards include the New Orleans' Cunningham Award for contributions to advancement of Latin America; International Broadcast Free Enterprise Award, as "distinguished citizen exemplifying that free enterprise is the true foundation of a free world"; Humanitarian Distinguished Community Service Award of International Association of Machinists; Success Unlimited Philosophy of American Achievement Award; Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. Medal of Merit for "contribution to human relations in industry"; American Society of Travel Agents Award; and City of Oakland and Alameda County, California, Kaiser Day and Award for "inspiring contribution to community progress and growth."

Partly because of his pioneering in medical care for all, in 1965 Henry Kaiser received the Murray-Green Humanitarian Award, "in recognition of notable accomplishments in voluntary medical care, housing and labor-management relations"—together with citation from President Lyndon B. Johnson stating this was "the first occasion on which the AFL-CIO selected an outstanding industrialist to receive their highest honor . . . Henry Kaiser epitomizes a departure from the past . . . a pioneer of the new breed of responsible businessmen . . ."

He was elected by students of U.S. colleges as favorite industrialist for 1963 Robbins Award of America for Inspiration to Youth; and recognized by Fortune magazine as a "Grand Old Man of Business," and that no man in history of private enterprise had established as many varied industries.

In Hawaii during recent years, Henry Kaiser was honored with Hawaii's Salesman of the Year Award; Order of the Splintered Paddle Award . . . "More than any American of this era a legend in his own lifetime—for contribution . . . through his vision, leadership, beliefs and his deep and abiding understanding of the need for good human relations"; Honolulu Realty Board Honorary Membership; Hawaii's Father of the Year; Resolutions by three Hawaii legislatures hailing Kaiser contributions to Hawaiian Islands' development; Hawaii's Native-Born Citizen of the Year; Brotherhood Award as "Distinguished Builder of Society."

Henry J. Kaiser recently made his home in Hawaii—a legend in his own lifetime—not only for his many accomplishments, but also for the way he has done them. The family of companies which he founded now exceeds the hundred mark. Their combined assets are more than \$2.7-billion. Aggregate

annual sales exceed \$2.1 billion. Plants and facilities total 190 in 33 states and 40 countries overseas. The annual payroll for 90,000 employees exceeds \$630-million. Shareholders in the publicly-held companies total 140,000 investors.

HENRY J. KAISER—HONORS AND MEMBERSHIP
Doctor of Science (1943), Hobart College, Geneva, New York.

Doctor of Laws (1943), Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.

Doctor of Engineering (1944), Montana School of Mines, Butte, Montana.

Doctor of Laws (1948), University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada.

Doctor of Humane Letters (1955), Marshall College, Huntington, W. Virginia.

Doctor of Laws, (1956), St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Calif.

Doctor of Laws (1961), University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

The LaSalle Medal (1944), LaSalle University, Philadelphia, Penn.

Cunningham Award (1957), International House, New Orleans, La.

Robbins Award of America (1963), Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Degree of Chevalier, Legion of Honor (1952), Republic of France.

The Murray-Green Award (1965), The AFL-CIO Executive Council.

Order of the Splintered Paddle (1966), Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

Member: Beta Gamma Sigma, national honorary business fraternity; the Beavers, Los Angeles, construction industry organization; Eiks Club, Everett, Washington; Wai'alae Country Club, Honolulu, Hawaii; San Francisco Press Club, San Francisco, California (honorary); Automobile Old Timers Club, New York; Newcomen Society of North America.

TRIBUTE TO LIZ CARPENTER

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the First Lady's press secretary, Liz Carpenter, returned to her hometown to be honored as one of the outstanding women of Texas.

In a colorful ceremony at Salado in central Texas, Mrs. Johnson lauded her as a person of "creativity, laughter, speed, and kind and thoughtful deeds."

Truly, Liz Carpenter is an outstanding woman, and I would like to commend to the attention of our colleagues the newspaper account of the ceremonies as they appeared in my hometown paper, the Austin American-Statesman:

SALADO: LIZ, OLD ROBERTSON HOME HONORED
(By Lois Hale Galvin)

SALADO.—Liz Carpenter returned to the summer home of her childhood Friday afternoon as both she and the historic Col. Sterling C. Robertson Home here were honored.

Among those present was Liz' boss—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson—for whom she serves as press secretary; first woman and first working reporter ever to serve in such a capacity.

