

"the domination of imperialism on the world scene has ended" because of the growth of Soviet military power. The statement also singled out the United States as the "main enemy" of the national liberation warfare movement and charged the State of Israel with aggression.

Second. Appointing—for the first time since Beria's execution in 1953—the Soviet secret police chief a member of the ruling Politburo. This is Yuri Andropov, whose promotion was announced June 22, 1967. Since the KGB—the Soviet secret police—have vast responsibilities for waging unconventional warfare around the world, it would appear that giving Andropov such power indicates stepped-up cold war operations.

Third. Writing in the official Soviet Armed Forces newspaper, Red Star, on June 3, 1967, Bulgarian Minister of Defense, General of the Army Dobri Dzhurov, said:

The Soviet Union has always been and will continue to be the main political and material base of the world revolutionary process. (Emphasis added.)

The general also went on to say that—The Soviet Union constitutes the main support of fighting Vietnam.

Fourth. Soviet escalation of the Vietnam war is another example of the Soviet's true intentions. Soviet shipping going into North Vietnamese ports has shown a marked increase this year over 1966. As of June 1967 the rate was 18 per month, with an additional two to five Soviet satellite ships per month. Indicative of this escalation is the Moscow Radio broadcast of July 28 which stated that Soviet ships "leave Odessa practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam."

Fifth. The recent hard line in the Soviet press which continually attacks Israel, "Zionism," and the United States. In reporting this trend from Moscow, the Washington Post of August 8, 1967, stated that the press campaign was one which "to some senior diplomats here recalls the worst days of the cold war."

These indicators of increasingly "stormy cold war weather" indicate that Soviet strategists understand quite well that revolutionary agitation and propaganda, "peace marchers" in London and New York, guerrillas in Africa and Latin America, are techniques of conflict on a par with guided missiles and nuclear submarines. But does it follow that these

same Soviet strategists are unaware of the possibilities for nuclear blackmail of the West in the event that they attain strategic military-technological superiority? Indeed, one may well ask whether the present U.S. limitations on air strikes against military targets in North Vietnam result from the steady accretion of Soviet military-technological power.

CHINESE COMMUNIST NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT

Even if it were possible to disregard the evidence of the Soviet deployment of an ABM system or systems and the counter-deterrence which this poses to the announced U.S. policy of deterrence, it would be still more difficult to close our minds to the ominous developments in China.

The Chinese Communists exploded their first H-bomb on June 17, 1967. It was apparently a sophisticated implosion type in the two-to-seven megaton range. The complicated electronic triggering and measuring devices that would appear to have been required, in this and other nuclear tests, would be of great assistance to the Chinese in building an intercontinental missile. Since the Chinese progress in nuclear weapons development has been faster and more effective than had been anticipated by Western sources, it may be that they will also develop a nuclear ICBM delivery capability sooner than the mid-1970's, which is the time phase previously estimated by Western sources. Moreover, the Chinese now possess the design capability for a multimegaton thermonuclear weapon which can be delivered by aircraft.

The possibilities of the Chinese Communists exercising nuclear blackmail against Southeast Asia countries, Japan, or, indeed, against the United States are underscored in a report released August 3, 1967, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The committee said:

We believe that the Chinese will continue to place a high priority on thermonuclear weapons development. With continued testing we believe they will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class with a yield in the megaton range by about 1970. We believe that the Chinese can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in the early 1970's. On the basis of our present knowledge, we believe that the Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971.

The Joint Committee then went on to sound a warning about the direct threat to U.S. national security posed by Chinese Communist nuclear weapons developments by pointing out that—

Most significant for the United States is the fact that a low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's. At present we do not have an effective anti-ballistic-missile system which could repel such a suicidal (for the Chinese) but nevertheless possible strike.

THE STABILIZING VALUE OF A U.S. ABM SYSTEM

In the final analysis, the value of a system of deterrence is that which the enemy believes about it. If the Soviets believe that the U.S. deterrent offensive force can be neutralized by their ABM systems to a point at which the Soviet warmaking capability will sustain only an acceptable level of damage—and, of course, their acceptable level may be much higher than ours—then they have achieved a counter-deterrence posture which may lead them to risk—at a given crisis in international relations—a nuclear war.

Equally, if at some future point the Chinese Communists should believe—in the absence of a U.S. ABM system—that there is somewhat more of a "suicidal" element for the United States than for them in a nuclear war, they might, in a given confrontation, launch a surprise nuclear attack on America.

The evidence of the post-World War II period suggests that it has been the stabilizing factor of U.S. military-technological power which has prevented a general war. Today, under the impact of both the Soviet and Chinese Communist military-technological thrust, that stability appears to be threatened. Would the production and deployment of a U.S. ABM system—perhaps even on a crash basis as a clear demonstration of credibility—have a definite stabilizing value on world politics? That it might well do so is indicated by the thoughtful and carefully measured words of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In reporting on the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal 1968—August 4, 1967—the committee said:

It is the view of the Committee that the deployment of the Nike-X antiballistic missile system should be initiated immediately, and the Committee urges the executive branch of the Government to take action accordingly.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1967

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

He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love.—1 John 4: 8.

God of love and Lord of mercy, lay Thy hand upon us and hold us steady amid the troubles of this time. The days come and go so fast that we lose our grip on life. We hurry here and there and wonder why we are weary and worn

out. We are slaves rather than masters. In fact our work controls us rather than in faith we control our work.

Halt Thou our haste, heal our ailing spirits, direct us in the doing of our duty, stay Thou with us and we with Thee until we come to ourselves. Then let us arise with a strength born of Thy spirit to face the tasks of this day with courage and to keep our faith even against the fury and violence of a world which has lost its true purpose and real destiny.

Abide Thou with us and encourage us to do Thy will that we may be open

channels through which Thy redeeming love may flow to heal the differences between men and nations. In the Master's name, we pray. 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 without

amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 547. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location to replace the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 497. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, August 31, 1967, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, September 11, 1967; and

H. Con. Res. 498. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions notwithstanding any adjournment of the two Houses until September 11, 1967.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 974. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the city of Glendale, Ariz.;

S. 1477. An act to amend section 301 of title III of the act of August 14, 1946, relating to the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a national advisory committee, to provide for annual meetings of such committee;

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 1568. An act to amend the sixth paragraph of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, relating to restrictions on eligibility for loans by Federal land banks; and

S.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the late Walt Disney and for the issuance of bronze medals to the California Institute of the Arts in recognition of the distinguished public service and the outstanding contributions of Walt Disney to the United States and to the world.

THE LATE DR. JOHN L. TAYLOR

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD of August 30, 1967, in tribute to the memory and work of the late Dr. John L. Taylor, staff consultant on territories and Indian affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, over the years there have been many fine men who have served the Congress of the United States with great distinction. Among these, Dr. John L. Taylor to me, was outstanding.

Jack Taylor exemplified beyond measure a man dedicated to the well-being of those served by the legislation on which he worked so diligently as a consultant to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. His judgment was never clouded by partisanship nor could he be persuaded to accept a special interest. Jack was truly an objective adviser to the Congress.

It was my privilege through association with him to learn from him in a small measure of his wisdom. As an institution, the Congress of the United States has been enhanced by his service. As members of a great committee we have lost in his passing a dear and personal friend.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues who have served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the untimely death of Dr. John L. Taylor, the committee's staff consultant on territorial and Indian Affairs.

While serving as U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council in 1961, I had the pleasure of making a visit to the Pacific Trust Territory with Jack Taylor. I learned what a warm wonderful human being he was and how widely beloved he was in Micronesia.

In his quiet and unassuming way, he was always ready and able to serve the interests of the committee and of the committee's clients effectively and selflessly. He will be sorely missed.

I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and five children.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its finest and most able counsels, and I have lost a personal friend in the death of Dr. John Taylor, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He was also a friend to Puerto Rico. Jack, as he liked to be called, was both loved and respected here, an affection and regard which he had earned. No favor was too much to ask of him; no task too great; and it seemed that his time was never too limited for this, although his responsibilities kept him very busy, indeed. He was a truly dedicated public servant, and the Congress was indeed fortunate to have his capabilities for these many years. He will be sorely missed.

I had the good fortune in 1965 to take a long, extensive trip through the Trust Territory of the Pacific with the House Interior Committee. Jack Taylor accompanied us as an expert, as a counsel, and as a guide. It was on this occasion that I came to know him as a personal friend and to admire his intimate knowledge of this vast area and the people on these islands. For I was a newcomer to the Congress, while Jack Taylor had already become somewhat of a pillar because of his long and rendering service. An educator, a captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve, a World War II naval officer, an adviser to an important House committee, Jack Taylor spent his life serving his country and people.

I especially want to extend my deepest sympathy to his loving wife and to their five children.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Dr. John L. Taylor who passed away on August 29. I knew Dr. Taylor for only these months of the 90th Congress, when we had the opportunity to work together on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but it was apparent to me from the beginning

that he was a tremendously talented individual who was making a very important contribution to the committee.

This versatile man at once portrayed expertise on both the Pacific islands and the American Indian, and was widely recognized in his important post as consultant to the committee, a position he served for 14 years with distinction.

Dr. Taylor will be sorely missed by the committee and by Congress and it is fitting that his mark be memorialized by the John L. Taylor scholarship memorial fund for students from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It was my privilege to know Dr. Taylor, and it will be the privilege of students of the trust territories in years to come to know of him.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was deeply saddened by the untimely passing of Dr. John L. Taylor, the committee's consultant on territorial and Indian affairs, on August 29.

Dr. Taylor had served the committee with dedication and distinction since 1953. It had been my privilege to know and work with him since 1961 when I became a member of the committee.

Since assuming the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs at the beginning of the present Congress, I found Dr. Taylor's counsel and knowledge of legislation affecting those areas to be invaluable.

Dr. Taylor's life aside from his work on the committee staff was also one of achievement. The recipient of a masters degree from Columbia and a doctorate from Clark University, he devoted a number of years to teaching, both here and abroad. He also contributed a number of articles to various publications concerning education in the islands and prepared instructional materials for the schools of the trust territory which were published by the Navy and Interior Departments.

Dr. Taylor served the committee impartially and objectively, giving his time and energies unstintingly even in the face of a terminal illness as was the case during the past several months. His absence will be keenly felt by everyone on the committee.

I join with my colleagues in extending to the members of his family my heartfelt sympathy and condolences on the occasion of their loss.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dr. John L. Taylor has removed from the House of Representatives and from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs one of the ablest congressional staff members I have ever known. He served as staff consultant to the Committee on Territorial and Indian Affairs for almost 14 years, and was known throughout the Federal Government as a leading authority in these two fields. Dr. Taylor was a man of great ability and integrity, and his services will be greatly missed and his loss deeply felt by all of us who have been privileged to know him.

I became closely associated with Dr. Taylor when I became chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee in January

1955, at the beginning of the 84th Congress. He was a wonderful person to work with, and I knew him not only as a capable adviser but also as a genial traveling companion. Over the last 12 years, we made numerous long and tiring trips together throughout the West, visiting Indian reservations and conducting field hearings on Indian legislation. Thus, I know firsthand the importance of his contribution to the Indian people and to legislation relating to the various Indian tribes. I was continuously impressed by his special sense of dedication and his cheerful and optimistic outlook on life. His great concern for his fellow man and his intense desire to be of service made him especially qualified to deal with our Indian people.

Even with all of the energy and dedication he gave to his work, Dr. Taylor still found time to serve his community and enjoy a full life with his family. Mrs. Haley and I want to extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Virginia, and to his five children.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the rewarding life and meritorious work of the late Dr. John L. Taylor, staff consultant of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for Indian Affairs and Territorial and Insular Affairs.

Dr. Taylor came to the committee on December 1, 1953. Before starting his effective work for us, he had served with effectiveness and outstanding distinction in the Navy during World War II and with the Department of the Interior in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. He held a degree of doctor of philosophy and a master's degree in geography from Clark University or Worcester, Mass., and a master's degree in political science from Columbia University.

Because of his experience in the Pacific during World War II and his work with the Department of the Interior, Dr. Taylor was uniquely prepared for the service he was to render to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the people of the United States in general. He had a disposition and personality which expressly prepared him for work with our Indian population and with the people of our off-shore areas. His patience with people and his genuine love for them as individuals were all-important assets in his work.

He rendered outstanding and effective service for all of us in the important and, at times, highly controversial legislative battles for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. In these programs, as in all other programs, he remained almost entirely in the background, furnishing factual information and material, and explaining the hopes and ambitions of those who were to benefit from such legislation to those of us who carried the legislative battle before the House. He was known to all of us as one who regarded the acquisition of factual material in order to build the proper legislative foundation as the most important part of the legislative process.

It was my good fortune, during the

years that he was with us, to travel with Dr. Taylor into the territories, especially in the Pacific, and to various of our Indian reservations. He was trusted and admired by all of those with whom he came in contact—coworkers, fellow citizens, nationals, and wards alike. He gave unstintingly of his time and effort in our programs in the Antarctica area, and he personally visited Antarctica.

I can truthfully say that I have never known a more genteel, yet highly disciplined, personality. I shall miss him very much, as all other members of our committee will, as the days ahead of us come and go.

I have, of course, been most familiar with Dr. Taylor's outstanding service to our National Government. However, he has been just as energetic and devoted in serving his community, holding many responsible positions in connection with church, school, and other community activities. In addition, he was an understanding and kind husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, as an indication of Dr. Taylor's outstanding service to his country, I am including, as a part of these remarks, a resolution adopted by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on August 30, and a few of the many communications we have received:

RESOLUTION

(Adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, August 30, 1967, upon learning of the death of Dr. John L. Taylor)

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has learned with profound sorrow of the death on August 29 at the Washington Hospital Center of its consultant on Territorial and Indian Affairs, Dr. John Lewis Taylor.

Jack Taylor, or "Doc," as he was familiarly known to all of us, was born November 25, 1910, in Oriska, North Dakota. His education beyond the elementary and secondary schools was at the State Teachers College, Luverne, North Dakota, Clark University, Columbia University, and Stanford University. It culminated with Clark University's admitting him to the degree of doctor of Philosophy in 1953.

Before joining the Committee's staff in 1953, Jack Taylor had served in the Navy during World War II and had had a wide variety of teaching experience in schools and colleges in and out of this country before, during and after the war. He brought to his position as a member of the Committee's staff a personal knowledge, derived from experience, of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and of their problems. More important, he brought with him a gift of patience, a love of people, a spirit of cooperation, a constant good humor, and a willingness to learn and to accumulate knowledge concerning the problems of the Nation's Indian population and of the people of its territories that stood him and the Committee in good stead throughout his fourteen years of service on Capitol Hill. His life was an exemplary one and, though it did not reach three score years and ten, was full of accomplishments for the good of mankind.

In view of all the foregoing, be it Resolved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, That the Committee hereby records its sorrow upon the death of Dr. John Lewis Taylor, extends its sympathy to Mrs. Taylor and to all members of the family, and directs that arrangements be made for permanent preservation of this memorial by printing it in the Congressional Record.

AUGUST 31, 1967.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Death of Dr. John L. Taylor great loss to Micronesia. His deep and sympathetic interest in these islands and their people will be long remembered and will be of enduring inspiration to those privileged to know him. Appreciate your conveying this message to Mrs. J. Taylor.

W. R. NORWOOD,
High Commissioner, Trust Territory of
the Pacific Islands, Saipan.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1967.

HON. JAMES A. HALEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALEY: For myself, and for all of those in Indian Affairs who have known and worked with "Doc" Taylor, I am writing to express our sense of loss at his untimely death.

The scholarly wisdom and sense of justice with which he conducted the business of your subcommittee will remain in memory for us in Indian Affairs to emulate.

With deepest sincerity,
ROBERT L. BENNETT,
Commissioner.

AUGUST 30, 1967.

Mrs. VIRGINIA TAYLOR,
Hyattsville, Md.:

Word of the passing of Jack Taylor comes as a shock to me. Because of the proximity of my office to his, our contacts have been frequent and pleasant. I shall sorely miss his presence and his cheerful word.

In a larger sense, Jack was a friend of the people of Hawaii. While making our problems as a Territory his concern, he understood and appreciated our aims to achieve statehood.

Because of his work as an able and dedicated professional staff member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, his name has also traveled into the far reaches of the Pacific. The people of these Pacific islands as well as the people of Hawaii share your sorrow in this hour of great loss.

My deepest sympathy to you and the other members of Jack's family.

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1967.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Secretary Dickerson and the people of Guam join me in expressing our deepest sorrow and sympathy at the death of Dr. John Taylor. Dr. Taylor was an exceptional public servant and a good friend of Guam. His passing was a great loss to us.

MANUEL F. L. GUERRERO,
Governor of Guam.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1967.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of Micronesia, we wish to express our deepest sympathy to the family of the Honorable John L. Taylor and his colleagues on the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOHN O. NGIRAKED,
President of the Senate,
Congress of Micronesia.
BETHWEL HENRY,
Speaker of the House,
Congress of Micronesia.

Mrs. Aspinall and I join with Dr. Taylor's legion of friends in acknowledging our loss and expressing our most sincere sympathy, especially to his fine family which he leaves to help carry on his contribution to immortality.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of Dr. John Lewis Taylor, Consultant on Indian and Territorial Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is with a deep sense of personal loss that I rise to pay tribute to the life and memory of "Doc" Taylor.

It was my privilege to recommend Dr. Taylor for the staff position on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the duties of which he professionally and faithfully performed since 1953, until his passing on August 29, 1967. During these 14 years, those of us who came to know "Doc" Taylor were impressed with the knowledge, counsel, and dedication he espoused so effectively in all his endeavors.

Dr. Taylor was aptly qualified to serve as our Consultant on Indian and Territorial Affairs because of his education and experience. A native of Oriska, N. Dak., Jack was a graduate of State Teachers College, Valley City, N. Dak. He was the recipient of a master's degree from Columbia University in political science, as well as a master's in geography and doctorate in philosophy from Clark University. Thereafter, Dr. Taylor served in Malaysia as an educator and administrator until entering the military service with the U.S. Navy.

Throughout the period of World War II, the Korean conflict, and thereafter, Dr. Taylor developed an expertise on territorial and insular affairs which, in addition to his experience in the field of education, made him acutely aware of the problems of the American Indian community. His outstanding service in these fields have made the name of "Doc" Taylor known in every Indian community of this Nation and throughout the territorial and insular possessions of the United States. His service to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was an outstanding contribution to our national life. The absence of his counsel and person will long be felt.

Although we shall no longer have the benefit of his hard work and good counsel, his spirit will remain with us, for Dr. Taylor was an exceptional person. He displayed a kindness and understanding seldom seen to all who sought his counsel. His patience and optimism instilled others to keep the light of hope burning.

"Doc" brought prestige to his professional, civic, and community responsibilities, and maintained a active interest in his professional military status, retiring as a Captain in the U.S. Naval Reserves. He participated in the activities of the Association of American Geographers and local parent-teacher associations. Dr. Taylor held many responsible positions in the activities of his church and served as a trustee at the time of his death. I had the good fortune to meet his associates in these other endeavors and all, I am sure, are deeply saddened by his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the love and devotion Dr. Taylor had for his lovely wife, Virginia, and their five children. I am certain that such a fine family can be justly proud of their father and husband. For, it can be truly said that he served his family, community, and Nation in the spirit of a great living American.