The occasion—honoring Liz Carpenter as an Outstanding Texas Woman and designating the Col. Robertson plantation complex as an official Texas Historic Landmark—was sponsored jointly by the Central Texas Area Museum Association, the Texas State

Historical Survey Committee, the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs and the Texas Historical Foundation.

Texas' First Lady, Mrs. John Connally; a bevy of prominent Washingtonians and Texans; and a passel of Robertson-Sutherland kin were among the 4,000 guests present for the ceremonies on the front porch of the ante-bellum home.

"I want to tell you how we see Liz," they heard Lady Bird Johnson say. "Creativity—laughter—speed—and kind and thoughtful deeds."

Silvery-haired, dressed in a turquoise floral dress with matching shoes, Mrs. Carpenter spoke both sentimentally and humorously in accepting the awards.

"It is awkward to share in public something which is very private, but this home place casts a spell upon all those it has touched. For me, it has always been like rose petals in some old earthenware jar. Every corner of it is a memory. Dozens of cousins on pallets in the summertime, reading the worn old books about Anne of Green Gables or the Little Colonel . . . The cool dignity of the old parlor where my mother and father were married . . . Cleaning out the spring so the watercress could grow free . . . Or cutting down your own cedar tree in the back pasture for Christmas . . . Feeding baby lambs in the Spring or your uncle saddling up the mare so you could ride to Norwood's Store for the mail.

That's the Salado that I take with me wherever I go and I am deeply grateful to my Aunt Lucile for the determination to see that this lovely old gem of a town was kept for the future. Now my own children and others . . . who have only known the sound of the city . . . may feel the enchantment of this spot."

Exclaiming over how Salado "looms" on the map today, Liz recalled the difficulties her journalist-husband Les Carpenter, had finding the place when "he came courting by Greyhound Bus in the early forties; the 1940's, that is."

Liz' Aunt, Mrs. Sterling Robertson and other members of the Robertson clan, made brief remarks during the ceremonies, as did John Ben Shepperd of Odessa, former Attorney General and immediate past president of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee; Dr. Leonard Holloway of Belton, president of Mary Hardin-Baylor College; Joe Wallace of Killeen, president of the Texas State Area Museum Association; Charles Woodburn of Amarillo, president of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee; Mrs. B. F. Seay of Andrews, president of the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs; Sterling C. Robertson of Dallas, great great grandson of the builder; F. Lee Lawrence of Tyler, president of the Texas Historical Foundation; Mrs. Robertson and Mrs. Jerry Van der Heuvel, president of the Women's National Press Club; Dr. DeWitt C. Reddick, dean of the School of Communications of the University of Texas.

Before and following the program, Mrs. Carpenter led reporters and friends around the plantation home grounds to visit the booths of skilled Texas craftsmen whose work was on display.

"Isn't this great!" she would say.

"Isn't this beautiful!"

"Doesn't this real Texas art beat those tacky rattlesnake ashtrays and things that most tourists have been remembering Texas by?"

The exhibiting craftsmen and artist were Julianan Cowden of Alvarado, Malcolm Thurgood of Wimberley, Mrs. Maise Lee of Marathon, Edward Arvin of Killeen, Buck Schwitz of Hunt, and Mrs. Gertrude Meyer of Hunt, Mrs. Helen Bourgeois of Fredericksburg, Mrs. William Ward of Mountain Home, Mrs. Sherman Lindsey of Temple, Mrs. L. J. Epperson of Tyler, Mrs. Alfred Negley and Janet Shook LaCosta of San Antonio, Helen Monette of Wimberley, Orvil S. Mitchell of Midland, Virgil Hagy of San Antonio and Ishmael

Soto of Austin and Mr. and Mrs. S. D. Rowe of Abilene.

Lending a note of color were Jaycees of Killeen and Jaycee-ettes who helped usher and furnish the booths. Last but not least were the colorful Highland Lassies of Dallas with their bagpipes.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the free world's leading industrial countries to find mutually acceptable bases of international monetary reforms reached a new high point last weekend. The finance ministers and the heads of central banks of the group of 10 countries—United States, France, Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, Japan, Italy, West Germany, and Sweden—have agreed upon a plan for the establishment of contingency machinery for creating a new international monetary asset to supplement gold, the dollar, and sterling reserves for settling international accounts. What they are doing, in brief, is creating a new form of international money.

In a report made 2 years ago, entitled "The Gold Situation," which was based upon a study made by the House Committee on Government Operations Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, of which I am chairman, the impending need to supplement gold and dollars with additional international monetary reserves was considered. The various plans that were then under consideration were also discussed.

The United States had taken the lead in calling for technical studies of means for accomplishing international monetary reforms and in progressing from the study to the negotiating stage.

Basically, the plan permits each member country of the International Monetary Fund to use special drawing rights—to be created—instead of its gold or dollar reserves to settle its obligations if the IMF decides that the creation of such new asset is necessary to foster a continued expansion of world trade. More details concerning the plan, and its provisions for veto of its activation are contained in the attached article from the Wall Street Journal of August 28, entitled "Big Ten Nations Propose Currency Reform Outline."

The plan will be presented to the International Monetary Fund next month for approval. The legislative branches of the member nations, before the plan will be adopted, also must grant approval.

The plan constitutes a marked success on the part of all the officials of the United States who have been working on the problem constantly for about 6 years, often with great opposition from other countries, particularly France. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, who headed the American delegation to

London which succeeded in working out the compromise plan, is quoted as saying:

This has indeed been one of the great days in the history of international financial cooperation.

I certainly agree, because a long step has been taken to help ease the strain on the American economy in the future, and to maintain the stability of the dollar and all world currencies. The Secretary and all who participated in this monumental task are to be commended.

This great achievement should reward to the benefit of the entire free world.

"BIG TEN" NATIONS PROPOSE CURRENCY REFORM OUTLINE—IMF MUST VOTE ON PROGRAM EXPECTS TO CURB GOLD LOSSES, SPUR WORLD TRADE—FUND WOULD SET UP LOANS

WASHINGTON.—Key industrial powers agreed on an ambitious compromise plan for international monetary reform that is expected to curb U.S. gold losses in the era ahead while allowing expanded world trade.

After six years of studying, sparring and stalling, the U.S. and others in the "Big Ten" group of nations emerged from a crucial weekend session in London with an outline that they all are pledged to push at next month's meeting of the 106-nation International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro. The agreement, Treasury Secretary Fowler said, marks "one of the great days in the history of international financial cooperation."

Basically, the plan calls for greater ability for nations to borrow existing currencies from the IMF, but the proposed "special drawing rights" could be used directly in settling payments accounts between governments. "There is no question," exulted a high-ranking U.S. strategist, "that we have created a new form of international money."

The fundamental aim of the plan is to avoid trade-stifling policies by countries that are short of current international reserves, chiefly gold, dollars and existing automatic rights to borrow currencies from the IMF. The reserves are used to tide the countries over balance-of-payments deficits, which occur when more money leaves a country than returns.

If expectations of the plan are borne out, countries will have less need to abruptly tighten credit, raise taxes or devalue currencies to curb international financial flows.

The U.S. and the United Kingdom have been arguing that the slow growth of international reserves makes it prudent to have a contingency plan ready. France and some others had been resisting, saying that there isn't any shortage of reserves and that making it too easy for countries to continue having payments deficits might encourage loose fiscal practices and feed global inflation.

NEW RESERVE "UNIT"

While the U.S. and the U.K. preferred creation of a new reserve "unit" that governments could use as money, the continentals generally preferred an expanded credit arrangement because of the "discipline" imposed by repayment. They were aiming this point mainly at the U.S., which has had a payments deficit almost every year since World War II.

The Europeans' fears haven't been entirely overcome, of course, and it's generally expected that the additional drawing rights wouldn't be pumped out until the U.S. and the U.K. prove they can solve their payments problems without the extra help. Lately, U.S. officials have been saying that they don't see how the American deficit could be ended so long as the Vietnam war continues to cause a substantial dollar outflow.

To a surprisingly large extent, the Johnson Administration negotiators, headed by Mr. Fowler, won on substance while the Europeans won on form; on every major feature of the plan there are built-in conditions that prevent claims of outright victory or defeat by either camp.

Assuming approval by the IMF and ratification by participating countries, the IMF would ration to each member country every year "special drawing rights" based roughly on economic size. Of a hypothetical \$2 billion, the U.S., for example, might get \$400 million of rights.

The U.S. could save the rights as a supplement to its gold reserves, cash them in for foreign currencies at the IMF, or "spend" them directly in payment for surplus dollars held by another country. Any dollars "mopped up" this way would be removed as threats to U.S. gold, which the Treasury has pledged to exchange for surplus dollars at the fixed price of \$35 an ounce.