Mrs. Saylor and I extend our most heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Virginia, and the children, in this hour of their great loss—a loss we shall all share for time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the remarks of Dr. James Elliott Mooney, a friend of Dr. Taylor, on the occasion of his untimely passing:

DR. JOHN TAYLOR'S INTEREST IN ANTARCTICA ON BEHALF OF THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(By Dr. James Elliott Mooney)

In recent years many historians and geographers indicate that "both here and abroad they have been interested in the social aspects of history." There is, however, an underlying intellectual assumption that the historian as a craftsman imparts geography as an integrated portion of their discipline. John Taylor always gave me the impression that writers and intellectual planners were taking time to place their historical subject within geographic bounds.

Doctor Taylor was firm in his belief that any intellectual perspective that dealt with social and economic matters should also include geographic information in order to properly place the thought expressed. He looked with some reservation upon historians, scientists, and economists who kept within the narrow range of their subject. He wanted history and geography to be living attributes with vital motivations. That was why he thought of the new continent of Antarctica (new in the sense of geography, science and economics) as a real opportunity to explore the many facets common to our modern society. He envisioned U.S. Antarctica efforts as a perfect circle, containing all of modern thinking and researching, and that there would be one central place where such would be amalgamated.

So he went to the source of things to find out how this could be accomplished. He studied the many aspects of Antarctica which was an area among many others with which he was concerned. It should be stated here that the many interests which the United States had in Antarctica were not, and are not simple. They are complicated. To glean facts and to research are expensive motivations and during the past ten or fifteen years have largely been the responsibility of the Federal government.

Antarctica exists as a relatively new continent over the horizon, and at the bottom of the world which is increasingly attracting, and I might add challenging, the interests of modern man and his technology.

Dr. Taylor envisioned that the efforts down there that concerned the United States should be centralized and not diffused, and I agreed with him, and for a number of years I have, with a number of my colleagues, tried to do something about it. Neither Doctor Taylor nor I wanted to tolerate "willy-nilly" or "catch as catch can" scientific organization for scientific research. We both opposed unattached, and uncentralized activities. So, Doctor Taylor and I, at the behest of the late Congressman, (later Senator) Engle, studied to find out ways and means to accomplish something of a basic organizational nature which would make possible good administration through the most practical implementation. It was our belief that a unit in the government should be established as a means to this end.

Doctor Taylor visited Antarctica on two occasions during the recent activities on that continent. He talked with operations people, logistics specialists, scientists, legislators and administrators.

He inspected buildings being used, and spent a good deal of time reading programs and visiting projects being developed. He went inland by tractor and airplane, and I am sure he would have trekked by dog team if one had been available. He wanted facts. He, upon his return, outlined what he had seen and heard, and he turned this information over to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He talked with a number of those who were directly involved with Antarctic projects, in particular Admiral Dufek, Admiral Byrd, Admiral Tyree and myself. These conferences were held over a considerable period of time—perhaps several or more years. Doctor Taylor also discussed the programs with representatives of the State Department, the National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences.

He talked with Senators as well as with Congressmen. He arranged with others to have Congressional representation in Antarctica each year so that the legislators could observe at first hand the many operations carried on down on the "ice."

Doctor Taylor, in conjunction with others, arranged to have the Commander of the Naval Support Force, Antarctica, and the director of the scientific program appear before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs each year to impart first hand the efforts of the United States in Antarctica.

Doctor Taylor came to the conclusion that no matter what activities were being carried on by the United States in Antarctica, they were not tied closely enough together. On this, he conferred with Congressman Engle and Congressman Saylor, with Admiral Byrd and me, and like myself, was a leading proponent of the need for legislative authority to establish an Antarctic Commission. As a result, we were asked to prepare such legislation.

Doctor John L. Taylor did much to further the interests of Antarctica among legislators, who realized millions of dollars were being spent by our Government each year in Antarctica, and it has been difficult to properly assess the benefits gained from our activities in Antarctica year after year.

Doctor Taylor will be greatly missed for his many and greatly varied contributions. Not least among these was his untiring effort to improve the stature of Antarctic research and logistic organization.

Somewhere in the autobiography of Doctor William Lyon Phelps he wrote:

"The vast majority of persons are compelled to live without prodigious adventures, and without gratification of most of their transient desires; yet ordinary circumscribed existence can be exciting too."

Yet, Doctor Taylor was able to live both types during his life, but his calling while a member of the Interior Committee staff could hardly be termed a "sheltered life." It was "anything but dull."

I think most of us envied Doctor John L. Taylor's calmness and self control, and I might add, lack of ostentation. While Doctor Taylor seemed placid of temperament he was the kind of man who would go to the South Pole, who would endure hardships, not as a dull part of his daily existence, but rather because he had an inquisitive mind and a quiet self-reliance. There is a passage in "Pilgrim's Progress" which is rather emblematical of Doctor Taylor's life:

"... yet now I do not repent me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought his battles who will now be my rewarder."

TRANSFER OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS AND AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO RECOGNIZE MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES FROM SEPTEMBER 4 AND 5 TO SEPTEMBER 11, 1967

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent and Private Calendars, in order on Monday and Tuesday, September 4 and 5, and authority for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules, in order on Monday, September 4, may be transferred to Monday, September 11, 1967.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand that both calendars will be called on Monday? Is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct. Both calendars will be called on the Monday after Labor Day.

Mr. GROSS. Both Private and Consent Calendars?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct. Both will be called.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ESCALATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. DOW. 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. DOW. Mr. Speaker, many of us were worried and want to sound a warning about escalation in Southeast Asia.

It is true that those of us who have advocated a deescalation of the hostilities in Southeast Asia, and purposeful steps for peace, have been heartened recently. Polls signify that more and more of the American people are coming to see the merits of disengagement. One by one, colleagues of ours in this and the other body are changing their stance and showing more sympathy for deescalation in Southeast Asia.

Nevertheless, I am fearful that some in high stations in our Government will continue to move us closer to the brink. In the present changing climate of American thinking, it is a shame that our bombing advances closer to the borders of China; that it plunges deeper into the civilian areas of Hanoi; that it might at any time be intensified in the harbor of Haiphong, or at the dikes of North Vietnam.

It would be the irony and stuff of ancient tragedy if involvement in world war and all its catastrophe becomes irrevocable, just at the time when the light of reappraisal is beginning to dawn in the minds and hearts of America—just at the time when the great qualities of soul in our country are commencing to rectify our course and set it on the path to peace.

At this critical period, we must warn and appeal and hope that those who

hold our destiny in their hands will allow welcome change to proceed and not set it back by belligerent and contrary action.

Mr. Speaker, as a footnote to these remarks, I offer herewith for the body of the RECORD, the full account of my trip to Vietnam which was my privilege earlier this summer:

A CONGRESSMAN IN VIETNAM: TOWARD A PEACEFUL SOLUTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA
(By JOHN G. DOW, Member of Congress, 27th District of New York)

INTRODUCTION

A time occurs in the affairs of men and the events of state when politics and compromise are no longer possible. I have felt now for the past several years that our foreign policy all over the world demands a deep and thorough investigation—by the American people. They are well able to understand these matters, even though some say foreign policy is beyond the scope of the average citizen—a mystery that only a few can perceive.

I have a special conviction about our presence in Vietnam—I believe that it is a mistake.

It is clear that I am not alone in my dissent over our Vietnam policy. As I speak on the Floor of Congress and in many areas of my own 27th District of New York State, it is evident that many of my Constituents feel the same way.

In fact, they joined in a very striking and unusual measure. A large group of these good people in my District banded together and raised funds to send me for an on-the-scene "evaluation mission" to Southeast Asia. This is the first time that a congressman has been sent to Vietnam by his constituents. It was a very impressive way to manifest concern for our most critical foreign policy problem.

It may at first glance seem odd that a representative from a rural district in an East Coast state should feel so involved in Vietnam. But I hold that it is my duty to be concerned in all policy decisions—whether rural and local, or technical and foreign. My constituents are concerned, too, and I owe them a report.

We can see more and more that our gradual involvement in Vietnam is putting us on a dangerous path. We may not escape the spreading destruction. It is a path of pits and traps and quicksands.

I find it disturbing that the American people have not been doing more thinking about examining and weighing the Vietnam threat, which could so easily lead to atomic warfare, the destruction of our civilization—and yes, even much of the human race. All of this I can picture coming as a result of carelessness, or miscalculation, or misinformation in our geopolitical affairs. American families are so careful to provide for their family future. Certainly, they must be concerned for the future of our society. Can citizens who work a lifetime to accumulate college funds, retirement income and life insurance, be any less concerned for safeguarding the world structure we live in? The stakes are too great to be left exclusively to a limited number of American leaders who are deciding the future not only for Americans, but taking it upon themselves to decide for the rest of the inhabitants on our planet.

Too, I think it should be of importance to us, a civilized and perceptive people, in the 20th Century, to consider the feelings, objectives, and aspirations of the other people on this planet.

With a mind full of these thoughts, I went this June to Southeast Asia to see for myself what I could in the capacity of a congressman—and a private citizen.

It was my first visit to Asia, a land fraught

with many contradictions and improbabilities as Marco Polo discovered so long ago. My trip was short, a total of 19 days—but filled daily with interviews, meetings, inspection tours and travel. Even though the visit was brief, it was probably one of the most varied and comprehensive made recently by any politician, reporter, or missionary.

I interviewed some 79 people from riot-torn Hong Kong to the inundated Mekong Delta and up the DMZ (Demilitarized Zone) highlands near the 17th parallel and North Vietnam. I talked with 41 Americans in Vietnam, including our principal diplomats: Ambassadors Bunker, Locke, Koren, Cottrell, their aides and special advisors; seven American newspaper correspondents; a USO director; 10 U.S. AID fieldmen; General Westmoreland and some servicemen; representatives of charities; and four doctors in charge of hospitals.

I talked to 13 Vietnamese including Premier Ky, two editors, two Buddhist Venerables, a union leader, two professors, and Catholic Archbishop Nguyen van Binh. Also, I spoke extensively with the Vatican representative to Southeast Asia, Archbishop Angelo Palmas. And I spoke with nine foreigners of significant status.

In Vietnam I visited the cities of Saigon, Can Tho in the Mekong Delta, and Da Nang on the northern coast near the DMZ. I also visited seven villages, several of which are refugee resettlements. I toured four hospitals, including the Marine-Navy complex at Da Nang.

I traveled quite a few other roads in Vietnam. It is a little risky to travel some of these, but I mention this as a part of the scene there. Most of the roads are unsafe to ride after 6:00 p.m.—for that is the "witching hour" when danger and death are close in South Vietnam.

I interviewed 16 people in Hong Kong, Thailand, and Laos including diplomats, educators, field service representatives of charities, and U.S. AID executives. Many of these individuals could comment on Vietnam only in an indirect way; nevertheless, some of their observations were significant not only to Vietnam but for Southeast Asia as a whole.

I flew into the golden-templed city of Bangkok and then north into troubled Laos. There I was "bush-piloted" to refugee camps near the Red-held Plain of Jars, set down in picture-book landscapes of jagged, mist-capped mountains and wild orchid-flowered valleys.

One question that I was asked on returning home was how much did my position change from the one held before visiting Vietnam. I would say that I haven't changed very much except perhaps in a few lesser particulars that will be noted later. Nothing to be seen in Vietnam can wash away the central and basic mistake that America has made by going there. This point will be better understood if we consider a number of points that do not relate specifically to Vietnam but do involve general principles of foreign policy. These are detailed in the next section.

II. RECKONING BEYOND THE HORIZON

A serious shortcoming amongst us all is the temptation to focus on details of a situation, rather than to reckon with wider consideration beyond the horizon. It is so easy to think that events and misdoings of particular people in Vietnam justify our being there—as if we were responsible for every act everywhere on this globe.

One danger that grips us in these United States is the emotional response, part fear and part hatred, to communism. Communism deserves our opposition, but fear and hatred generally are poor counselors. Rather, we need wisdom and judgment in order to deal with communism's threat. In our anger toward communism, we may find ourselves in many places beating down all legitimate re-

bellions of men who are trying to improve their conditions. It is true that communism colors some of these rebellions. Yet we must not allow American boys to fight hungry men, and men who are struggling to secure a better existence for themselves. Powerful as any country is, it cannot survive the cumulative enmity of two billion desperate men.

Another doubt that still remains in my mind is whether the United States should be a world policeman. I asked this question of Premier Ky. I said we are a little alarmed in the U.S.A. that we may be imposing a "Pax Americana" on the world, and he said, "You can't help yourselves."

I thought that was a fair comment. Instead of hedging and denying, Premier Ky was saying that, in fact, America is becoming a world policeman. If we are, it seems to me that internally we will take on the trappings of a Police State while externally, wherever we assume the police role, we will be stamping out democracy. Both Pope Paul and Mr. U Thant have shown clearly their anxiety about our role, in part, because they have no voice in the earth-shaking decisions that the United States has chosen to make.

Thirdly, I have had some doubt whether we are moving with the tides of history to be on the beaches of Asia in a period when all the colonial powers are being driven out. The British withdrew, the French were defeated, and the Dutch were ousted. Yet, here we are going back. I know many people say, "Well, we have a different motive." That may be. However, a great many Asiatics, seeing us land on their shores, are not aware that our motive is far different from the motives of the former European colonial powers. This may be unfortunate, but I believe many Asiatics do feel this way.

A fourth important matter is our relations with China. It is plain that we have bases in Japan; we have them in Korea, on Taiwan, in the Philippines and on Guam. I suspect we could find one in Singapore. We support the Taiwan Chinese at their bases on Quemoy and Matsu, from which they launch bloody raids on China's mainland. These bases constitute a chain that the Chinese thoroughly resent. If we add to that two more links on the mainland of Asia, in Vietnam and Thailand, it seems to me that this assures and guarantees us eternal enmity, belligerency, and eventually war with China. In effect we are saying to China, "We will co-exist with you, but only as long as we have a chain around your throat." I am certain that China will never hold still as long as this situation remains.

So, I can't say that I've changed very much in those views which relate to broad policies that lie beyond the internal conditions of Vietnam.

A fifth and supremely important matter is that by escalating the Vietnam conflict in any manner, and by bombing North Vietnam, particularly, we are running the risk of a nuclear confrontation with Russia and China. Our bombs contain seeds of catastrophe that may explode throughout the world.

Accordingly, we have reasons for not staying in Vietnam that cannot be altered or watered down either by circumstances or events in Vietnam—no matter how large these may bulk when one is on the scene there.

III. THE SCENE AND THE HISTORY

Our small jet plane took a hard bank to the right. The blue East Pacific some six miles below changed rapidly to a rich Veronese-green quilt patchwork of troubled equatorial jungle. I knew then that Saigon was not far away.

"What will I find?" was the question in my mind. I didn't have long to ponder. For swiftly, the long silver wings were slicing a downward path over a bright red-roofed city on the banks of a swollen yellow river lined with rows of black-hulled freighters. The sign on the forward cabin bulkhead signaled

in three languages: "Attachez Votre Ceintures de Securitie," "Beos Day Nit Nai," and "Fasten Your Seat Belts."

Just as I thought the plane was landing in a green rice paddy by a row of thatched, huts, a mile-long concrete runway sprang out beneath. I was watching rows and rows of giant four-engine jet transports in olive green camouflage, then rows of needle-nosed jets poised menacingly in concrete bunkers, then a small one-story building with a large sign reading "Saigon Airport."

The aluminum doors swung open. We stepped out into a sweltering, bright Saigon afternoon. Soon I was riding speedily down long tree-covered streets surrounded by dozens of motorcycles and bicycles.

I was struck by contradictions in the scene. Trees were green, tall, flamboyant but they lined streets that were shabby, smoky, pock-holed. The greenery fronted pastel stucco buildings—many resembling Riviera villas—but, alas, these were shabby, weather-beaten, and gray with scale.

Through the "smog" (for Saigon is also plagued with a deadly combination of steaming humidity suffused with carbon monoxide and unburnt fuel), there was a constant flow of humanity. Vietnamese girls—sitting precariously on motorcycles behind determined young men, long silk gowns flowing elegantly in the wind—were a small touch of charm in the widespread drabness. I was amazed at the number of new motorcycles—Hondas, Suzukis, Lambrettas. When the lights on the street corners turned green, the little vehicles came hurtling through the intersection snorting fumes and growling.

What better sign of inflation in a war-torn and under-developed country? The money to buy shiny new high-powered motorcycles (mostly Japanese) has come, apparently, from war profits and indirectly from monies that Uncle Sam has put in the country. Here the city-dwellers are benefitting, finding a new way of life for the first time in their experience.

Certainly they are willing to let affairs continue as they are—taking their wives and families to the city's outskirts on weekends, visiting local temples, riverside cafes, or a new hilltop monument to an Unknown Soldier.

One of the major troubles in South Vietnam, I was immediately told, is widespread corruption, especially in the area of Saigon. This is admitted on all sides. Premier Ky told me personally that he knows of it. But he said, "I just can't eliminate officials every time I find there's something out of order. I often have to wait and wait. And I don't have the people to put in their places. Too, I have to wait for the right moment. Corruption isn't easy to eliminate here."

The corruption is thought to be most prevalent among Vietnamese military officers who have been appointed Province Chiefs. This group controls the rice distribution, a source of great power.

As an entry to the present condition in Vietnam, I think it is essential to note recent Vietnamese history. I mention this because quite a few people, both South Vietnamese and Americans, told me that it is impossible really to understand the situation without some historical background.

Vietnam has been a French colony since the 1880s. But, according to an eminent authority, the late Bernard B. Fall, it became infiltrated in the 1920s by communists, who immediately established the effective "Indochinese Communist Party" (ICP). In 1945, after the surrender of Japan, the Viet-Minh and the ICP disarmed the Japanese before the arrival of the Allies, and took over the extensive Japanese power structure. At Tehran and Potsdam it was decided that the former French colony would be occupied by the Chinese Nationalist forces down to the 16th parallel and by British Commonwealth forces in the south. The Chinese Nationalist

forces did not behave well and are remembered with bitterness by the peasants.

On August 16, 1945, the Viet-Minh announced the National Liberation Committee of Vietnam and shortly thereafter they entered Hanoi. Emperor Bao-Dai in the city of Hue surrendered the great seal of the Vietnamese Empire and abdicated.

On September 2, 1945, Vietnamese independence was announced from the Hanoi opera house, and Asia's second oldest (after Outer Mongolia) Communist state was born.

In late 1945, the French were allowed to return as colonists. Finally, after the French defeat at the battle of Dienbienphu in 1954, the Diem regime came into power in South Vietnam, and Ho Chi Minh retained firm control in the North. However, the autocratic Diem regime did not suit the peasants too well.