Probably 90% of the use of the new rights would be through such direct transfer from one country to another, one U.S. analyst said.

"CONVERSION RIGHT"

The direct "conversion right" wouldn't be an iron-clad one, though, as the other country would have the privilege of saying no. In that case, the U.S. would turn the rights back to the IMF, which would pick out a country with a fast-growing surplus of dollars. Such a country would be obligated to take the rights up to three times its own allocation. This method, too, would absorb dollars that might otherwise have been used to buy U.S. gold.

Unlike other "drawings" or loans from the IMF, the new rights wouldn't ever have to be actually repaid to the IMF, U.S. officials said, and the "reconstitution" agreed on instead is only partial. During the initial five years, a country could freely use 70% of the rights it had been allocated, but it still would have to have 30% left at the end. "This makes it 70% money and 30% credit," one official said.

If at the end of five years the U.S. had less than 30% of its rights left, it would have to "reconstitute" its holdings to that level. It could do this by accepting rights instead of dollars or gold from a government in debt to the U.S. or by using dollars to purchase rights from a country with an excess of them. In either case, there would be more dollars than otherwise in foreign hands that would then be potential claims on U.S. gold.

One price the U.S. paid for escape from an outright-repayment clause could prove steep. This is an agreement that it would take an 85% majority of the IMF to "turn on" the proposed new credit-issuing machinery and to set the overall amount, period and rate of allocation. This would be a high enough proportion to assure the six common market countries—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg—a "veto power" over any issuance of new rights.

All but Luxemburg also are in the Big Ten. Aside from the U.S. and the U.K., the other members of the group are Canada, Japan and Sweden.

COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF POLAND

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, although 28 years have passed since the Nazi and Soviet invasions of Poland took place on September 1, 1939, we cannot yet recall that tragic event without bitterness and shame.

Throughout history, Poland has served as a bulwark of Christian civilization in Europe, restraining the Tartars and the Turks as they plundered and pillaged across the continent.

In the fall of 1939, there was no one able to protect Poland or to preserve her civilization, and this long-suffering land became a nation without a state, a tyrannized and persecuted country, deprived of half its territory and millions of its people.

When the Germans invaded Poland on September 1, their 76 superbly organized and mechanized divisions met little difficulty in devastating the unprepared Polish forces, though the 830,000 soldiers and officers of the Polish Army fought doggedly and gallantly.

Alone and unaided, they maintained a courageous resistance, first to the Germans, and 16 days after the German invasion, to the Russians, who entered eastern Poland on the pretext that the Polish state no longer existed.

Thousands of Polish Infantry, Navy, and Air Force troops, forced to flee the military might of the invaders, joined the Allies and took up arms once more in Germany, France, Norway, North Africa, Italy, and Sicily. As the regular army slowly disintegrated within the country, an underground movement developed, directed by the Polish Government-in-Exile. Stray divisions of the Polish Army together with civilian men, women, and children, intrepidly destroyed German planes, ammunition dumps, bridges, and other military installations.

Often forced to survive for months, or even years in forests and mountains, members of the resistance and the Polish populace at large reacted consistently with spirit and conviction. Refusing to betray their national honor and collaborate with the enemy, 6 million Poles preferred self-respect and death to capitulation and cringing life.

Millions more suffered deportation and imprisonment in labor camps in Siberia and Asiatic Russia, or in Polish and German concentration camps, as Germans and Russians alike systematically attempted to destroy Polish cultural and religious life. Even in 1945, there was no peace for Poland. Absorbed by Soviet imperialism, the Poles have continued to fight for personal liberty and national integrity.

Those who have immigrated to the United States have brought with them their love of liberty, and their respect for law and order. They have contributed much, socially, economically, politically, and culturally, to the advancement of our Nation, and have helped make the United States one of the greatest countries in the world.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to give recognition to the great number of Polish Americans who reside in the Seventh District of Illinois and whom I am proud to represent in the Congress. They form a substantial part of the

group of solid, hard-working American citizens who are the backbone of our country. I can easily recall many Polish Americans from Chicago who are leaders in their community and a credit to their Polish heritage. They are:

Aldermen: Donald T. Swinarski, Casimir J. Staszczuk, Joseph J. Kraska, Frank J. Kuta, Robert J. Sulski, Casimir C. Laskowski, Edwin P. Fifielski, Stanley M. Zydlo, Robert Brandt.

Judges: Casimir V. Cwiklinski, Walter J. Kowalski, Eugene L. Wachowski, Raymond P. Drymalski, Sigmund J. Stefanowicz.

Justice, Illinois Supreme Court: Thomas E. Kluczynski.

Judge, appellate court: Thaddeus V. Adesko.

Committeemen: John C. Marcin, Theodore A. Swinarski, Mathew W. Bieszczat, Felix F. Kucharski, Edwin T. Kołski, Aloysius A. Mazewski, Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Hon. ROMAN PUCINSKI.

County commissioners: Charles S. Bonk, Lillian Piotrowski, Mathew W. Bieszczat.

Board of appeals: Bernard J. Korzen. Metropolitan sanitary district trustees: John B. Brandt, Valentine Janicki.

Associate clerk of the circuit court: Theodore A. Swinarski.

County treasurer: Edward Kucharski. City clerk: John C. Marcin.

State representatives: Chester R. Wiktorski, Jr., Chester Majewski, Matt Ropa, Walter Duda, John G. Fary, Louis Janczak, Henry J. Klosak, Henry M. Lenard, John S. Matijevich, Nick Svalina, John F. Wall, William F. Zachacki.

State senators: Thad L. Kusibab, Zygmunt A. Sokolnicki, Joseph J. Krasowski, Frank M. Ozinga.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I also want to give special recognition to our distinguished Polish American Congressmen from Chicago: Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, and Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.

It is thus appropriate that on Friday, September 1, which is the 28th anniversary of the invasion of Poland, we salute the unquenchable spirit and endurance of the Polish people. Their battle has not yet ended but we look ahead hopefully to the day when they will join us in the ranks of free nations.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, as part of my ad hoc hearings into the affairs of general farm organizations, I issued an invitation to Mr. Frank Sullivan, insurance commissioner of Kansas, to testify about some very serious charges made against his office. Mr. Sullivan, when contacted by my office by phone, assured us that he would appear. Subsequently, in

telegrams to me, he pleaded "previous commitments" and did not appear.

Since the Farm Bureau Federation and its affiliates have decided to boycott these hearings, the president of the Kansas Farm Bureau Insurance Co. will not be present to answer to these charges, either.

The statement I am making is on behalf of an individual whose identity must be protected in order to prevent reprisals against him.

However, when this case is taken before the appropriate judicial or administrative bodies, all of the facts and sources will be presented.

It has been brought to my attention that the Office of the Commissioner of Kansas, Department of Insurance, has received highly improper gifts from the Farm Bureau Insurance Cos. of Kansas consisting of two or more annual football and basketball season tickets valued at several hundred dollars.

I do not think it is important that the exact value be placed on it.

The insurance commissioner's office has been placed in the position of accepting gifts from someone he is supposed to be regulating.

I think if this happened on a Federal level that Federal official would not be around very long.

Furthermore, it has been charged that the Kansas Department of Insurance has overlooked numerous improper activities carried on by the Farm Bureau insurance companies of Kansas.

I would remind you again at this point that the Farm Bureau justifies its insurance companies by stating that they exist only to provide economic services for its members.

This justification is difficult to accept in light of the way the Kansas Farm Bureau insurance companies operate.

The top executives of the Farm Bureau insurance companies are also provided with season football and basketball tickets for themselves and their wives and their families.

The insurance companies spend several thousands of dollars a year for membership for their top executive personnel in an expensive Kansas country club.

It is the job of the Kansas Department of Insurance to supervise the activities of insurance companies licensed to operate in Kansas. One must question the diligence with which the department is performing its function in the case of the Kansas Farm Bureau insurance companies. These questions become more serious in the light of the reported gifts that that office is receiving from the Farm Bureau insurance companies.

I would say right here that we all read how the costs of insurance continually go up and how there is now a cry for Federal regulation of insurance companies.

One of the duties of an insurance company is to see that the rate increases are justified. Surely with this kind of padding going on, this kind of puffing up of expenses, the one who finally pays is the policyholder, the automobile owner. It certainly seems to me that the Kansas Department of Insurance is quite delinquent in its duties.