As a result of exploitation through centuries as well as recent years, it is said that the peasants have developed antagonism to outsiders, which includes their own government agents as well as foreigners. Vietnamese in some of the rural areas can hardly distinguish between French and Americans. These are all strangers to the peasants who use a generic word "nguai ngoai-quoc," which means literally, "person outside country."

Those who explain South Vietnamese government say that the French policy in Vietnam was to divide and conquer. This legacy is very important to remember for later on I will dwell on the divisions among groups in South Vietnam.

I would like to mention something about American personnel in Saigon. It is apparent—in many places—that we are in South Vietnam in great numbers. But in Saigon, it is not especially obvious. The U.S. military has kept the soldiers largely out of the city. In fact, the general feeling about American soldiers is that they are conducting themselves better than any U.S. troops have ever done before in any place where they've been sent overseas.

The immensity of the American presence is better seen at the great military bases such as Bien Hoa outside Saigon, Nha Trang, Cam Ranh Bay on the coast, and Da Nang up north. Within the bases, the vast extent of our commitment is visible. Hundreds of planes, trucks, armored vehicles, oil containers and hutments are lined up in profusion, all surrounded by barbed wire, sandbags and concrete bunkers. Looking from the air at this land of bright green rice paddies and clumps of verdant trees, our bases—laid out in huge sprawling concrete rectangles—are so out of place, an obviously foreign intrusion.

IV. FRAGMENTATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

One of the most serious conditions prevailing in South Vietnam today is the fragmentation of the society. If I learned anything on the mission, it was this: South Vietnam is a collection of many separate groups who are talking very little to anyone—especially to one another.

One of my principal concerns was to find out about the Buddhists, for that is the religion of the majority, although the devoutness of the people varies greatly. I spoke first to Thich Tam Chau, principal Buddhist leader at the Saigon temple. He is a man of peace; and simply stated, he would like the situation returned to the Geneva accords of 1954.

Next I spoke with Thich Tien Minh, head of the Buddhist Institute and a representative of the celebrated dissident Buddhist leader Thich Tri Quang. Thich Tien Minh is a man of high intelligence. He says we are not winning the war, and it is useless to fight "without the support of the people." He opposes the bombing of North Vietnam.

However, I found that all Buddhists oppose communism. Minh urges that the U.S. take a stronger hand in the South Vietnam

government. This is an attitude very prevalent among Vietnamese, especially the intellectuals and others dissatisfied with the present regime. Unfortunately they think the U.S. can control South Vietnam as it pleases. Thus many of the faults of present government leadership are laid at the door of the United States. When General Ky acts in a manner they consider to be wrong, they say, "The United States let it happen!"

However, officers in our diplomatic corps do not regard Ky as a puppet. They add, "We wish he were. He's very difficult to handle." The Premier might be considered a creature of the United States in a general way, yet still not cooperative with us in day-to-day specific matters.

Another of the indigenous religious groups is the Hoa Hao, a sect having Buddhist affiliation and very strong in one province of the Delta. They have been effective in keeping communists out of that province. Then there is the Cao Dai, an animist sect having considerable strength in the northern areas.

One group in Vietnam that most of us forget though—a group politically inert—is the "overseas" Chinese. A million Chinese live in South Vietnam, but you hear little of them. Perhaps they seek obscurity since they are torn between relationship to their mother country and their strong commercial commitment in Vietnam.

It was somewhat difficult to reach the Chinese group in Vietnam, and I had to talk to them indirectly through intermediaries. Many of them are eminently successful businessmen who prefer to remain anonymous.

They have had little political freedom or, you might say, few privileges of citizenship in Vietnam. The new constitution attempts to remedy this condition. I believe that they will be brought into a more active role. Many of the Chinese have sons fighting in the South Vietnamese Army, abbreviated and called ARVN.

Another interesting and important group in Vietnam are the Catholics. I interviewed the Archbishop Nguyen Van Binh, at his headquarters in suburban Saigon. I then talked with the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Angelo Palmas, from Sardinia. He is the delegate to Cambodia and Laos as well as to South and North Vietnam.

The two archbishops speak in the same spiritual vein as Pope Paul. One of them indicated it would be acceptable for the present government to sit down for talks with the Viet Cong. They are very much for peace and would like to see the bombing ended. At the same time, they think the North Vietnamese should respond by stopping the infiltration and acts of terrorism.

Then there is the labor group. Nearly one-half million workers belong to three principal unions. I spoke with the Treasurer of the CVT, by far the largest union. They strongly support the war, yet they, like others whom I met, are worried about corruption. "Any aid that America gives to be successful should go directly to the peasants," the Treasurer said. The CVT is also trying to organize the peasants and stresses that our aid is being soaked up by middlemen within the chain of corruption.

Then there are the intellectuals—brilliant, but a little impractical. I interviewed two newspaper editors and two university professors. Some of these men have been imprisoned at one time or another by the Ky government. They, too, do not care for communism and are quite vehement in saying so. Two of them once owned rice paddies in North Vietnam and are understandably resentful that their land was taken away. Like the Buddhists, these very verbal men hold strongly to the viewpoint that the U.S. can do almost anything it wishes in reconstituting South Vietnam. "America is all powerful. She should straighten out our troubles."

But they, too, admit to a lack of any unity

in the country. The following conversation may throw light on their thinking:

"Couldn't you subscribe to a document like our Declaration of Independence or a charter or articles of faith reflecting the desires and goals of the South Vietnamese?" I asked. "Why doesn't the United States give us one?" they answered.

"Americans can hardly understand your problem as well as you yourselves," I replied. "If you could formulate the articles of faith that are needed, certainly the United States would help you." I realized my answers were falling on skeptical ears. This conversation revealed that South Vietnamese set a high value on advice and precepts that they think the United States is capable of providing. At the same time they are sensible of the woeful inability of their society to coalesce into a form that is capable of absorbing such benefit.

It is important to note that in South Vietnam there is no true leader whom all groups admire. Hardly any leader in South Vietnam has the respect of more than a single faction of the society. South Vietnamese face a dilemma. They don't want communism, yet they have so little to put up against it. They are relying, I think, too much on the United States to provide the props for their society, to develop a program, move the pieces, and designate the leadership. I believe that they must do more of these things themselves.

The Montagnard tribes in the mountains are one segment of Vietnamese society that I did not see. Knowing that they have special problems in order to maintain their own identity, I wish I might have visited them, but it was not possible.

Still another element in the society, of great magnitude but little leverage, is the refugees. Mr. George A. McDonald, head of our AID mission there, spent all of one morning explaining the program of the U.S. AID Mission to me. He is a dedicated gentleman. He said that by the end of the year, roughly, the number of refugees who had come in from Vietnamese villages would reach the mark of 2,400,000, and by that time the number held in resettlement camps would be 1,800,000.

Let me say that one of the heartening aspects in Southeast Asia is the great work of many people from the U.S. AID Mission and in the charitable organization from the United States. Here are dedicated, courageous and sincere Americans who are trying to help the Vietnamese in every possible way. These are Quakers, Menonites, people of many religions, doing their best work under the most trying conditions. We can be proud of them. No matter what the settlement is at the end, I do hope that the work of these people may be permitted to continue.

Two sets of rivalries add further to the fragmentation of South Vietnam. One of these is the jealousy among South Vietnamese towards northerners. Nearly all of the Generals in the South Vietnamese army are northerners. This may account for faults in the performance of that army and for disenchantment among the peasants about the leadership in Saigon. A still further distrust exists between the military and civilians. Clearly the military dominate the government. Yet I heard nobody in South Vietnam volunteer approval or praise of their military administration. Many are critical of it. While the military ticket of Generals Thieu and Ky that came to be selected for the elections has clearly a lead position, I am not in the least certain that it is basically a popular ticket.

Finally, in this recital of divisiveness, there are the peasants, a vast segment in South Vietnam and probably the largest group of all. Eighty-five percent of the people in South Vietnam are rural inhabitants. These people are there, but they are awfully hard to reach. The historical alienation of these millions, which I have already mentioned,

is part of the problem, and I'll talk more about it.

It is a good question whether the divisions in South Vietnam will be resolved by the elections for President which are set for September 3. Besides Ky, the only one of the other candidates whom I met was Dr. Suu, who is President of the Constituent Assembly. Dr. Suu impressed me as a flexible person. I also take note of a candidate named Huong, who is rather a solid, not too brilliant man, but said to be reliable and honest. He was a Premier at one time and has a past record that is respected. He has the advantage that he is a southerner.

A further electoral problem is the advantage that a well-known candidate like General Thieu or General Ky enjoys because of being a head of the Government. He can have helicopters, loudspeakers and all the paraphernalia necessary to win, but which is hardly available to other candidates.

The electoral process will depend somewhat on the security that is maintained. The Chief of Security, General Nguyen Ngoc Loan, is regarded as being high-handed and one who would employ "questionable" methods to throw the election in favor of the military group. Reporters in Saigon told me that if Loan were not ousted, we might as well discount the value of the election. Since the time I was in Vietnam, I have heard that the General's power has been curtailed somewhat.

The principal conclusion to draw from all this, and one of the essentials in appraising South Vietnam, is the fact of the overall division in that society. Let me not imply that there is open hostility between these groups. There is some to be sure, but the real trouble is the paucity of effective dialogue between them. Each aspires to the achievement of a different objective, primarily the success of its particular group purpose. Each is waiting for the time when its own coin will come up heads and hoping that its particular cause will triumph in the end. Such orientation of purpose, more toward special objectives, and less toward defeat of the Viet Cong, makes a truly national success in the war very difficult.

To me, the forthcoming elections have somewhat the aspect of an American "mechanism" that we imagine will make Vietnam perform like America in the ways of democracy. After centuries of despotism and corruption, is it likely that democracy will spring full-fashioned into the seats of government, upon the happening of this election? Moreover, in the midst of warfare, where something like half the villagers will not participate and where the polls will be conducted "under the gun," what degree of validity can we expect?

I believe the elections should be held and we should wish well for them. But let us not entertain illusions that they will be a panacea for much, or truly conclusive.

V. THE FORGOTTEN MULTITUDES

From the small iron-corrugated building of "Air America" headquarters at the Saigon airport we were taken to what appeared to be a prototype of a new vertical take-off craft. This was a twin-engine, high-wing passenger plane from Europe. My luggage was packed in the fuselage compartments near the tail.

Very soon Saigon became paddies and fields as the plane inched through clumps of white mist loitering on the outskirts of the Vietnamese metropolis. The fields soon turned to water-logged rectangles and twisting rivers sprawled in all direction. This was, I realized, the Mekong Delta. So much water—muddy, blue, green, brown—all varieties.

Then there appeared what looked like yellow straw-covered islands tufted with dark green trees. I realized they were hamlets and villages, huts of reeds sitting above the rivers and lakes on poles. Long, canoe-type boats were seen on the waterways. On this inundated land is grown the country's

major produce. It is the rice bowl of Indochina, a rich asset to the South and desired by North and—perhaps by China? The plane landed at the province capital, Can Tho.

In the Delta transport is difficult. Few roads exist and even fewer power lines and telephone poles. Viet Cong snipers fire from thickets of bamboo across streams, rivers and canals, where pursuit is almost impossible. Paths exist amongst the village huts, but bridges are precarious and frail. It is here I realized the depth of isolation of the villages and its people. One can sense their puzzlement about visitors as they watch from the shadows under the thatch of their homes.

The attitude of the peasants in Vietnam should be a massive concern to us. I was not able to detect it directly myself, for the problems of language and time prevented me from learning more about their feelings.

It must be remembered that the history of rural villages throughout the colonial world—and the world of the under-privileged nations—is a long one of outsiders always taking something, but never giving anything in return. Taxes, sharp trading for agricultural products, high rents and a host of other abuses have been the lot of the villages in Africa, Asia, and South America. And this is especially true in Vietnam.

A scholar and anthropologist who lives in Stony Point, New York, Dr. Louis Dupree, brought this to my attention before I went to Vietnam. My observations confirm it. In this connection, he noted a scientific theory that the village community in isolated under-developed areas is conditioned to protect itself from outsiders, not only from foreigners but also from their central government.

In some Vietnamese villages, when strangers come, the real elders stay hidden and incognito. It could be that among these people the Viet Cong secure their converts and represent themselves as resisters to enemies of the village. It is clearly very hard to convince the villages, after centuries of this relationship, that suddenly a platoon of foreign soldiers who come into the village will be deliverers of something good for them.

Let me come to one point on which perhaps my thinking has altered a little since the Vietnam trip. This relates to such commitment or obligation as may be owed to those people in South Vietnam who have braved danger in their trust of the United States. The village elders who assumed office in the face of terrorism should not have to suffer as a result of their faith, it seems to me. Later in my visit, when I was close to the DMZ, I saw about 14,000 refugees from there who were being resettled. These people come out largely under the leadership of a Catholic priest named Father Co, who invited me to tea. Now wherever you go in Vietnam, no matter how miserable it is, the Vietnamese invariably bring out very pretty tea cups serving you jasmine-flavored tea. And from somewhere in that forlorn resettlement camp near North Vietnam, Father Co brought out very beautiful tea cups. Father Co is a leader of these people. He's a very intelligent, gentle man. Some how or other we should assure such community leaders protection under any settlement of the conflict.

VI. A LAND OF TORMENT

When we flew up from Can Tho in the Delta to Da Nang in the north of South Vietnam, it was possible to see a gorgeous vacationland. Rio de Janeiro is beautiful, but Nha Trang, Cam Ranh and Da Nang are just as beautiful.

High, dark-green cones of jungle mountains rise around those bays. At the feet lie shelves of ordered rice fields, green and tan and white. Vivid green waters edge along the rocky shores in places and then farther out, the water deepens to blue and then swiftly to deep blue.

Yet here a war rages. Occasional puffs of gunfire, flashes from gun muzzles and secret mortars in the mountains are here—not easily seen, but well understood by all who fly that land. The visibility of American bases within these beautiful harbors is all too regrettable. Fortified rectangles, acres of acres of equipment, and facilities for modern warfare are laid out on the shores of Elysian-like bays. And the base at Da Nang, headquarters for the conflict at the DMZ, dominates the city of Da Nang itself.

As for bomb destruction in the fields and villages—I can't speak with much authority because I saw rather little of the country at close hand. On my flights, it was possible to see some evidences of bombing and pockmarks on the hills, and bomb craters here and there. I would say that most of this evidence was outside of the villages, and rather small as a fraction of the untouched land. A good deal of the bombing has been done in hedgerows and ditches rather than in actual villages.

I visited the public hospital in Can Tho, the Delta and in Da Nang up North. The hospital in Can Tho was not overloaded, but the one in Da Nang was. Because of two patients to a bed, traction cases here could not be positioned as they should have been. I judge that there are close to 400,000 civilian hospital cases annually in South Vietnam. Of those a little over 10 percent—about 50,000—could be due to the war. However, not all civilian casualties of the war manage to reach a hospital.

I spoke to several patients in the hospitals. Though aided by interpreters, conversation was still very difficult. One of the great handicaps that obviously face us in Vietnam is the language barrier. Speaking to a number of patients in the hospitals, I asked them how they came to be injured. I talked to 18 civilian patients, 13 of them casualties of the war. Civilian casualties are often a result of kerosene stoves upsetting in the home. According to some hospital authorities, these create more burns than the napalm does.

Of the 13 civilian war casualties to whom I spoke, three claimed to have been struck by Viet Cong weapons, two by ARVN and one by American, while two did not know. Five were struck by objects from the air, although just one felt sure that the missile was American. This isn't a very extensive sample; I hesitated to bother those people. I spoke only to those who appeared composed enough to talk without inconvenience. I saw only four cases that were admittedly burned by napalm. That was in the hospital at Da Nang. No napalm cases were evident in the hospital at Can Tho. Normally, they say there will be about three napalm cases a month in that hospital. I don't know how many more there might be in the provincial hospitals. This is a debatable subject. I don't pretend to know any more than I saw.

We come at last to the principal question that I asked in Vietnam, indeed, that I asked the greatest number of people. It is this question: "What makes the Viet Cong fight so hard?" There were two classes of answers. The most prevalent view was that offered by American civilians, namely, that the Viet Cong are drugged by massive doses of propaganda originating in China, coming down to Hanoi, and finally reaching the Vietnamese peasants through communist representatives. Another view holds that the Viet Cong fight because they are intimidated or frightened into it. While there is certainly some truth in these views, I can't say that I subscribe to them wholly. I think they are a little oversimplified because the Viet Cong couldn't fight so hard as they do without something more than intimidation to inspire them.

On this subject I talked to others, particularly to our newspaper people. Of the nine press writers I spoke to, eight of them told

me we are not succeeding in Vietnam. So I rather judge from this that the American newspapers are not printing completely the views of the reporters on the scene. I don't say that I saw an absolutely representative cross section of newspapermen, but most of those that I talked to indicated that we are not succeeding. These men gave me a better idea and a little more explanation of why the Viet Cong fight as they do.

To the Viet Cong the conflict is a struggle for nationalism. Nearly everyone with whom I raised the subject agreed that 20 percent are nationalists who are continuing the wars of the past, seeking some national fulfillment. Also remaining among the peasants is a dislike of the French and foreigners generally. A part of this dislike has been transferred to Americans. Another grievance is abuses by the government in diverting rice and levying heavy taxes.

Still one more grievance that was mentioned quite often is the lack of opportunity for advancement. In Vietnam hardly anyone has become an officer in the ARVN, unless he holds a second baccalaureate. This is equivalent to completing junior college in the U.S. Bright young men who don't have that education apparently find more opportunity for their aspirations in the ranks of the Viet Cong.

As everyone knows, terrorism is a problem in Vietnam. The Viet Cong certainly employ terrorism. Terrorism is an article of their instructions; this point was emphasized to me by one of our American leaders. He admitted that South Vietnamese soldiers committed acts of terror and torture also. But, he said, at least it's not an article in our program, as it is in the program of the Viet Cong. I tallied up a number of the acts of terrorism that were listed during two weeks. There were 75 cases. I took one of the two-week lists and went over it. About 25 of the cases were directed at village elders—people who are leaders in the South Vietnamese society.

One-sixth of the cases were efforts to demolish bridges or village halls or facilities. Another one-sixth of them were outright attacks upon the ARVN soldiers. Still a third of the cases were apparently indiscriminate terror wreaked on individuals at random. Whether the Viet Cong had particular aims when they committed these indiscriminate acts I don't know, but there was no evidence of it in the list that I saw.

Next, let us examine the question of the pacification. This is very important, I believe. The pacification is an effort to complement military activities by teaching and aiding the peasants. There must be now about 400 pacification teams of 59 men each who go out into the villages and stay six months. These are Vietnamese. Few of these teams are up to their strength of 59. They wear black uniforms. They train for the purpose of helping the villagers. Half, or 30 of these men in each team, are police officers. They are armed to protect the group. Some of these South Vietnamese are doing a good job, yet others are not. They were criticized by at least one of the Buddhist venerables with whom I spoke, by the intellectuals and other people, and by our newspapermen.

Some members of the pacification teams tend to be corrupt. Many of them are said to join the pacification teams for reasons of prestige. They have sometimes had a record of being afraid. When it gets to be six o'clock, a number have been going back to the city, not staying out in the villages. The report on these teams is mixed. Undoubtedly some have done fine work.

Americans are oftentimes present with such teams. These are men of the U.S. AID Mission and they are dedicated. They serve as agricultural workers introducing new crops. They advise and train the South Vietnamese police. They conduct training in medicine and health. They aid in varieties of

community activities such as road and school-building. It is impressive to see these AID officials at work. The one drawback is their limited numbers.

A chief thing to note about the South Vietnamese pacification teams—to me, the critical factor about them—is that they must always have a platoon or a company of ARVN soldiers with them. Obviously it is not safe for the pacification teams to be out there and to do their work without this protection. The protection also includes national police and local militia. All this is very significant. It suggests that pacification cannot be achieved by good works alone, without military protection. It suggests that these military forces can never depart but must stay perpetually to guard the pacification. If American boys must be there, too, as reinforcements, it is a dismal future because of the numbers required.

The Chieu Hoi program was explained to me. This is the "Open Arms" policy and that's what Chieu Hoi means. Its purpose is to entice Viet Cong to come over to our side. In recent months more have been coming. About 40 percent more have come at this time than a year ago. Viet Cong who accept the open arms are given a personal allowance plus a bonus for weapons they turn in. There's a specified price on each kind of weapon. However, it's a little puzzling whether this program is all that it seems to be. I talked to one American newspaperman. He said that in a Delta camp where the Chieu Hoi plan was in effect, 60 Viet Cong were being held and reconstructed. He found that only one had been an arms-bearing soldier of the Viet Cong army. Most of the others were, I gather, camp-followers who came in for the rewards. This was the point that one of our correspondents made.

Many of our soldiers, our marines in particular, take time and are assigned to work in the villages of South Vietnam in order to help the people. They make a tremendous effort. I know that our men are well-disposed and very kind. I went to one village where marines were staying and was given the opportunity to address them. They are doing their best. Yet, it must be admitted, and this was apparent from my talking with some of them, that military men are not trained to specialize in this kind of community rehabilitation. Some have the knack, but not all.

We can expect our military to do their share on the military side, but you can hardly expect our boys, however well disposed, to win the pacification program by themselves.

It requires a long while for our soldiers and marines to secure the confidence of the villagers in Vietnam. Many of the people to whom I spoke in Vietnam said that it would take three, five or more years to win or to end the war. This was the opinion of half the people I talked to. The other half said that the duration of the hostilities is unpredictable. I asked many people, "When are we going to win?" "I don't know," they replied. "It's going to be a long time." The answer was similar, whether said by Vietnamese or Americans.

Beyond this, nobody ventured to picture what a win would be like. Would it be a complete pacification of South Vietnam? Pacification will require an infinite while, as I have indicated. Or would it be an American invasion of North Vietnam that would achieve the victory? As you know we are facing the North Vietnamese Army at the DMZ, the North Vietnamese have three divisions which are fighting against our one division, the First Marine Division. That division is doing very well. It is beating the North Vietnamese divisions in the fights. But this has cost our division in the neighborhood of 17,000 casualties.

While the North Vietnamese have three divisions out on the front lines, they have

fourteen in reserve, according to authorities. Fourteen divisions in reserve should be quite an element to deal with, and certainly one reason why winning the war in Vietnam will take a long time.

VII. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Before ending with thoughts for a solution of the great problem, I summarize very briefly the several conclusions that deserve remembering. These are a repetition of beliefs expressed earlier, but repeated here for purpose of emphasis.

I. In our anger at communism, we ought not to stamp out all legitimate rebellions of men who are trying to improve their conditions. These people should not be fought by our American boys.

II. For America to take the role of a world policeman will be undemocratic, and the strain on our society will turn us into a police state.

III. For an outside nation, like our own, to return to the beaches of Asia after the recent withdrawal of the great European nations is to oppose the manifest tide of history.

IV. China will never hold still and there will never be peace in Southeast Asia, so long as we maintain a chain of bases so tight around her throat.

V. By escalating and bombing in North Vietnam, we constantly risk a nuclear confrontation with Russia and China.

VI. I offer one further conclusion: If we should ever accomplish pacification and the Viet Cong are beaten down, it would be next to impossible for us to go away and leave the scene: It would take hundreds of thousands of our troops stationed there for an indefinite period of time, in order to maintain many position against this Asiatic rebellion.

VIII. SOLUTIONS

Finally, I offer suggestions for a solution.

First of all, I would say that we ought to stop the bombing of North Vietnam. It is quite debatable how much damage this is doing to them. It does much physical damage. Yet many authorities believe that it strengthens their resolve to win and to hang on. One very interesting point came into view in my discussions. An authoritative correspondent indicated that the more we bomb North Vietnam, the more she will become a tool of China because she will have left few resources of her own and will become dependent on what China may choose to give her. Moreover, the discussions involving a peaceful settlement with North Vietnam have been predicated on a stop to the bombing. This could be a first step acceptable to both sides leading hopefully to a permanent Vietnamese solution. Let us stop the bombing and learn the full potential that it may realize.

Another suggestion I offer is that we ask all the factions in Vietnam to join in discussions. As many know, and as I mentioned, this society is fragmented. Twelve or fifteen different elements and groups are not talking very much with one another. They need not do so as long as they remain under the American umbrella of protection. These groups are waiting for fortune to come around to such a degree that their respective causes may rise to the top.

It seems to me that we should take a much stronger line with them. We should talk to them one by one, or together, or in any way that Ambassador Bunker decides, and say to them that they must unite and carry more of the load themselves. I know it will be hard to undertake this and difficult to achieve. Yet we must put more of the responsibility on them. Only the Vietnamese can ever accomplish the pacification, if it can be accomplished.

I would also commence to withdraw our troops to the fortified positions along the coast as was suggested by Generals Gavin and

Ridgway. I think we have to do this in order to induce South Vietnamese to take more of a hand themselves. Also, in fairness to the world at large, we ought to de-escalate, rather than to escalate, the war. Moreover, I submit that a far lesser number of boys will be wounded and killed than will be the case if we persist in projecting the war into North Vietnam.

As another step, I'm certain that we should invite all the nations with any practical stake in Vietnam to discuss this problem with us on any footing they want. We might need several conferences. The United Nations should be involved, if possible. Countries that participated in the Geneva Convention on Vietnam in 1954 should be involved, and the neighbors of Vietnam such as Thailand and Cambodia. The Viet Cong must be included. We have to assemble all who have a position on this and get them somehow or other to talk without conditions. It is possible that none of these efforts will produce a response, yet I know that we should keep on experimenting with methods for peace.

Alas, the United States is experimenting in Vietnam all too freely with devices of war and escalation. We are experimenting with defoliation of the crops and forests, with personnel carriers in the rice paddies, mines in the rivers of North Vietnam, 175 mm artillery rifles, new targets for air strikes, and on and on. None of these new attempts have proved conclusive.

If we would experiment with measures for de-escalation and retrenchment, we could be no less successful. Experiments for peace and de-escalation will be just as uncertain, and just as challenging—but a great deal more rewarding than any other experiments we have attempted so far in Vietnam. We must experiment with peace.

EDUCATIONAL RADIO AND TELEVISION

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider what I believe to be one of the most important legislative proposals to come before it this session: the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, H.R. 6736.

In view of the fact that so many Members share by deep-abiding interest for innovative educational programs, I include in the RECORD the following letter from Dr. Delyte W. Morris, president, Southern Illinois University, endorsing H.R. 6736. His remarks are brief, but they succinctly and forcefully convey the very real need which exists for developing greater educational broadcasting opportunities.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,

Carbondale, Ill., July 14, 1967.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As president of Southern Illinois University, I support early and favorable action by your committee on the Public Television Act, H.R. 6736.

Southern Illinois University currently owns and operates an educational FM radio station and an educational VHF television station. We believe that a strong and viable system of educational broadcasting, both radio and television, will provide service to the entire

population of the United States in programming areas not presently available in either quantity or diversity of content. The Public Television Act, under review by your committee, is dedicated to that end.

I realize that the time of the committee is limited and the number of witnesses seeking to be heard are many. I have, therefore, refrained from seeking an opportunity to testify but would appreciate my letter being embodied in the record of the hearings.

Yours truly,

DELYTE W. MORRIS,
President.

WILLIAM McCAWLEY LEADS EAGLES

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends and constituents, Mr. William McCawley, Belleville, Ill., was recently elected as grand worthy president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. His election, I might add, was unanimous, something for all of us to envy.

This tribute indicates Bill McCawley's outstanding leadership and service to his organization and the high regard in which he is held by his fellow members. It reflects, too, his community's appreciation for his unselfish efforts on its behalf.

So that my colleagues may enjoy reading about this fine gentleman, I am inserting in the RECORD the article appearing in the August-September issue of the Eagle on my good friend Bill McCawley.

IRON MAN McCAWLEY: THE WORKINGMAN'S ORDER ELECTS A WORKINGMAN AS GRAND WORTHY PRESIDENT

(By Art Lindberg)

As a structural worker, "Iron Red" walked steel girders, one foot wide, fifty stories high!

This man, possessed of nerves of steel, is the new Grand Worthy President of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. He stands six feet tall and weighs two hundred pounds. William Andrew McCawley—carrying the nickname of "Red"—was unanimously elected to this exalted office at Kansas City, Mo.

He is a man of stature who has shown outstanding leadership qualities in gaining this coveted honor. Although a rugged individualist, he exemplifies a great awareness and compassion for the needs of others. He has been an active worker for the Cerebral Palsy Association in Illinois, and helped institute a new home for retarded children in his home town. The new Grand Worthy President is looking forward to a larger, more successful Durante Children's Fund promotion next year.

"Red" McCawley first saw the light of day on June 24, 1912, on a farm near Jacksonville, Ill. Says Red, "I'm of Scotch-Irish descent—and half Kentuckian." He was raised on the farm and attended Palmira High School where he excelled in athletics, particularly baseball, basketball, football, and track, winning 12 letters in these sports. As a track man he set new county and district speed records in the 440-yard dash. His athletic career came to an abrupt halt when he broke his back while playing semi-pro football after his high school graduation.

He entered the heavy construction field in 1942, and joined the Iron Worker's Union, Local 392, an affiliation of the International

Association of Bridge Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers. In 1953 he went to work for the Ben Hur Steel Erection Company, moving up the ladder of success to foreman and then general foreman—which he is today.

Although never serving as an officer in the union, he has played an active role in promoting amicable relations between the company and the union. He commands the respect of both management and labor, who value his judgment and opinion most highly. Possessing a rare quality of cool logic, he has proven himself a successful mediator. He has never been involved in a strike or walk-out.

William A. McCawley became an Eagle in 1942 when he joined East St. Louis Aerie 545. He served as worthy president of that Aerie and is a past Illinois state president. He was also a district and zone director. He helped organize new Aeries in Jacksonville, Dupo, and Chester, Ill. He served as Grand Worthy Chaplain, then for two years on the Board of Grand Trustees. Last year he served as Grand Worthy Vice President.

The McCawleys are an Eagle family. Red's wife, Helen, is a Past Madam President of the Auxiliary and presently serves as the treasurer. She was twice named "Mother of the Year" by the Auxiliary. Two daughters and a son are all married. Both sons-in-law and son are members of the Eagles. The McCawleys have 12 grandchildren.

Red McCawley likes the great outdoors. His favorite hobby is fishing so they live in a comfortable home by a lake in Belleville, Ill., a suburb of St. Louis. They are members of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Belleville.

Whether it's walking a steel beam, mediating a labor dispute, organizing a new Eagles Aerie, or promoting a charity drive, the new Grand Worthy President thinks positive and emerges victorious.

Everyone likes a winner. The Eagles have one in its newly elected leader, William Andrew (Red) McCawley.

"TOMORROW'S STRATEGY"—ARTICLE BY COL. STEPHEN J. SALTZMAN

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and fellow Americans a very provocative article written by Stephen J. Saltzman, a retired U.S. Air Force colonel, published in the August issue of Air Force & Space Digest.

Although I do not agree completely with Colonel Saltzman's argument, he brings vast experience, insight, and a refreshing candor to bear upon the continuing debate over America's military strategy.

I recommend Colonel Saltzman's article, "Tomorrow's Strategy," to all persons interested in military science and world politics, and under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW'S STRATEGY: OUT OF THE JUNGLES AND INTO THE LAB

(By Col. Stephen J. Saltzman, USAF, retired)

The basis of US strategy can be stated simply. It rests on the notion that we can

deter nuclear war and at the same time avoid an arms race by building a missile force only large enough and secure enough—and clever enough—to withstand any level of attack and still strike back to inflict unacceptable damage on the attacker. This notion is labeled "assured destruction."

It is becoming clear that our strategy of assured destruction has had an effect on the Soviets exactly opposite to the effect it was hoped to have. Instead of encouraging them to be content with some relatively low level of nuclear forces, a kind of nuclear stalemate, it has encouraged them to go for superiority by increasing their supply of high-payload missiles, by designing orbital weapons, and now by deploying antiballistic missile system.¹ Some students of these matters are concerned at signs that we will continue to try to make our strategy work; that we will patch and mend, cut and try. These students are concerned that each new fix and each new rationale will mire us deeper in a bog whose quicksands are no longer as easily identified as they once were.

Tomorrow's strategy will have to be designed around the military forces that are being laid down today; the prospect of shaping tomorrow's strategy around today's forces offers a famine of alternatives for some future President. Tomorrow is almost on us. And today's military force structure is a costly matrix which hardheaded realists will want to amortize slowly, which its designers will not abandon easily, and which new strategists will not be able to change swiftly, hampered as much by the very long time it takes to design and build new weapons as by resistance from those who will insist on getting the most mileage from the existing investment in military hardware.

THE BASES OF OUR STRATEGY

When you begin to address this problem, you look naturally for its source. You look for the fulcrum from which today's strategy gets its purchase, the keystone that locks together strategy's arch. Two of these we can identify rather positively. There may be others; these two suffice to illuminate the area.

The first of these we may call The Parity Concept, a concept that built upon the thesis that nuclear war is not an alternative available to rational governments but tempered that thesis with a fine report for pragmatism—such a war *could* occur; you'd best face that fact and be prepared to cope with it. This concept held that no progress could be made toward peace unless the military environment could first be stabilized.

With the invention of nuclear weapons and high-speed delivery systems, the offense had outstripped the defense, a highly unstable situation. One way to correct this imbalance is through arms control. But the proponents of parity held that another and perhaps more practical way is to bring your nuclear weapons and their delivery systems into balance with the enemy's. In this way you reduce his fears, prove your good faith, and remove the pressure to engage in a spiraling arms race. These theorists argued that the national self-interest is best served by this course of action. All that remains is to convince the Soviet that his self-interest is also best served thereby. Until you can convince him, however, you maintain some edge of superiority but show good faith by a cautious and visible phasing down to parity.

Mr. Paul Nitze, until recently Secretary of the Navy and who on June 30 replaced Cyrus Vance as Deputy Secretary of Defense, enunciated this idea publicly in 1960. In a paper,

¹ The problems inherent in maintaining a strategy of assured destruction and a suggested new strategy were dealt with in detail in "Nuclear Strategy and the Arms Race," by Col. Richard C. Bowman, USAF, AIR FORCE/SPACE DIGEST, April 1967.

he wrote of a Class A and a Class B nuclear capability.² He said that a Class B capability—one in which you deter an enemy by having enough secure nuclear strength to retaliate powerfully but not enough to destroy him—was far preferable if the enemy could be convinced that it was also in his best interest to maintain this kind of force. Failing to convince him, however, Mr. Nitze said that the only rational strategy was to develop and maintain a Class A capability in which you have clear-cut superiority.

It was this kind of thinking that led Secretary of Defense McNamara to remark shortly after he took office that he would breathe easier if the Soviets would develop second-generation intercontinental ballistic missiles to replace their exposed early models. The early models sat on top of the ground and would probably be destroyed if we should attack first. Secure in deep silos against attack, however, second-generation missiles would not have to be used at the slightest provocation, and you would thus reduce the likelihood of their use at all. The parity concept only makes sense when both your nuclear force and your enemy's can survive an attack. Exposed, "soft" bombers and missiles didn't meet this requirement. Soft missiles were quickly done away with, and the bombers are following.

To convince those who felt that the Soviets could not be trusted to cooperate in such a heady gamble, along came the categorical statement that an all-missile posture is safe, that the thirty minutes' flight time and half-mile accuracy of ICBMs is going to look good for any reasonable future planning period. Since, therefore, there are no strategic military jobs that cannot be done by improved ICBMs dug more deeply into the ground or carried by submarines at sea, and kept modernized by improvements, it became possible to eliminate any serious thought or work toward developing follow-on strategic systems, including military space systems.

Mr. John Rubel, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense at the time, was able to say these things in 1961.³ He was able to repeat them with new emphasis in a 1962 speech that was heralded as a major policy statement.⁴

Dovetailing with The Parity Concept, a second idea exerted a tremendous influence on New Frontier strategic views. This was the idea that internal and external pressures on the Soviet government would have a moderating influence on its long-range goals, and quickly.

Walt W. Rostow, who is now a Special Assistant to the President, was the idea's principal architect and untiring salesman. He reasoned that such pressures had always turned militant states into conservative ones. But he felt that no states had ever suffered the order of "corrosive dynamics" now affecting the Soviets—massive agricultural deficiencies, a public clamoring for long-promised but long-delayed improved living standards, the growth of pressure groups within Russia, the demands of the satellite states, the burgeoning economies of Europe and Japan, the abrupt halt of The Great Leap Forward in Red China, and the Russian-Chinese schism. So Rostow hypothesized that at some point in time, perhaps as early as 1971, the danger of war with the Soviets would recede. With war fear no longer a factor, the struggle against communism would then take social, psychological, technological, political, and economic forms, and we should be devoting

much of our energies and resources to preparing ourselves for conflict in those areas.⁵

If you were persuaded by this line of reasoning, it became relatively simply to accept the follow-on thought that there was really no requirement for strategic military forces beyond those then in production or improvements of the same. Coupled with the parity idea and its technical support, lingering doubts about Rostow's point tended to disappear. Either idea standing alone posed high risk. Together they seemed to cancel out the risk or at least to make the risk acceptable.

CURRENT STRATEGIC PROBLEMS

In the years since the new strategy took shape, difficult problems have confronted the United States, some of which defy solution. A big problem, and close at hand, is obviously Vietnam and the very large war we are waging there to guarantee the right of a people, patently unable to agree among themselves, to agree upon their political future. Stated that way—and how else can you state it?—it is a Wonderland nightmare. Even more nightmarish is the image of our nation moving more and more of its major pieces into the protection of a pawn it has probably advanced too far.

Another problem is related to the first. The development of The Great Society is stalled, or at least impeded, by the diversion of a treasury of brains and material and money and men. What value is there in holding the Soviets at bay with a cost-cutting policy of assured destruction instead of a more expensive policy of superiority, thus generating funds and energies and manpower to develop The Great Society so we can engage the Communists nonmilitarily at the point when war danger recedes—when we are detoured from our nonmilitary goals through a military quagmire that drains our strengths and prevents us from attaining one of the major goals our strategy was designed to attain? Thirty to forty billion dollars a year would build a lot of Great Society.