Despite statements by the Farm Bureau that their insurance is provided as a service only for members, it is reported

to me that approximately 40 percent of the policyholders of Kansas Farm Bureau insurance neither own nor operate a farm nor have a major agriculture interest.

In Riley County, for example, where the company home office is located, non-agriculture membership is 64.5 percent. It would seem to me that in Kansas it is pretty hard not to find people who are farmers. That has a pretty high percentage of its population directly involved in farming and still the Farm Bureau manages to find them. Unfortunately, the American taxpayers are underwriting these questionable activities on the part of the Kansas Farm Bureau Insurance Co. Despite the fact that the two Kansas Farm Bureau insurance companies have earned premiums of more than \$13 million, they paid less than \$7,000 in Federal income tax last year.

I intend to furnish this information and other information regarding the Kansas Department of Insurance and the Farm Bureau insurance companies to the appropriate judicial administrative bodies for their appropriate attention and action, and in particular Governor Docking, of Kansas.

This is also very difficult to understand when I am sure their membership are supposedly the farmers of Kansas, the wheat farmers of Kansas. I don't think too many of them could be found out on those golf courses, especially in the summertime.

I can understand Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. or Prudential or Nationwide feeling that their people have to be in the country club but I find it very difficult to understand that somebody selling insurance supposedly only to farmers has to be at country clubs.

It has been charged that the expense accounts of these executives are highly padded. Automobiles for personal use are provided by the company for its executives.

It has been estimated that nearly 1 million miles a year in personal mileage is paid for by the company.

Many of these cars have absolutely no business-related purpose. Many of the cars are provided with trailer hitches for the employees' boats.

It may be that they are in the boat insurance business and they go around appraising boats but in any event, they have trailer hitches on their cars.

For example, one board member despite the fact that her office is in the Farm Bureau Insurance Co. drives a round trip distance of about 550 miles per week to and from her home.

This mileage is paid for by the company.

In addition, there is a blatant and direct overlap in Kansas between the duties, jobs, and functions of the Farm Bureau insurance agents and of the Kansas Farm Bureau employees.

There is also an overlap in office space.

Again, I believe this points up that these insurance companies are used as a source of income.

In other words, income from the insurance companies are funneled into the Farm Bureau operation so they can car-

ry on their various economic and political activities.

THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIETNAM JOIN IN A DRAMATIC PUBLIC EFFORT TO PUBLICIZE FREE ELECTIONS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the United States and South Vietnam have now joined in a dramatic public effort to invite world observance of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

This is a remarkable show by the Government of South Vietnam to demonstrate its faith in its ability to have free and open and honest national elections.

President Johnson has chosen, from our Nation, a broadly representative group of Americans from all segments of society, representing all political views, and reflecting the opinions of labor, management, religious groups, and local government.

This is certainly a group we can trust to give us a broad view of the elections, and President Johnson should be complimented for having responded so swiftly and so well.

South Vietnam has also opened the elections and the country to the free press and the United Nations.

In short, we shall have complete evidence on which to base an evaluation of the elections while they are going on and after they are completed.

This is an outstanding show of confidence of Vietnam in itself.

Rarely has a nation embattled opened its doors to this kind of election scrutiny. We ought to be proud that the United States is sharing this moment of democracy, just as we have shared the burden of defending Vietnam against communism.

I commend President Johnson for accepting the Vietnamese invitation.

I hope and pray that this effort will serve to answer those who have cried "fraud" before there was any fraud proven.

I hope and pray that we as a nation take renewed hope from these efforts by Vietnam, for they certainly show a nation willing and eager to be judged by the standards of world opinion.

This is something the Communists in Hanoi have never done and will never do.

The contrast between a budding democracy in the south and a closed dictatorship in the north are now evident for all to see.

Let us take a lesson from this and support President Johnson as he perseveres in Vietnam.

NICHOLAS KYROS, FATHER OF REPRESENTATIVE PETER KYROS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my condolences to my good friend and our respected colleague, Representative PETER KYROS, on the death of his father.

The elder Mr. Kyros, who passed away at Portland, Maine, on Friday, August 25, was born in Greece on January 1, 1882. His early years were filled with great adventure, and his closing ones with satisfaction.

As a child, Nicholas Kyros was caught up in the great exodus that left the old world to seek America. The immigrants brought a wealth of vitality, an idealism and an ambition that has enriched the Nation, and Nicholas Kyros was exemplary among them.