There are larger problems, although their lack of immediacy tends to cloak them from view. Perhaps the most distressing of these is that while we face west to Vietnam, the greatest of our post-World War II alliances appears to be crumbling at our backs. NATO, created and built on the foundation of US nuclear superiority, has had its military base all but wiped away, and its political base was never very strong. The process of disintegration began with the Berlin Crisis in 1961. After Berlin there was no longer any reason for Europeans to be confident that the United States would back them up with nuclear defenses. To the contrary, our frantic efforts to rush nonnuclear reinforcements to Europe made it obvious that we probably wouldn't. Berlin pulled the plug and confidence ran out fast. And our recent decision to pull back 35,000 troops gave the *coup de grace* to any notion of a nonnuclear defense.

The fact is that de Gaulle is correct: Traditional concepts of mutual defense alliances are invalid in the face of nuclear weapons. Atomic warfare is simply too dangerous for a nation to engage in it willingly for the benefit of an ally. It has become axiomatic that nuclear defenses will be used only when national interests are identical, not when they are merely mutual. Identicality of national interests implies political union, a vision that has vaporized in the heat of de Gaulle's drive for a renaissance of Gallic greatness. Our own ineptitude also contributed to the demise of that goal which many Americans desired so greatly.

Another and major source of concern is that belief in a US-USSR détente is causing us to be indecisive about the technological

war. US military technology long ago reached a state of advanced tumescence and in large part has had to lie moist and quivering, waiting to be taken. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, unaffected either by the war in Vietnam or by any deep belief in a peaceful future, is using today's hiatus to move rapidly ahead in space and unquestionably in other military technology fields that could give them strategic dominance in the 1970s. Those who face the fact that we have contained the Soviets primarily through a dwindling strategic dominance suffer from the niggling gut feeling that there are some things we ought to be doing in research and development that we aren't doing.

And then there's the Red Chinese bomb, an unhappy reminder of the existence of another militant giant's growing military power. It is symptomatic of the fact that the world, no matter how fervently we would wish it, simply won't stand still.

There are more problems. And the list, unmercifully, grows. But these serve as illustrations.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

A fighter off his balance cannot begin to make his strength and skill felt until he regains his footing. This seems to be the case with the United States today. There are some immediate problems that must be solved even as we begin to shape a new strategy.

Again, the most obvious is Vietnam. How to conclude a war we never wanted and in which we seem unable either to prevail or disengage? The variety of options has long since dissolved. Ho Chi Minh has no wish to negotiate. That seems to leave us with the choice of winning or getting out.

Has anyone taken a dispassionate look at withdrawal? Just what would such a move cost us?

In terms of lost territory, it might cost little. The Chinese have been fighting the Vietnamese for a thousand years and have never managed to conquer them. If we accompanied our withdrawal with certain well-advertised assurances to more stable governments in the area, such as Thailand, and with expanded military assistance commitments there and naval commitments in South China waters, there is good reason to believe that our withdrawal from Vietnam would not initiate a series of falling Southeast Asian dominoes.

In terms of reduced credibility in US guarantees, it is at least moot that withdrawal would affect either the US image abroad or our treaty arrangements. If we rationalized our disengagement by citing the inability of the South Vietnamese to form a stable government, the Western world might applaud our move. Indeed, a global opinion survey might well show that most governments and most people regard our continued actions in Vietnam as ill-advised if not plain stupid. And you feel certain that historical hindsight will write the Vietnamese War as a major and perhaps crippling mistake, depending, of course, on whose historians are around to write that history.

It is in terms of lost face and national pride that the cost of withdrawal could be high. But the cost of saving the national face in Vietnam comes high. Perhaps too high. Only time will tell how high.

If you are unwilling to look dispassionately at withdrawal from Vietnam, then it seems you must be willing to face up to a dispassionate look at the risks involved in concluding that war as quickly as possible and at the least cost. In an either-or situation, how can you deny the logic of such a proposal? Can you describe a viable third alternative?

It must be clear by now that incremental increases in US strength fighting under the same ground rules and with the same restrictions won't do the job. Given the French-, British-, and now American-proved axiom that it takes approximately fifteen

² "Strategy in the Nuclear Age," by Paul H. Nitze, Foreign Research Center, Johns Hopkins University, 1960.

³ "The Military Impact of Astronauts," by John H. Rubel, *Missiles & Rockets*, October 1961.

⁴ Speech to Aero Club of Washington, D.C., by John H. Rubel, November 1962.

⁵ "West Awaits New Red Strategy," by W. W. Rostow, *Washington Post*, December 30, 1962.

formal troops to cope with one guerrilla and given the fact that a horde stands behind the Viet Cong, how can you argue with Senator Fulbright's warning that Vietnam is "an open-ended war"?

If we are to conclude the Vietnam War as quickly as possible and at the least cost, then it is obvious that we must isolate the Viet Cong from outside support so we can finish him off inside South Vietnam, so that we can put an end to the "open-end" feature of this war. This means, for example, attacking targets we haven't been allowed to attack. It means closing the port at Haiphong by mines, by blockade, or by bombs. It means considering extreme steps, such as clearing an easily defended border around South Vietnam's jungles cheaply and quickly with small tactical nuclear weapons, as Gen. Fredric Smith suggested in a 1960 article,⁶ instead of trying to do it at exorbitant cost and slowly with bulldozers and Marines as we recently tried on a twelve-mile section of border.

In a word, it means upping the ante. In a word, it means risk. If we are unwilling to fight with the means at our disposal instead of pussyfooting around in dread of esoteric notions like escalation and at a cost in flesh and material resources that is fast becoming unbearable, then it is time for us to use the words that have ended all wars since time began: "Let's get the hell out of here."

The Red Chinese problem must be faced, perhaps less pantingly than Vietnam but certainly with more alacrity than is implied in the official line that, although Red China has the bomb, it will be a long time before Red China develops modern delivery systems—another myth that isn't holding up too well.⁷ Aside from the fact that major cost reductions for rocket vehicles have put a delivery capability within reach of the poverty-stricken Red Chinese, is it mandatory that a nuclear weapon be delivered by "a modern delivery system"? Or in thirty minutes? Might not a suitcase, or a lot of suitcases over a long period of time, do the job just as effectively? An Oriental might just be thinking along those lines. He usually does think along the lines of the simplest solution. And that fact inevitably comes to us as a surprise.

So, it is time to begin—in Sun Tzu's phrase—to "shape" the Red Chinese instead of being shaped by them. The obvious *cheng* of Vietnam is shaping us and softening us for some less obvious *ch'i*, Sun Tzu's dicta on war have been basic to Chinese strategy since 500 years before Christ and have been unaffected by such latter-day strategists as von Clausewitz. It is reasonable to assume that that old man is beaming approvingly at the modern practitioners of his art. On the other side of that coin, you wonder at the suitability of our tongue-in-cheek aspirations to head off the Red Chinese via US-USSR cooperation against a common threat.

Beyond question, one of our most desperate problems is at home. The Vietnam syndrome—Save the World—has created the Vietnam backfire—Hands Off the World. Our strategy to contain communism by guaranteeing freedom of choice for anyone requesting assistance has swung a large segment of our public opinion to a viewpoint you can only describe as isolationist. Complicating the problem further, this new state of the public mind is most prevalent among the

very persons who will have to support a new strategy, the mass of today's youngsters who will be tomorrow's voters and taxpayers. Perhaps it is symptomatic of age (in states as well as in individuals) and of the kind of creative decline that marks a society's apogee that we turn, in our less-confident years, to worship power as the only true guarantor of our security, and perhaps the young persons who oppose today's policies will, with age, take what we may euphemistically call more moderate views. But for those who must plan tomorrow's strategy, this problem of the public mind is a frustrating but necessary factor to consider. What assumption would you make regarding tomorrow's public mind? Since your strategy would largely stand or fall on the accuracy of that assumption, it assumes major importance.

Can you imagine a U.S. President today who would have the political courage to intervene massively in some new crisis far from home? Can you imagine the United States in another war of attrition where we wear the enemy down or he wears us down? Yet that sort of intervention, that sort of war, is basic to the military force structure (bayonets and helicopters and antiguerrilla specialists and World War II-Korean-type forces) we have built and are building in expanding numbers to support our strategy. Can there be any doubt that our strategy is faulty or has in fact been breached? Where are we planning to use these forces after Vietnam? Another Cuba or another crisis that directly affects our national interests would bring instant public-supported reaction. But another Vietnam? An African crisis? In point of fact, we might find it difficult to arrange for intervention.

The Organization of American States has consistently rejected the U.S.-sponsored proposal for an Inter-American Peace Force (which would be, as these things are, largely U.S.) because such a force would "violate the principles of national sovereignty." What part of that OAS decision is a reaction to daily impressions of the loss of national initiative to a crusading military-assistance force? So the new strategist must add to his burden the problem of a strong international reaction against intervention. If the cure appears to be worse than the disease, maybe these nations we are preparing to save won't want to be saved. Maybe they'll prefer to fumble through on their own. And how does that affect the United States security and the new strategy?

TOWARD A NEW STRATEGY

Where to begin in the formation of a new strategy? Certainly you would want to save as much of the old as remains useful. All of it hasn't been overtaken by events. All of it hasn't been proved faulty.

You would want, for instance, to preserve much of Rostow's thinking. Certainly tomorrow's Soviet Chairman is going to be much more troubled than today's Chairman by internal and external stresses, and certainly this is going to soften Soviet militancy. Besides, this idea appeals. It is the kind of positive idea that solidifies national opinion. It appeals alike to fact-facing realist and to idealistic intellectual. No one wants war. Not even our fiercest hawks want war. No one wants to make the future mark time while we solve more imminent problems first. Everyone wants to get on with the future, confident in his own security and well-being and in even more utopian conditions for his descendants. So you would want to save much of Rostow's thesis and get on with The Great Society. You might, in time, even hope to apply the same concepts, cautiously, to the Red Chinese.

You would continue foreign aid on an increasingly selective basis and continue the present trend toward *quid pro quo*, posting continued aid on continued good performance, a policy that recognizes that you will be disliked whether you assist or not, that a desire to be liked isn't any kind of a basis

for foreign policy anyway, and that world opinion is a will-o'-the-wisp.

You would want to preserve a capability to react swiftly—instantly!—and nonnuclearly to international crises where our assistance was requested or where our interests were threatened. This capability should be large enough to handle several simultaneous crises, but it would probably be wise to plan only on strengths sufficiently large to confront an aggressor with the fact of US presence, a *fait accompli* he would have to circumvent if he desired to continue with his aggression.

But this crisis-handling force would only have meaning if it were backed up by strategic military strength that the Russian and the Chinese would respect and that others with aggressors—Communist-exploited or no—would have to consider before continuing the aggression in the face of US presence. Here, it seems, is where present strategy stumbles hardest, and it is here that the new strategy must concentrate.

What direction should you take in the development of new strategic strengths? Obviously you don't throw away what you have. And obviously you try to fix what you have so that it can do the job better. But there are other things you can do.

If you base your thinking on the assumption that the nuclear weapon is the last weapon man will invent, then you proceed quite naturally to the conclusion that a Maginot Line of survivable and deliverable weapons is the be-all and end-all of strategic weaponry and that all you must do is to embellish and amplify and protect and sophisticate the one you've already got. You proceed to this conclusion even in the full knowledge that a static defense has always been flanked by a determined aggressor, as ours is being flanked today. And anyone would concede that in terms of explosive power the nuclear weapon is quite ultimate. What value explosive power of an order of magnitude two or even twenty times today's, excepting for specialized applications such as space-detonating missile defense systems?

But the new strategic thinker must ask himself where, in the doctrine of war, is there a rule that a weapon must explode, or make a noise, or raise a lot of rubble? And then he must test his thinking against this question. A weapon of the future could, in fact, affect only the climate. Or communications systems. Or the mind. Or the nervous system. Or the reproductive process. What then of your expensive, foolproof, static nuclear defense systems?

So in your new strategy, you would want to unfetter our vibrant technology to regain and then to maintain worldwide military technological superiority.⁸ The result of that unleashing would not only support the new strategy; it would become a weapon in itself. It would become a weapon whose effects could be used psychologically or politically, as well as militarily. Technological victory, in your hands, could give you the means to control aggression. In your hands, it could end wars and the threat of wars. In a dangerous world, technological defeat could be fatal.

Like the tone of Rostow's thinking, technological warfare also has its appeal. It stimulates the imagination. It is dynamic. It is a policy that can rally allies around new strengths. It is a policy that says we are tired of being pushed around and of having our security threatened and our well-being disturbed. And it is a policy that gives you the highest return in security for the dollar invested. It also gives you a high payoff feedback into the civilian economy.

The old strategy has built rigidity into the

⁶ For a detailed exposition of how nuclear weapons might be employed in a tactical war situation such as Vietnam, the only authoritative article on this subject available in the public domain, see "Nuclear Weapons in Limited War," by Gen. Frederic H. Smith, Jr., USAF, *Air University Quarterly Review*, Maxwell AFB, Ala., Spring 1960.

⁷ "The Myth of Technological Stalemate," by J. S. Butz, Jr., *Am. Force/Space Digest*, March 1967.

⁸ Brig. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, III, USAF, addressed the problem of military technological superiority in his article "Defense on the Technological Front" in *Air Force/Space Digest*, June 1966.

end of the war spectrum that can kill us—the strategic end. It has given us essentially a pure missile posture, with its one-option “go-no-go” characteristic, an all-nuclear strategic posture in a world that shrinks in horror from nuclear explosives, a posture whose only useful effect is to threaten and whose threatening ability is becoming less and less credible. There aren't many men who could bring themselves to use such a capability, even in retaliation. And their numbers will shrink.

There are many who will say that a policy of technological warfare is destabilizing and warlike. They will say that it will set off another arms race. To them you must say that it takes two to tango. You must say that the Soviet is already running as hard as he can; the only reason we don't see the specter of an arms race today is that there is only one contestant. Besides, like the Soviet, we aren't going to display our plans on a sandwich board. There are things you can do that will provoke the Soviet and there are things that are not visible and will not provoke him. There are things going on in his laboratories and in his space experiments that we would probably find quite provoking if we knew of them.

The decision to initiate the Manhattan Project (and similar decisions to initiate similar projects in other countries) opened a Pandora's box. We opened the box and we have pestilences abroad. Rational men know we must live with those pestilences. Refusal to think about the unthinkable won't make the unthinkables go away. They exist. It would be unimaginable folly to turn our backs on them or to make our strategic plans as if they didn't exist, or as if today's bubbling technological cauldron won't produce new pestilences to threaten our existence.

The original Pandora's box contained, among all the plagues, Hope, which remains as man's sole comfort in misfortune. You hope for a better future. You hope our leaders will have the vision and wisdom and statesmanship to move our society to greater heights and that these new peaceful responses will guarantee our safety and well-being. You are dismayed, shamed, by your own careful conclusions that say: Rely on power until peace is assured.

But you remember, from *Ecclesiastes*, the verse:

“If the serpent bite before it be charmed.
Then is there no advantage in the charmer.”

THE “CAN-DO GENERATION”

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an article which appeared on August 27, 1967, in the *Herald-Advocate*, a good and substantial newspaper published in Wauchula, Fla.

With all the confusion, marching, and protesting going on involving a lot of our young people this day and time, apparently there are still people in the United States who have returned to their own communities after finishing their education and have assumed their responsibilities of citizenship. These young men and women are making substantial contributions to the welfare not only of their own communities, but also to their State and Nation.

The column I refer to has been written by one of our fine young Floridians, Larry Smith, who, by his own example and observations, illustrates that his is a generation not of protest, but of those who believe that under our form of government, one of its cornerstones is to reward people in accordance with their ability to produce and assist in the making of progress and, therefore, in building a better nation.

It is refreshing to know that in the midst of so many examples of people advocating negative actions and protest of various kinds, there are those young people with positive, constructive attitudes and actions who represent a “can-do” rather than an “I-won't” generation.

The editorial column follows:

CRACKLIN'S

(By Larry Smith)

We reached a plateau of sorts Saturday night, the 89 of us who streamed back into Hickory, N.C., for the tenth anniversary reunion of our high school graduating class.

It was the first time many of us had met since we received our diplomas in June, 1957, and thought we had the world by the tail.

There was the usual handshaking and backslapping and “howareyoudoing” and “whereareyoulivingnow” chatter.

There was laughter. At receding hairlines, expanding waistlines. At comic prizes that went to my wife and me for having the most babies. And later in the evening at my winning a door prize of concrete patio blocks—more than 700 miles from home.

There was shocked disbelief at seeing an old flame—once so quiet and shy but now a slightly pudgy bleached blonde swinger wearing a pink mini-skirt.

But there was wonder, too. At how suddenly the 10 years had slipped by. The sudden realization that life doesn't go on forever; two of our classmates have died untimely but natural deaths. Life seemed dearer for that.

The evening brought to mind one writer's recent description of our age group as the “Forgotten Generation”—born too late for World War II, too early for the Korean Conflict, and now too old for the “Ban the Bomb” movement. There wasn't a bearded beatnik among us.

I'd prefer to think our lives have a little more substance than that description implies. In the brief span of 10 years many of our class members are well on their way to success in business and professional fields.

Our class has produced a lawyer, minister, teachers, accountants, chemist, engineer, and inventor, nurses, an actor, a fashion model, two editors, a pharmacist, dentist, several who already own their own businesses, and many others who have made creditable contributions to the business community.

The “Forgotten Generation?” I don't believe it. If a catch phrase is necessary to identify us, I'd sooner use the “Can-Do Generation.” For while the latest crop is parading in beards protesting the bomb and anything else that strikes their fancy, our group is working toward the goals which have made this country great—and which will keep it great despite the protesters. And I hope that in 10 years they will discover the same thing.

It was worthwhile Saturday night's short plateau. It was a time for assessment, gathering up the strings of 10 all-too-brief years. Not a destination but a short and useful resting place.

THE NEED FOR FISCAL RESTRAINT

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Ways and Means has been holding extensive hearings on the President's tax message. As usual, it came at a time of fiscal crisis. The administration witnesses submitted their case, which proved but one thing—the Federal Government needs more money. They would not accept any of the responsibility for ignoring the warnings which many of us had been sounding for several years, to wit: the need for fiscal restraint.

The request for a 10-percent surtax and the continuation of certain excise taxes come about 2 years too late. In late 1965 and the first half of 1966, the American economy was booming. In the third quarter, the administration demanded the repeal of the 7-percent investment credit, against the advice of every Republican in the House, and by early 1967 the administration took the advice of the Republicans and urged the immediate restoration of the 7-percent investment credit. The administration used every argument that we had previously advanced in our minority report, but the damage was done. The softening of the economy, which was so apparent in late 1966, eventually revealed itself to the Government experts.

The administration calls its present request a war tax made necessary by the conflict in Vietnam. In the last 10 years, the Federal budget has jumped from \$77 billion to \$144 billion, approximately 90 percent. How much of this is due to Vietnam? Of the \$67 billion budget increase, \$25 billion is for Vietnam, and \$42 billion is for increased domestic spending.

Since 1960 the U.S. population has grown by only 10 percent. In the same period, the personnel comprising the civilian bureaucracy of the Federal Government has grown by 25 percent; the cost of Government payrolls, including military, has grown by 75 percent; the total of all Government spending has grown by 83 percent; nondefense expenditures of the Federal Government are up 97 percent.

The administration knew in 1965 that the Vietnam cost was \$10 billion higher than they would admit, and strongly denied it before our committee. If the public had been warned of this increase, there would have been a demand for more restraint on domestic spending. This restraint, of course, would have jeopardized the implementation of the Great Society programs at a time when the President's party controlled both Houses of Congress by a 2-to-1 majority.

We are facing an estimated deficit, by July of 1968, of \$30 billion. Again, had the public been warned that the threat of this unprecedented deficit was in the making, and that increased taxes would necessarily follow, the present crisis could have been avoided. On the contrary, the administration did not recommend the elimination of any of the domestic programs or the reduction of any, and a rubberstamp Congress went

meekly along, heeding only the demands of the administration.

The administration still refuses to face up to the problem of deficits. The President's tax message proposed that the \$30 billion deficit be met in the following manner: one-fourth by a tax increase, one fourth by reduced Federal spending, and one-half by borrowing. This tax message is now 30 days old. Our committee commenced hearings immediately on the tax part, but what has happened to the spending restraint to which the President said in his message that the administration "was firmly committed and which I urge upon Congress"? The answer is clearly indicated by actions not in keeping with the President's words.

Our committee rewrote the President's social security bill and cut \$2 billion from the legislation. This bill was passed by the House and sent to the Senate Finance Committee. Before it had even reached that committee, the administration sent swarms of its top-flight lobbyists to the Senate to demand that the House bill be junked and that the \$2 billion be restored.

The White House was busy last week calling House Members, demanding that they restore the cuts that the Senate had made in the foreign aid bill, and just last week the White House was successful in getting the Senate to restore the cuts which the House had made in the demonstration cities project, rent supplements, and beautification program. The administration is requesting increases in the shameful poverty program which has failed to produced any good thing. The administration is asking for more, not less, appropriations for the Export-Import Bank, which finances the sale of arms to countries not friendly to us.

The administration having so quickly reneged on its commitment "to urge" spending restraint upon Congress, I cannot bring myself to support a 10-percent tax increase. To pass a tax bill without spending restraint is to invite another deficit in 1969, which can only be met by additional taxes. This is not acceptable to me, and I am sure it is not acceptable to the public.

The administration will be in a bind and, to meet this crisis, the President has the authority to withhold spending, even though Congress appropriated the money. The responsibility is on his shoulders.

"THISA AND THATA"

The President has sent an election team to look over the Vietnam elections and to report any fraud that takes place. They had better be sent to Chicago or Texas. Perhaps South Vietnam will send an inspection team here for the 1968 elections.

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR DETERMINATION BY CONGRESS WHETHER FURTHER CONGRESSIONAL ACTION DESIRABLE IN RESPECT TO POLICIES IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today, by letter, inviting each Member of this body to join me as cosponsor of the resolution set forth in my letter to my colleagues.

This resolution provides a way to fulfill a constitutional requirement which up to now has been neglected, and at the same time help to clarify and unify the national will and purpose in regard to the Vietnam war.

This is the logical, proper, sensible way to remove the feeling of uneasiness so prevalent today.

Here is the text of the letter I am today placing in the mail to my colleagues:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Today there is a great uneasiness among Members of Congress who voted for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution—an uneasiness that pervades the entire country. It arises in great part from an important error of omission in connection with the Resolution. The government failed to invoke properly the SEATO treaty which serves as the only expressed basis for Section 2 of the Resolution. The omission was the absence of an official determination that "an armed attack" occurred against South Vietnam. The only determination of armed attack was against two American ships. Therefore, debate at the time dealt with the subject of the attack upon the American vessels, with little consideration given to the military and political situation in Vietnam and the commitment we were undertaking there. I have outlined this more fully in the Congressional Record of Wednesday, August 23, page 23741.

Because of this omission the issue of Vietnam was not placed squarely on the Congressional anvil. This deprived the country of the great synthesizing debate—and unifying influence—through which we traditionally hammer out major policy decisions.

Yet, it is not too late to correct this error. In doing so, we will fulfill constitutional procedure and comply with the provisions of the SEATO treaty. In my view, this is the logical, proper, sensible way to remove the feeling of uneasiness so prevalent today. Accordingly, I invite your support of the following resolution:

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that upon the adoption of this resolution, the appropriate committees of the Congress shall immediately consider and report to their respective bodies their determination as to whether further Congressional action is desirable in respect to policies in Southeast Asia."

The procedure, far from causing the enemy to misjudge our determination, would in the end clarify America's will and purpose. No Representative should feel that the fulfillment of constitutional procedure would constitute criticism of past conduct of the war. Rather, it would be recognition that it is time for both houses of this representative government to measure up to the grave responsibility placed upon them by the Constitution.

Should you care to be listed as a cosponsor of this resolution, please call my office, extension 5272. Thanks for your consideration.

With every good wish,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

NEED FOR EARLY DECISION ON H.R. 12573

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, early morning reports over the wire services inform us of firefighters being pinned down by snipers while attempting to fight fires during rioting in Milwaukee last night. Such cowardly sniper attacks on firefighters prove again the need for protection for these unarmed public servants who seek to preserve our lives and property.

The Milwaukee incident is not an isolated one. Firemen have been subject to the same kind of attacks in nearly every such disturbance. Yet, until now, there is no Federal law and, so far as I can determine, no State law, specifically designed to protect firemen under these circumstances.

Congress now has the opportunity to correct this serious oversight, through H.R. 12573, which I had the honor to introduce earlier this month. Other Members also see the need, as shown by the fact that 25 Congressmen have joined with me as cosponsors. Others have introduced identical bills.

I submit that the need to correct this oversight is too great for prolonged delay. Already we have been described in the press as "fiddling while Rome burns," because of failure to come to grips more quickly with problems of riots and crime.

Mr. Speaker, I propose that we proceed to an early decision on H.R. 12573, giving no opportunity for charges that we also "fiddle" while our firefighters die.

THE WARREN REPORT

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

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

THE WARREN REPORT—VII

WALTER CRONKITE: Good evening. For the past three nights we have been examining the circumstances of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. On Sunday, we returned to Dealey Plaza to recreate that fatal motorcade ride beneath the windows of the Texas School Book Depository.

Believing that rifle tests conducted by the Warren Commission were less than adequate, we conducted new tests, more closely simulating the conditions of the actual murder. We found hitherto undiscovered evidence in film of the murder itself that the killer had more time than the minimal 5.6 seconds indicated in the Warren Report to get the shots off. And we concluded that beyond reasonable doubt, Oswald was indeed at least one of the killers.

But was there more than one? On Monday night, we interviewed eyewitnesses who said all the shots came from the School Book Depository. And others equally insistent that

there were shots from the grassy knoll overlooking the motorcade itself.

We tested more exhaustively than did the Warren Commission the extremely controversial single bullet theory, found that one bullet could, indeed, have wounded both the President and Governor Connally. We heard autopsy surgeon, James Humes, break three and a half years of silence to report that he has re-examined the X-rays and photographs of the President's body, and still has no doubt that all the shots struck from behind.

We concluded that in the absence of solid evidence that there were other assassins, and with the indications that one killer could account for all the shots, there was no second gunman. But, even as the only gunman, was Oswald, as the Warren Report suggests, a lone madman? Or was he the trigger-man for a conspiracy to kill the President?

On Tuesday, we considered such frequently mentioned indications of conspiracy as the murder of Officer J. D. Tippit, found that he was legitimately ordered from his normal patrol area as part of a redeployment of police forces to cope with the assassination. Found too, that a partial description of the assassin, broadcast on police radio, could account for Tippit's stopping Oswald.

We found the nightclub owner, Jack Ruby, the man who killed Oswald, was a strange, mercurial creature given to hitting first and asking questions afterward. And none of his closest associates would credit Ruby with the ability to keep a secret very long.

We presented the conspiracy theories of New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, theories which Garrison says he will present in a court of law, but which today remain a series of largely unsupported statements. And we concluded that, for now at least, no conspiracy theory of the assassination has been proved.

Tonight, we turn from the assassination to the Warren Commission itself. Having found that the Commission's conclusions, in the main, still stand up almost three years after published, we now ask our fourth and last fundamental question: Why doesn't America believe the Warren Report?

ANNOUNCER: This is a CBS news inquiry: "The Warren Report." Here is Walter Cronkite.

CRONKITE: Tonight, as in our preceding reports, my colleague Dan Rather and I are going to break this fundamental question into subsidiary questions. For the first part of the broadcast, we will ask: Should America believe the Warren Report? We will explore just how well and honestly the Warren Commission operated, to what extent it deserves belief.

The second question will be: Could America believe the Warren Report? And we'll try to determine whether there are elements in the way people, and particularly Americans, think about great events, which would prevent their accepting the Warren Report, however trustworthy it might be.

But this final broadcast will be different. The questions we will ask tonight, we can only ask. Tonight's answers will be not ours, but yours.

RATHER: As we take up whether or not America should believe the Warren Report, we'll hear first from the man who perhaps more than any other is responsible for the question being asked. Mark Lane, lawyer and former New York State Assemblyman, was the gaddy of the Warren Commission. He demanded the right to appear before it as a defense counsel for the dead Lee Harvey Oswald. Refused, he began his own investigation of the President's death, a study that produced first the best selling attack on the Warren Commission, "Rush To Judgment," and now a movie of the same name.

Mark Lane has lectured all over the world on his own theories of the assassination, theories which he spelled out for Bill Stout. MARK LANE: There was one conclusion, one basic conclusion that the Commission

reached, I think, which can be supported by the facts, and that was the Commission's conclusion that Ruby killed Oswald. But, of course, that took place on television. It would have been very difficult to deny that. But, outside of that, there's not an important conclusion which can be supported by the facts and—and this is the problem.

And what the Commission was thinking and what they were doing is still hidden from us, of course. The minutes of the Commission meetings are locked up in the National Archives and no one can see them. A vast amount of the evidence, F.B.I. reports, C.I.A. reports, which may be directly related to the information we should have, are also locked up in the Archives. No one can see that.

The photographs and X-rays of the President's body, taken at the autopsy in Bethesda, Maryland, taken just before the autopsy was begun, taken by Naval technicians, which in and of themselves might resolve the whole question as to whether or not there was a conspiracy, cannot be seen by anyone today and, in fact, not one member of the Warren Commission ever saw the most important documents in the case, the photographs and the X-rays. And not one lawyer for the Commission ever saw—was curious enough to examine the most important evidence.

I think the villain was the desire of government officials to be nice, to see to it that nothing would upset the American people, that the apathy which has seized us for all of these years be permitted to remain uninterrupted by a factual presentation of what happened. The American people would have been upset surely if they were told there was a conspiracy which took the life of your President.

CRONKITE: But Mr. Lane, who accuses the Commission of playing fast and loose with the evidence, does not always allow facts to get in the way of his own theories. In "Rush To Judgment," for example, he writes: "The statements of eyewitnesses close to the President tended to confirm the likelihood that the shot came from the right and not from the rear." Lane then quotes Associated Press photographer James Altgens, and another eyewitness, Charles Brehm, as giving testimony that would support the idea of a killer on the grassy knoll. Yet Mr. Altgens, as we saw Monday night, is entirely certain that all of the shots came from behind, a fact that Mr. Lane does not mention.

As for Mr. Brehm, Eddie Barker discovered that he holds no brief either for the grassy knoll theory or for the use of his words by Mark Lane.

EDDIE BARKER: Well now, some critics of the Warren Report have taken your testimony, or interviews with you, to indicate that you thought the shots came from behind the fence over there. What about that?

CHARLES BREHM: Well, as I say, it was not a number of critics. It was one critic, Mark Lane, who takes very great liberties with adding to my quotation. I never said that the—any shot came from here like I was quoted by Mr. Lane. Mr. Lane would like me to have positively identified the—what I saw fly over here—his skull—although I told him I could not—I did not—I thought it was but I could not. So, he has added his interpretations to what I said, and consequently that's where the story comes from—that I said that the shots come from up there. No shot came from up there at any time during the whole fiasco that afternoon.

CRONKITE: Nor are these the only examples of Mr. Lane lifting remarks out of context to support his theories. Perhaps the most charitable explanation is that Mark Lane still considers himself a defense attorney for Lee Harvey Oswald—and a defense attorney's primary duty is not to abstract truth, but to his client.

There exists, however, a less partisan, and

therefore perhaps more disturbing critique of the Warren Commission Report.

RATHER: One of the most influential attacks on the work of the Commission is the book, "Inquest," by a young scholar named Edward J. Epstein. It began as a thesis in political science, Mr. Epstein deciding to find out just how the Warren Commission had gone about solving this crime of the century.

He studied the 26 volumes of hearings, then interviewed five of the seven Commission members, General Counsel J. Lee Rankin and some of the Commission's top investigators. And the pattern that began to emerge disturbed him.

EPSTEIN: Well, there were three, I think, levels of complaint. The first one was the institutional, you might say: the general problem that a government has when it searches for truth. The problem of trying to have an autonomous investigation, free from political interference and at the same time, it's dealing by its very nature with a political problem.

The second level might be called the organizational level of—was the Warren Commission organized in a way that prevented it from finding facts. And here my findings were that by using a part time staff and by the Commission's detaching themselves from the investigation—in other words, not actively partaking in the investigation—it raised some problems as to whether the Warren Commission's investigation went deep enough, so that if there was evidence of a conspiracy, they would have in fact found it.

The third level of my criticism concerned the evidence itself, and this concerned the problem of when the Warren Commission was come—confronted with a very complex problem. For example, the contradiction between the F.B.I. summary report on the autopsy and the autopsy report they had in mind—how they solved this problem, whether they simply glossed over it or whether they called witnesses and—and this—this, of course, brought up the questions of—of a second assassin.

RATHER: One of the men Mr. Epstein interviewed for his "Inquest" is Arlen Specter, now District Attorney of Philadelphia, but in 1964, one of the principal investigators for the Warren Commission, charged with establishing the basic facts of the assassination. Mr. Specter thinks the Commission did its job well and came up with the right answers.

SPECTER: I would say after having prosecuted a great many cases that seldom would you ever find a case which was as persuasive that Oswald was the assassin and, in fact, the lone assassin, and we convict people in the criminal courts every day right here in City Hall, Philadelphia. And the times the death penalties are imposed or life imprisonment—so that—so that the case does fit together.

RATHER: In separate interviews we asked critic Epstein and investigator Specter to discuss some of the central issues that must determine how well or how badly the Warren Commission did its work.

EPSTEIN: Part of the job of the Warren Commission was restoring confidence in the American government. And for this he had to pick seven very respectable men, men who would lend their name and lend probity to the report. And so that the problem was, in any seven men he picked of this sort, they would have very little time for the investigation.

They would also have two purposes. One purpose would be to find the truth, all the facts. The other purpose would be to allay rumors, to dispel conspiracy theories and material of that sort.

SPECTER: My view is that there is absolutely no foundation for that type of a charge. When the President selected the

Commissioners, he chose men of unblemished reputation and very high standing. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States would have no reason whatsoever to be expedient or to search for political truths. Nor would Allen W. Dulles, the former head of the C.I.A., nor would John McCloy, with his distinguished service in government, nor would the Congressional or Senatorial representatives.

Now, the same thing was true of the staff members. When it came time to select the individuals to serve as assistant counsel and general counsel, men were chosen from various parts of the United States who had no connection with government.

EPSTEIN: For example, there were rumors concerning the F.B.I. or various intelligence agencies. I noticed that there were a number of memorandums where the—where—from Warren to the Secretary of the Treasury, who was in charge of the Secret Service, assuring that their findings wouldn't impair the efficiency or the morale of the Secret Service. And the same thing again with the F.B.I., a question of whether there was ever any possible connection between Oswald—and by connection I don't mean anything sinister, I simply meant that he was furnishing information and there were some rumors to this effect—and they, rather than investigating these rumors, they preferred to give it to the F.B.I. to investigate the rumors themselves. As J. Lee Rankin, their General Counsel, said, they would rather than investigate clear its own skirts. Well, what this meant, of course, is that if the F.B.I. would have discretion if it did find a connection between Oswald and itself, the discretion of either reporting it or not reporting it.

SPECTER: In the main, the F.B.I. conducted the basic line of investigation. But the Commission used its independent judgment wherever, say, the F.B.I. or the Secret Service was involved itself so that they would not investigate themselves on the subjects where they were directly involved, and I think the Commission showed its independence in that regard by criticizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation and by criticizing the Secret Service where the facts warranted such criticism.

On every subject where the Federal Bureau of Investigation had contact with the area of investigation with which I was intimately connected, I was fully satisfied with their thoroughness and with their competency and with their integrity.

CRONKITE: Despite Mr. Specter's defense, it is the opinion of CBS News that the role of the F.B.I. as well as the Secret Service, both in the assassination and its aftermath, has been less than glorious. And, to some extent, the performance of these agencies weakens the credibility of the Warren Report. As to what the F.B.I. and the Secret Service did wrong before the assassination, we need look no further than the Report itself.

It notes the Secret Service agents assigned to protect the President had been drinking beer and liquor into the early hours of the morning, that no search was made of buildings along the route, and that, quote: "The procedures of the Secret Service, designed to identify and protect against persons considered serious threats to the President, were not adequate prior to the assassination," end of quote. That is, the Secret Service should have known about Lee Harvey Oswald.

But the Report goes on to point out that if the Secret Service did not know about him, the F.B.I. did, and did not see fit to mention his existence to the Secret Service. The report issues a mildly phrased yet devastating rebuke to the F.B.I., charging that it took an unduly restrictive view of its responsibilities. Knowing what the F.B.I. knew about Oswald, the Report says, an alert agency should have listed him as a potential menace to the President. Yet, after the assassination, the Commission itself relied heavily on these two agencies as its investigative arms.

Did their performance improve? We know that some of the tests conducted by them for the Warren Commission were unsatisfactory. In the first of these broadcasts we pointed out that to stimulate Oswald's problem of hitting a moving target from a sixty foot high perch, the F.B.I. conducted its firing tests on a fixed target, from a 30-foot height. Certainly, if CBS News could duplicate the conditions of the actual assassination for a firing test, the feat's not beyond the capability of the F.B.I.

RATHER: There is also the case of the famous exhibit 399, the bullet which the Commission thought wounded both the President and Governor Connally, winding up on the Governor's stretcher in Parkland Hospital. Critics of the Report, you will remember, insist it couldn't have hit both men, but must have been found on the President's stretcher. Yet, part of the now permanent confusion surrounding the bullet and where it was found, must be charged to the cavalier attitude of agents of both the F.B.I. and the Secret Service at Parkland Hospital.