He arrived in Philadelphia in 1892 at the age of 10 and was educated there. From Philadelphia, he moved to Lowell, Mass. In 1907, he moved again to join his brothers in Portland, Maine, where he lived out his life.

He traveled to Portland with his young wife Anna Poulos Kyros, and there raised two sons. Mr. Kyros operated a restaurant in Portland where he became widely known and greatly respected. He was an industrious, hard-working, deeply religious, and honest man, and his success as a businessman and parent attests to his courage.

For this immigrant boy, grown respected, the election of his son as a Member of Congress must have been a source of great pride, and we can take pleasure in the fact that he lived to see it.

When Nicholas Kyros died at the age of 85 last week, Portland lost a distinguished citizen and all who knew him lost a valued friend.

I extend to our honored colleague, to his widowed mother, to his brother, and to their families my condolences upon the passing of their beloved husband and father.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for Tuesday, August 29, 1967, on account of official business (National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders).

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, for the week of September 11, on account of official business.

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. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. BOB WILSON), for 30 minutes, today; to revise

and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(Mr. PRICKLE, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON), for 15 minutes, on August 30; to revise and extend his remarks and to 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOB WILSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAYNE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOW.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1467. An act to provide authorizations to carry out the beautification program under title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1504. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for loans for enterprises to supplement farm income and for farm conversion to recreation, remove the annual ceiling on insured loans, increase the amount of uncollected insured loans that may be made out of the fund, raise the aggregate annual limits on grants, establish a flexible loan interest rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5876. An act to amend titles 5, 14, and 37, United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the code.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 30, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1030. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of followup review of cotton inventory management by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1031. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on commissary activities outside the continental United States for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 596A; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1032. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend part I of the Federal Power Act to clarify the manner in which the licensing authority of the Commission and the right of the United States to take over a project or projects upon or after the expiration of any license shall be exercised; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1033. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1034. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, covering the calendar year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of the Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12681. A bill to raise additional revenue by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 12682. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish additional criteria for determining whether certain college curricula are full-time courses of study; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12683. A bill to amend the income limitation provisions applicable to veterans and widows of veterans receiving non-service-connected disability pensions under chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12684. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 12685. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 12686. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12687. A bill to prohibit national banks from engaging in the travel agency business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 12688. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 196th anniversary of the birthday of Brig. Gen. Samuel Dale; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 12689. A bill to amend section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to modernize certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12690. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make arrangements for an improved insurance protection program for areas where such insurance at reasonable rates is not now available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 12691. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12692. A bill to provide counseling and technical assistance to local educational agencies in rural areas in obtaining benefits under laws administered by the Commissioner of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 12693. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 12694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the estate tax treatment of certain interests created by community property laws in employees' trust and retirement annuity contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 12695. A bill to create an independent school board in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WYATT (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. KEITH):

H.R. 12696. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that

the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 12697. A bill to provide Federal assistance to courts, correctional systems, and community agencies to increase their capability to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to assist research efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12698. A bill to amend part I of the Federal Power Act to clarify the manner in which the licensing authority of the Commission and the right of the United States to take over a project or projects upon or after the expiration of any license shall be exercised; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12699. A bill to amend part I of the Federal Power Act to clarify the manner in which the licensing authority of the Commission and the right of the United States to take over a project or projects upon or after the expiration of any license shall be exercised; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. CAREY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.J. Res. 811. Joint resolution to remove the present limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12700. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 12701. A bill for the relief of Dr. Teobaldo Cuervo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 12702. A bill for the relief of Lee Chun Hyong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12703. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Rampulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12704. A bill for the relief of Mr. Rafael Cisneros-Calderon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ballot for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, recently I was one of a panel of four speakers, includ-

ing our outstanding colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN], who addressed an ad hoc forum on the subject of Vietnam.

This occurred on a Saturday afternoon, August 26 last, at Ocean Beach, N.Y., a resort on Fire Island, where a great many New York City people have summer homes.

The meeting represented no group intending to advance a particular theory. It was open to the public and consisted

of the public. Two of the four speakers represented a position favoring a continuation of the present course in Vietnam or an escalation thereof. Two, including myself, favored deescalation and steps toward a peaceful settlement.

My purpose in mentioning all this to you, Mr. Speaker, is to reveal the impressive and significant vote expressing the views of the audience by written ballot at the end of the meeting: 257 votes were cast in favor of deescalation or