On Monday night, hospital attendant Darrell Tomlinson described how, in shoving a stretcher into place, he dislodged a spent rifle bullet. Mr. Tomlinson quite properly sent at once for the hospital's chief of security, O. P. Wright. Mr. Wright describes what happened then:

WRIGHT: I told him to withhold and not let anyone remove the bullet, and I would get a hold of either the Secret Service or the F.B.I., and turn it over to them. Thereby, it wouldn't have come through my hands at all. I contacted the F.B.I. and they said they were not interested because it wasn't their responsibility to make investigations. So, I got a hold of a Secret Serviceman and they didn't seem to be interested in coming and looking at the bullet in the position it was then in.

So I went back to the area where Mr. Tomlinson was and picked up the bullet and put it in my pocket, and I carried it some 30 or 40 minutes. And I gave it to a Secret Serviceman that was guarding the main door into the emergency area.

BARKER: Mr. Wright, when you gave this bullet to the Secret Service agent, did he mark it in any way?

WRIGHT: No, sir.

BARKER: What did he do with it?

WRIGHT: Put it in his lefthand coat pocket.

BARKER: Well now, did he ask your name or who you were or any question at all about the bullet?

WRIGHT: No, sir.

BARKER: How did the conversation go? Do you remember?

WRIGHT: I just told him this was a bullet that was picked up on a stretcher that had come off the emergency elevator that might be involved in the moving of Governor Connally. And I handed him the bullet, and he took it and looked at it and said, "O.K.," and put it in his pocket.

CRONKITE: There is little to praise in such treatment by the F.B.I. and the Secret Service of perhaps the most important single piece of evidence in the assassination case. Moreover, the Warren Commission seriously compromised itself by allowing the Secret Service, the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. to investigate questions involving their own actions.

RATHER: The Commission had before it the hard fact that Oswald's notebook contained the name, phone number and license plate number of Dallas F.B.I. agent, James Hosty. The F.B.I.'s explanation was that Hosty had asked Ruth Paine, with whom Marina Oswald was living, to let him know where Oswald was staying, that he jotted down his phone number and that Marina under prior instructions from her husband, also copied down Hosty's license plate.

CRONKITE: The question of a link between the killer and the F.B.I. was indeed a legitimate part of the investigation. The Commission's handling of that question is scarce-

ly justifiable. What it did was to accept as conclusive sworn affidavits from J. Edgar Hoover, and other F.B.I. officials, that Oswald was never employed in any capacity by the F.B.I.

The Commission says it also checked the F.B.I.'s own files, but mentions no other investigation. It followed the same curious procedure with the C.I.A., taking the word of top C.I.A. officials that Oswald had no connection with that agency either. The Commission then came to the sweeping conclusion that there was absolutely no type of informant or undercover relationship between an agency of the U.S. Government and Lee Harvey Oswald at any time.

Now, elsewhere, the Warren Report argues persuasively the difficulty of proving a negative, of proving in that case that Oswald was not a member of a conspiracy. You will remember that it hedged its conclusion, saying only that there was no evidence of a conspiracy.

Yet the Commission had no hesitation in asserting another far reaching negative: that Oswald was not involved with any agency of the U.S. Government ever. Oswald's mother, Marguerite, has always maintained that her son was a government agent—she favors the C.I.A.—and that he was innocent of the assassination.

BARKER: Mrs. Oswald, what sort of proof do you have that your son was an agent of this government?

MARGUERITE C. OSWALD: Now, proof, Eddie—that's a very strong question. I think the Warren Commission members themselves gave Marguerite Oswald the proof. They want us to believe that Lee Harvey Oswald went to Russia as a defector. And yet he got out of the Marine Corps three years before his hitch was up on a Dire Need discharge. Now, this is documented. This is what they tell the American people. They go into great details, that Lee Harvey Oswald got out of the Marine Corps three months ahead of time because his mother had an accident—which was the truth, and it all went through the Red Cross legitimately.

And when he came home, he stayed with his mother three days. We sort of know that story. And then he left for Russia. And, so, this is supposed to be all cut and dried. But when you read the Warren Report, and when you know the case—and this is my case, and my son's—so I know it, then you see a little part where the Warren Commission says, the documentation says, that Lee Harvey Oswald was given a passport by the State Department to travel to Russia, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and et cetera; and at that time these countries were not restricted.

Now, how can Lee Harvey Oswald get out of the Marine Corps three months ahead of time on a Dire Need discharge, and at the same time be issued a passport to travel?

CRONKITE: The evidence is overwhelming that Mrs. Oswald is wrong as to whether her son did assassinate the President. Yet, there remain disturbing indications that she may not be quite so wrong about some kind of link between Oswald and various intelligence agencies of the United States. The question of whether Oswald had any relationship with the F.B.I. or the C.I.A. is not frivolous. The agencies, of course, are silent.

Although the Warren Commission had full power to conduct its own independent investigation, it permitted the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. to investigate themselves—and so cast a permanent shadow on the answers.

THE WARREN REPORT—VIII

ANNOUNCER: A CBS News Inquiry: "The Warren Report," continues. Here again is Dan Rafter.

RATHER: More than one critic of the Warren Report has attacked it over the question of witnesses: which ones it heard, and which of those it decided to believe.

Once again Edward Jay Epstein:

EPSTEIN: I'm not sure that the Commission went below the surface, but then no one could be sure of whether they did or not because from what's visible, what we can see, the Commission did seem to bring forth most of the testimony, most of the relevant witnesses. Whether these witnesses were saying all they knew, or whether there were other witnesses they should have called is another. I think there are. You can show examples of other witnesses the Commission didn't call.

There was a witness, Mrs. Eric Walther.

Mrs. CAROLYN WALTHER: When I saw this man in the window with a gun, and there was another man beside him, and he was holding the gun down. His arms were resting on the window.

EPSTEIN: Well, they never called her, nor did a Commission lawyer ever investigate her, or go down and ask her any questions.

RATHER: The Warren Commission and its staff interviewed 552 witnesses. Their testimony takes up these 26 thick volumes. Yet the question of whether it interviewed the right witnesses, and how it evaluated the testimony it did hear, are basic to any decision on how well it did its job.

For instance, what about Mrs. Carolyn Walther, who saw two men and a gun in a different window of the School Book Depository, and who never got to tell her story to the Commission?

CRONKITE: David Belin, an attorney for the Commission staff, who had a hand in the decision not to call Mrs. Walther after her interviews with the F.B.I., has said that the Commission simply could not hear every single person who had been in the plaza that day. He pointed out that Mrs. Walther's woman companion, standing next to her, told investigators Mrs. Walther had never mentioned seeing any men. Nevertheless, among those 552 witnesses who were called by the Commission were many whose testimony was considerably less relevant than Mrs. Walther's.

Perhaps the Commission should have had the chance to decide whether or not she saw what she says she did.

RATHER: Right now, long after the fact of the Commission Report being out, right now, what bothers you most about the Report? Are there any—is there a central question, or central questions that bother you most?

EPSTEIN: There is one central question that does bother me, and that is—involves the autopsy that was performed on President Kennedy. And there was a conflict—really, a contradiction, between the F.B.I. report on the autopsy, which the F.B.I. says they received from the autopsy doctors—at least they said in these reports, and the autopsy report published by the Warren Commission. And I don't think we have to get into the exact details, but it wasn't absolute—if one was true, the other couldn't be true. It concerned the path of the bullet through President Kennedy's body. The F.B.I. said it didn't go through, it only went in a short distance. The Warren Report said it went—or the autopsy in the Warren Report said it went clean through and exited.

There was evidence, evidence that I think any lawyer or law court would have demanded, and that is the actual photographs of the autopsy and the X-rays.

CRONKITE: Almost from the day the Warren Commission published its report, its decision to omit those vital X-rays and photographs has been under attack. Only that physical evidence, say the critics, can finally resolve the debate over how many bullets struck the President, where they came from, and where they went—the central questions in the argument over how many assassins opened fire in Dealey Plaza.

More than one critic has charged that the autopsy record in the Warren Report is not the original autopsy, but has been changed

to conform with the Commission's theories. You will remember that after a silence of three and a half years the doctor who headed the autopsy team at Bethesda Naval Hospital agreed to re-examine those disputed photographs and X-rays, and review his findings for these broadcasts. And here is what Captain James Humes told Dan Rather.

HUMES: The Report, as I stated, is exactly the way it was delivered, and the way it was written.

CRONKITE: Yet it seems to CBS news that one of the most serious errors made by the Warren Commission was its decision not to look at those photographs and X-rays, an error now compounded. For the Kennedy family, which had possession of the autopsy pictures, agreed last year to donate them to the National Archives, but only with the stipulation that the pictures be locked away for five years—with only certain authorized government personnel allowed to see them.

Now, no one would propose that those grim and tragic relics be made generally available, to be flashed across television screens and newspaper pages. But in view of their crucial bearing on the entire assassination we believe that those films should now be made available for independent examination by expert pathologists, with the high qualifications of Captain Humes—but without his status as a principal in the case.

There is one further piece of evidence which we feel must now be made available to the entire public: Abraham's Zapruder's film of the actual assassination. The original is now the private property of Life Magazine. A Life executive refused CBS News permission to show you that film at any price, on the ground that it is, quote, "an invaluable asset of Time, Inc." unquote. And that, even though these broadcasts have demonstrated that the film may contain vital undiscovered clues to the assassination.

Life's decision means you cannot see the Zapruder film in its proper form, as motion picture film. We believe that the Zapruder film is an invaluable asset, not of Time, Inc.—but of the people of the United States.

CRONKITE: Until now we have heard a great deal about the Warren Commission from its friends and its foes. But what of the Warren Commission itself? Where do its seven members stand amidst this torrent of controversy over their performance?

Chief Justice Warren, who headed the Commission, has refused to discuss the Warren report publicly, with CBS News, or indeed with anyone. But one Commissioner has agreed to participate in this broadcast. He is John McCloy, internationally known lawyer, Presidential adviser, and former High Commissioner for Germany.

Mr. McCloy, however objectively the Commission may have set about its work, the Report itself—it seems to us—may have just as well have been entitled "The Case Against Lee Harvey Oswald."

Now, are you satisfied that as much effort was put into challenging that case, as into establishing it? In other words, did the accused man get a fair trial?

McCLOY: I'll answer that in just a moment. If I may just say one thing, I—which I'd like to say. In the first place, I had some question as to the propriety of my appearing here as a former member of the Commission, to comment on the evidence of the Commission—seems to be some question, and I think there is some question about the advisability of doing that. But I'm quite prepared to talk about the procedures and the attitudes of the Commission. And I'm—the scope of its conclusions, and so forth. But I will now try to answer your question by pointing out that this was an investigation, and not a trial.

We didn't have any plaintiff and defendant. This wasn't what is known as an adversary proceeding. We were all called upon to come down there to—I believe the wording

was—the directive from the President, "to satisfy yourself," that is the Commission, "what were the relevant facts in relation to this assassination." And that's the base from which we started.

There've been a number of suggestions that the Commission, for example, was only motivated by a desire to put—to make things quiet, so as to give comfort to the Administration, or give comfort to the people of the country, that there was nothing vicious about this. Well, that wasn't the attitude that we had at all.

I know what my attitude, when I first went down, I was convinced that there was something phony between the Ruby and the Oswald affair, that 48 hours after the assassination, here's this man shot in the police station. I was pretty skeptical about that. But as time went on and we heard witnesses and weighed the witnesses—but just think how silly this charge is.

Here we were seven men, I think five of us were Republicans. We weren't beholden to any Administration. Besides that, we—we had our own integrity to think of. A lot of people have said that you can rely upon the distinguished character of the Commission. You don't need to rely on the distinguished character of the Commission. Maybe it was distinguished, and maybe it wasn't. But you can rely on common sense. And you know that seven men aren't going to get together, of that character, and concoct a conspiracy, with all of the members of the staff we had, with all of the investigative agencies—it would have been a conspiracy of a character so mammoth and so vast that it transcends any—even some of the distorted charges of conspiracy on the part of Oswald.

CRONKITE: What did you do on those visits to Dallas?

McCLOY: Well, we went there and walked over the Dealey Plaza, almost—it seems to me—foot by foot. We went into the School Book Depository. We talked to all of the police officers there—that were there, a number of the witnesses. Visited the boarding house—the boarding houses that Oswald had lived in. Retraced, step by step, his—his movements from the School Book Depository to the point at which he was apprehended in the theatre. We chased ourselves up and down the stairs, and timed ourselves. I sat in the window and held the very rifle, with a four power scope on it, and sighted down across it—seeing—must have been at the exact spot that whoever the assassin was sat, with the carton of boxes as a headrest; snapped the trigger many times; saw the—we had a car moving at the alleged rate—well, I can go on.

But I'm just trying to give you the—the impression of what was the fact that we did, assiduously, follow this evidence, and work out as best we could our own judgments in relation to it.

CRONKITE: Mr. McCloy, the Commission came into being late in 1963, went through to September '64—when you were dissolved. Could you have used more time? There is the charge that it was—your conclusions were rushed, that there was some stringent time scale imposed.

McCLOY: The conclusions weren't rushed at all. If there's any charge that can be made—and maybe this is an unjust charge, because I wasn't in charge of it—I'm inclined to think that we perhaps rushed to print a little too soon. But the conclusions were arrived at in our own good time.

I think that if there's one thing that I would do over again, I would insist on those photographs and the X-rays having been produced before us. In the one respect, and only one respect there, I think we were perhaps a little over-sensitive to what we understood was the sensitivities of the Kennedy family against the production of colored photographs of the body, and so forth.

But those exist. They're there. We had the

best evidence in regard to that—the pathology in respect to the President's wounds. It was our own choice that we didn't subpoena these photographs, which were then in the hands of the Kennedy family. I say, I wish—I don't think we'd have subpoenaed them. We could have gotten—Mr. Justice Warren was talking to the Kennedy family about that at that time. I thought that he was really going to see them, but it turned out that he hadn't.

CRONKITE: It's not surprising that there should be some skeptics, quite obviously, to any such report. But how do you account for the fact that the disbelievers outnumber the believers by such a wide margin?

McCLOY: I think that—if you want me to speculate on it, first place there's the credulity of people generally. This is pretty spicy, pretty scandalous. Bear in mind that there have been an enormous amount of books written now, a large number of books written, pamphlets written—with the most shocking and distorted statements in regard to the evidence; with all of the blurbs and all of the propaganda. You know the business that goes with selling books.

Many more thousands of those have been distributed and read than the rather limited distribution of the Report, with the rather prosaic accounts. So, that I suppose this tends to build the thing up. There are other—there are other things that I suppose you can talk about. Strange attitudes. The people associate their politics with their belief, or their disbelief, in the Report.

I've gone to a number of campuses, for example. I'm astounded to find that they—the professors, as well as students—in many of the cases, I don't say the majority, think that it's illiberal to come to the conclusion that a Communist inclined defector could have been the assassin of the President. It's liberal to feel that it was the result of a right-wing conspiracy in the hostile atmosphere of Texas. And nothing that you can say or do seems to be able to dispel their viewpoint.

Maybe there's a general distrust of government and government agencies. I don't know. You can speculate, Mr. Cronkite, as much as I can about it. I—I—what I do resist, in a way—it irritates me, is any suggestion that the Commission were motivated other than by—and I'll leave myself out, there were competent people in that Commission, people who—who were experienced in investigation, like the Senators and the Congressmen, have been through many types of investigation; Dulles, who was—people who were used to dealing with F.B.I. reports, appraising them, weighing them, taking many of them for something less than their face value.

They went at this thing, and they came to this conclusion—and there was nothing fraudulent about it, there was nothing sinister about it—either conscious or subconscious, in my judgment. And I think that, as I say, that common sense would tell you that this must be the case. We may have erred somewhere along the line, but so far I haven't seen any credible evidence which dispels the soundness of the fundamental conclusions that we came to.

CRONKITE: In a way, we have come to the end of this report on the Warren Report. For some three and a half hours new we have presented what seemed to us the most significant new evidence concerning the assassination itself, and the President's Commission to investigate the assassination.

Yet over these months, as we prepared this report, we began to realize that there is one more question to be answered. That question does not really involve the assassination, or the Warren Commission—except indirectly. It involves the people of the United States. We began to wonder how it is possible that so many more Americans disbelieve the Warren Report than have ever read it.

Why, for instance, when fewer than two

million copies of the Report have been sold, a Gallup Poll indicates that six Americans out of every ten think they know enough about it to mistrust it? Or why, by a considerable margin, more people have bought copies of books attacking the Report than have bought the Report itself?

Such indications begin to suggest that, completely apart from the merits of the Warren Report itself, there may be something abroad in the land that wants not to believe the Report's conclusion, that President Kennedy was the victim of a lone madman, and not of a conspiracy.

Our final question then: Could America believe the Warren Report?

Dr. Seymour Lipset of Harvard is a distinguished sociologist whose special field of interest is American behavior. And Dan Rather asked him about this national reaction of disbelief to the Warren Report.

LIPSET: Sort of thing, you know, we're terribly bothered by murders. You know, when you get the kind of Jack the Ripper thing, or this fellow in Texas who shot down—if someone's killed because—for his money, if someone's kidnapped for money, if—this is OK. I mean, not that you—we don't want it. But at least you can understand what happened. If it—and, therefore, an assassination which is a consequence of a plot is like a murder in the context of a crime for more money by a gang. But if somebody's just shot down in the street by some fellow who just picked up a gun and shot him, well, if it happened to him it can happen to you.

If the President is assassinated, not because of a rational plot, but because of just a nut who has a gun, then any—not only any President can be assassinated this way—which he can be—but anybody else can. It becomes a much less controlled world.

CRONKITE: A man who looks into the American spirit from another viewpoint, but with equally keen interest, is historian Henry Steele Commager, whose book "Search for a Usable Past" is considered a major insight into what we are and how we got that way.

COMMAGER: But I do think that there has come up in recent years, particularly since the coming of the Cold War, something that might be called a conspiracy psychology. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—a particular thing, like a discovery of espionage somewhere, or the terrible fact of the assassination—is not to be explained as other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States. And the point is that the ordinary rules for the rest of the world don't hold for us.

And so with a great number of the things that are ordinarily explained by the normal processes of history are not to be explained by this, because they don't apply to the United States. We are expected always to be victorious, and always to triumph, and so forth and so forth.

And to this came the—added to this came the McCarthy era, with the miasma of suspicion, with the careless insistence on conspiracy, and dirty work at the crossroads, everywhere. And we were—I think we have been persuaded very largely since the beginnings of the Cold War to be more receptive to conspiracy theories. I don't think we'd become paranoid. But we were on the road to a paranoid explanation of things.

MORLEY SAFER: Do you think that a second investigation, an independent investigation, into the assassination of the President is any more likely to be believed than the Warren Commission?

COMMAGER: No. I see no reason to suppose that anyone who doesn't believe the first will believe a second, or a third, or a fourth. The conspiracy theory, the conspiracy mentality,

will not accept ordinary evidence, any more than the conspiracy mentality accepts the ordinary explanation of the assassination of Lincoln, and the death of Booth. It has—there's some psychological requirement that forces them to reject the ordinary, and find refuge in the extraordinary. And if another investigation were to be held, and came up—came to the same conclusion, as I'm inclined to think it would, who knows—I think it would be found just as unsatisfactory, and the critics would say, "Well, of course, this too is part of the Establishment. The Establishment appointed this; they want this kind of an explanation and we don't believe any of it, because we know there's dirty work at the crossroads somewhere. They're covering things up." So I see no value, really, in another investigation.

CRONKITE: In Washington, Eric Sevareid has been watching these four programs with you, and we turn to him now for his thoughts on the Warren Commission and its work.

SEVAREID: When this reporter returned home after the first year of World War II in Europe, I made a few speeches to American groups. Intelligent, middle-class, Town Hall kind of audience. But almost invariably some man, or group of men, would get me aside after the speech and say, in effect, "Now tell us the real low-down."

This was my first adult encounter with that strain of permanent skepticism about what they read or hear that runs through so much of the American people. This distrust governs peoples' feelings toward government and public events more than their feelings toward one another in their daily life. Part of the impulse is simply that traditional Yankee horse trader desire not to be taken in. Part is the wish to be personally "in the know," one up on the other fellow.

But this automatic reaction that there must be conspiracy somewhere, the prevalence of this devil theory of politics, this probably has increased among us, as Professor Commager suggests, as a result of World War II and the Cold War that followed.

Roosevelt must have sold out East Europe at Yalta, so many people thought; obscure Reds in the State Department, teachers and writers here and there must have delivered vast China to Communist hands. Indeed, one or two otherwise reputable personages argued that Roosevelt conspired with the Japanese to bring about the Pearl Harbor attack.

What fed the conspiracy notion about the Kennedy assassination among many Americans was the sheer incongruity of the affair. All that power and majesty wiped out in an instant by one skinny, weak-chinned, little character. It was like believing that the Queen Mary had sunk without a trace, because of a log floating somewhere in the Atlantic, or that A.T. & T.'s stock had fallen to zero because a drunk somewhere tore out his telephone wires.

But this almost unbelievable incongruity has characterized nearly every one of the assassinations and attempted assassinations of American Presidents. Deranged little men killed Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, tried to kill President Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt. Only the Puerto Rican attempt on President Truman represented a real conspiracy.

There are still people who think Adolph Hitler is alive, people who think the so-called learned Elders of Zion are engaged in a Jewish plot to control the world. The passage of years, the failure of anybody anywhere to come up with respectable evidence does not shake the people who cling to these illusions.

And so, three and a half years later, there are people who still think some group of men are living somewhere, carrying in their breasts the most explosive secret conceivable, knowledge of a plot to kill Mr. Kennedy.

These imagined men supposedly go about their lives under iron self-discipline, never falling out with each other never giving out a hint of suspicion to anyone else.

And nearly three years after the Warren Inquiry finished its painful and onerous work, there are not only the serious critics who point to the various mistakes of commission or omission, mistakes of a consequence one can only guess at, and of a kind that has probably plagued every lengthy, voluminous official investigation ever staged; there are also people who think the Commission itself was a conspiracy to cover up something.

In the first place, it would be utterly impossible in the American arena of a fierce and free press and politics to conceal a conspiracy among so many individuals who live in the public eye. In the second place, the deepest allegiance of men like Chief Justice Warren, or of John McCloy, does not lie with any President, political party, or current cause—it lies with history, their name and place in history. That is all they live for in their later years. If they knowingly suppressed or distorted decisive evidence about such an event as a Presidential murder, their descendants would bear accursed names forever. The notion that they would do such a thing is idiotic.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

CRONKITE: We'll be back in a moment.

CRONKITE: Three years ago, after we had studied for the first time the Report of the Warren Commission, we summed up our feelings about it. In the end, we find confronting each other, we said, the liar, the misfit, the defector, on the one hand and seven distinguished Americans on the other. And yet, exactly here we must be careful that we do not say too much. Oswald was never tried for any crime and perhaps, therefore, there will forever be questions of substance and detail, raised by amateur detectives, professional skeptics and serious students as well.

For the Warren Commission could not give Lee Harvey Oswald his day in court and the protection of our laws. Suspects are not tried by seven distinguished Americans. Their cases are heard under law by 12 ordinary citizens. If it had not been for Jack Ruby's revolver in the basement of the Dallas police station, 12 such citizens would have heard the evidence, would have heard Oswald, if he had chosen to speak.

That jury would have represented our judgment, our conscience, and in the end would have spoken for us. Now, we do not have that reliance. We must depend on our own judgments and look into our own consciences. The Warren Commission cannot do that for us. We are the jury, all of us, in America and throughout the world.

We found no reason to withdraw what we said then. But, now we have studied the Report again, this time with the benefit of three years of controversy, of all of these books, of our own investigations. We have found that wherever you look at the Report closely and without preconceptions, you come away convinced that the story it tells is the best account we are ever likely to have of what happened that day in Dallas.

We have found that most objections to the Report—and certainly all objections that go to the heart of the Report—vanish when they are exposed to the light of honest inquiry. It is a strange kind of tribute to the Warren Report that every objection that can be raised against it is to be found in the Report itself. It is true that the answers to some questions leave us restless. The theory that a single bullet struck down both the President and the Governor, for example, has too much of the long arm of coincidence about it for us to be entirely comfortable. But would we be more comfortable believing that a shot was fired by a second assassin who materialized out of thin air for the purpose, fired a shot, and then vanished again into thin air, leaving behind no trace of himself, his rifle, his bullet, or any other sign of existence.

Measured against the alternatives, the Warren Commission Report is the easiest to believe and that is all the Report claims. But, we have found also that there has been a loss of morale, a loss of confidence among the American people toward their own government and the men who serve it. And that is perhaps more wounding than the assassination itself. The damage that Lee Harvey Oswald did the United States of America, the country he first denounced and then appeared to re-embrace, did not end when the shots were fired from the Texas School Book Depository. The most grievous wounds persist and there is little reason to believe that they will soon be healed.

This is Walter Cronkite. Good night.

ANNOUNCER: This has been the fourth and last of a series, a CBS News Inquiry: "The Warren Report."

This broadcast has been produced under the supervision and control of CBS News.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL TO DEESCALATE IN VIETNAM

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in continuing to call the attention of the House to the favorable editorial support for the July 10 proposal of eight House Republicans for the gradual, reciprocal, deescalation of the war in Vietnam, I include for the RECORD today editorials from the Easton, Pa., Express; the Hanover, Pa., Evening Sun; the Pottstown, Pa., Mercury; the Pottsville, Pa., Republican; the Harrisburg, Pa., Patriot; the Spartansburg, S.C., Journal; the Mitchell, S. Dak., Republic; the El Paso, Tex., Times; the Nacogdoches, Tex., Sentinel; the Salt Lake City, Utah, Tribune; and the Rutland, Vt., Daily Herald:

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, July 11, 1967]

A WAY OUT?

Eight Republican congressmen, none of whom can be counted among the ardent "doves" aligned against the administration's Vietnam policy, have come up with a plan for a unilateral diplomatic U.S. initiative for "de-escalating" the war.

It seems like a quietly sensible proposal. As explained by Rep. F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, it would call for halting U.S. bombing of North Vietnam in five successive 60-day stages starting with the 21st parallel. Each step would be conditioned on a de-escalatory response by the North Vietnamese.

Assuming a full response by both sides, both the U.S. bombing and North Vietnamese infiltration of South Vietnam ultimately would come to an end, according to the GOP congressmen's plan. The idea is not new. It has been suggested before to President Johnson as a compromise between those who want the war effort increased and those who want the U.S. to pull out unconditionally. The administration did not respond.

Many Americans, deeply concerned with the directions taken by the most unpopular war in the nation's history, nevertheless will find a substantial measure of accord in the congressional group's evaluation of the administration's war policy as "unyielding and inflexible—rigidly insisting that the first

concrete step toward de-escalation be taken by the North Vietnamese."

"It is a position," said Rep. Morse, spokesman for the group, "which comes dangerously close to changing the atmosphere of restraint to an atmosphere of power—and a limited war cannot stay limited or be ended in an atmosphere of power."

This, of course, is the core issue which has made U.S. involvement in Vietnam extremely unpopular both at home and abroad. The war is, undisguisedly, an American war, pitting the mightiest nation in the world directly against a small, technologically primitive state. The involvement weakens our global position of moral and legal leadership—and it is this to which French President Charles de Gaulle alluded in saying that U.S. action in Vietnam was part of the encouragement for trouble in the Middle East.

There is no guarantee that Hanoi, with continued material support from Red China and the Soviet, would respond to in kind to a de-escalatory process as modest in its dimensions as that proposed by the GOP congressmen. But it seems that the U.S. would lose little tactically by making the overture, inasmuch as the bombing has never accomplished any of its stated objectives.

[From the Hanover (Pa.) Evening Sun, July 12, 1967]

SOMETHING BETTER THAN NOTHING

None of the eight Republican congressmen backing a plan to cool down violence in Vietnam by degrees has anything to do with party leadership.

This gives them the option to speak freely. It gives other Republicans the option to kick the stuffing out of their proposal.

It also gives the general public a chance—and this could be important—to assess their proposal with a minimum of partisan prejudice.

It is a plan to let the undeclared enemy in Vietnam respond to an invitation to de-escalate the war by following the example of the United States. This side would quit bombing targets in North Vietnam for 60 days. If North Vietnam then showed signs of easing up its military efforts, a series of similar withdrawal moves would be undertaken, until military violence had ended.

Both sides could save face. Both sides would be relieved of an open-ended commitment to beat the other side into surrender.

The ultimate outcome would be like the outcome in Korea, where the United States maintains a massive garrison on a standby basis, though there has been no overt military violence since Dwight D. Eisenhower carried out his 1952 presidential campaign promise to stop the fighting.

It is significant in 1967 that the Johnson administration is where the Truman administration was in 1952. The Truman administration knew the public was growing intolerant of a war that fighting men could not understand. It knew something needed to be done but did not know how to go about it.

The eight Republican congressmen have proposed a plan to end the most recent U.S. adventure into Asiatic power politics. It is something better than nothing which is all that has been forthcoming from the Johnson administration.

The Johnson administration can think of nothing better than to promise to negotiate if the enemy makes the first move.

[From the Pottstown (Pa.) Mercury, July 19, 1967]

DEFINING "LIMITED WAR"

While Defense Sec. McNamara is saying little publicly about results of the latest trip to Vietnam, the indications are that he plans to keep a fairly tight lid on manpower increases.

We hope he does. For two plain facts must be faced regarding the escalation so

far. One is that it has failed to bring the desired result of negotiations toward a settlement. The other is that the investment to date has upset the whole balance of U.S. domestic and foreign commitments, diluting and weakening our efforts in places where they should have been sharp and strong.

The imbalance might be tolerable if the war in Southeast Asia were a traditional-type war where one simply pressed on full force toward final, "total" victory.

But McNamara evidently perceives, as did Rep. F. Bradford Morse (R-Mass.) and a group of Republican colleagues in a report Monday, that a limited war has its own set of imperatives, most of which have thus far been ignored.

The first imperative listed by the Republican congressman is that the diplomacy accompanying the Vietnam war "must not risk expansion to total war," for the obvious reason that total war would produce mutual destruction on a scale to obliterate the objectives sought in the limited war.

The pressure now being applied by nearly 500,000 American troops and the combined, intensive efforts of the Navy and Air Force would have been ample to smother the Communist force that was faced a year or two ago. But the Communist effort has risen to match the U.S. escalation. And the Communists are piped into sources of supply that can presumably match any U.S. effort right up to the brink of total nuclear war.

If this is McNamara's conviction, he can be expected to give increasing attention to the other imperatives of limited war. These are: (1) that an atmosphere of mutual confidence must be fostered, (2) that each side must be permitted to preserve "face" and claim the initiative, and (3) that the effort must "be susceptible to presentation, verification and implementation through the private channels of diplomacy."

The Republican congressmen made clear in their report that there could be no significant relaxation of military pressure that would alter the balance in the enemy's favor, and they specifically warned against a complete halt in bombing as involving "great military risk."

They did feel that a phased, reciprocal de-escalation was within the realm of the possible. If McNamara shares that view, there could be a significant new effort to break out of the vise.

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican,
July 14, 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 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 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 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 Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot,
July 11, 1967]

ALTERNATIVES: THEY MUST BE FOUND IN VIETNAM

Alternatives to further escalation of the war in Vietnam, even at this late date, still exist. It is still not too late for the United States to adopt a course less costly in American lives and resources and less risky of wider consequences.

That there are other ways out of the present bloody status quo than once again raising the stakes to higher and more deadly levels has been emphasized, on the one hand, by a group of eight Republican congressmen and, on another, by John Kenneth Galbraith, chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

The GOP group, which includes Rep. Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania, proposes a suspension of all bombing of North Vietnam as a first step in a "staged de-escalation" dependent on matching gestures by Communist forces. Mr. Galbraith proposes a suspension of the bombing and adoption of a "defensive" posture by our military similar to "enclave" proposals made in an earlier stage of the war.

The Republicans, headed by Rep. F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, are not as innovative or sweeping in their alternative proposals as Mr. Galbraith. This may be merely in deference to the political realities of their own position; after all, the Republican Party has, if anything, been more hawkish than the Administration. In any case, the GOP group's demand for reciprocal actions by the North Vietnamese may be too similar to Adminis-

tration proposals which have already proved to be unpalatable to Hanoi.

Mr. Galbraith, meanwhile, pegs his views to a broad plea that Americans at all levels reject our own official propaganda and begin to recognize certain truths about Vietnam. One such truth, he says, is that the rest of the world does not share our official belief that any form of government, even a military dictatorship, is preferable to communism—especially a communism that would apparently be as fiercely nationalistic and independent as Yugoslavia's.

Neither the House Republicans' proposal nor Mr. Galbraith's may be a workable alternative to whatever plans the Administration has in mind. But both are certainly more attractive than the prospect of sending still another 100,000 or 200,000 American boys—to use a phrase once spoken by President Johnson—to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves.

[From the Spartansburg (S.C.) Journal,
July 13, 1967]

VIETNAM BACK IN SPOTLIGHT

With the Middle East War distraction fading, interest is again turning to Vietnam. The picture is still discouraging with no workable solution.

Secretary of Defense McNamara has just ended a tour of the battle areas, General Westmoreland and other military leaders have made their recommendations (and they are reliably reported to include the sending of more troops) and congressional groups (this time several Republicans) have proposed a partial suspension of bombing to see if North Vietnam will respond by a similar de-escalation.

Military men feel that the American and South Vietnam troops now have the initiative and are steadily increasing the pressure on the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regulars. Reports indicate that they believe that with more troops they can increase this pressure.

Recently reports from the battlefield have confirmed that the North Vietnamese are using (or at least we are capturing) more and more youngsters, both boys and girls, in the front lines. This supports the belief that North Vietnam is suffering.

It cannot be dismissed that the United States, over holiday periods, has halted the bombing and even extended the air truce in the hope that this would encourage Hanoi to talk peace. The United States has made it crystal clear that this country and South Vietnam are ready to talk anywhere and anytime without conditions, but we will insist on South Vietnam remaining free and independent, and has found Hanoi unwilling to respond to our overtures or those of others.

Hanoi will talk peace when she is convinced she can't win. She is not convinced now. Any weakening of our will or resolve to see Vietnam through to the end will strengthen Hanoi's will to continue the fight.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Republic,
July 15, 1967]

GOP SOLONS BACK MCGOVERN POSITION

A number of House Republicans early this week offered a proposal on the conduct of the Vietnam War which closely parallels what Sen. George McGovern, D., S.D., has been saying for some months.

Eight GOP Representatives submitted what they called a new plan to scale down the war in Vietnam as an alternative to dispatching more American troops. Rep. F. Bradford Morse, R.-Mass., said the proposal "would not require either side to lose face" and could be a preliminary step on the road to peace. As outlined, the plan essentially would restrict the scope of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam in exchange for a reduction in Communist military efforts, one step at a time.

Under the GOP proposal, the U.S. would

halt bombing north of the 21st parallel for 60 days, excluding Hanoi but not the port city of Haiphong. If the Communists responded in kind, the U.S. would reduce air raids gradually to the 17th parallel—dividing line between North and South Vietnam.

Morse said North Vietnam could respond by stopping shipments of war supplies to the south, halt terrorist bombings, release U.S. prisoners and transfer MIG jet fighters to remote northern airfields.

"The staged cessation of U.S. bombing, if the plan does not work," said Morse, "can be reversed on a few hours notice. It does not risk significant erosion of the current military advantage of the United States in Vietnam." He said if it does work, the bombing and infiltration will be ended and a "spirit of confidence" will have emerged to negotiations.

In addition to Morse, the other Republican lawmakers behind the proposal are Reps. Richard Schweiker, Pa.; John D. Dellenback, Ore.; Marvin S. Esch, Mich.; Frank J. Horton, N.Y.; Charles Mathias, Jr., Md.; Charles Mosher, O., and Robert T. Stafford, Vt.

Sen. McGovern has long been urging a halt to the escalation of the war. He has never, as his opponents insinuate, proposed a U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. Rather, he has called for a holding action in the south and a cessation of bombing in the north—as the above Republicans want—as a step toward negotiations for settlement.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, July 12, 1967]

IT HAS BEEN TRIED

Republicans in Congress have proposed another effort at de-escalating the war in Vietnam. They want the U.S. to discontinue bombing North Vietnam a step at a time to see what the reaction would be in Hanoi.

In that respect, we must agree with Rep. Carl Albert, House Democratic leader, who said he rejects an implication of the proposal that the key to peace in Vietnam lies not in Hanoi, but in Washington.

"The proposal may reflect good intentions," Albert told the House, "but it reveals a shockingly bad memory on the part of its authors."

Albert said there have been 28 separate peace proposals accepted by the United States and rejected by Hanoi.

President Johnson has "literally searched the world to find terms acceptable to Hanoi," Albert added.

That appears to be an entirely correct picture.

Every time we have declared a bombing recess, the enemy has used that opportunity to bolster his position and increase his resistance.

It looks as though bombing is what hurts the enemy the most. Why surrender our most potent weapon in a forlorn hope the enemy will respond?

The Republican sponsors of that move ought to offer an acceptable answer to that question.

[From the Nacogdoches (Tex.) Sentinel, July 15, 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.

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 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 Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, July 12, 1967]

FLEXIBLE PROPOSAL FOR VIETNAM DEESCALATION

Although hawks and doves get the most attention in any discussion of Vietnam, the central question is not how the war is to be conducted, but how it is to be ended. The hawks say, "First smash the Communists, and the rest will take care of itself." The doves urge an end to the bombing of North Vietnam in the belief that this will encourage the Communists to change their minds about negotiations. The Johnson administration has tried both methods in a limited way, first pounding selected northern targets, then ordering bombing pauses of various lengths. But the Communists have not been impressed.

Now eight Republicans suggest that the United States initiate a program designed to bring about step-by-step deescalation.

As a starter, the U.S. would stop bombing North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. (This area includes the city of Hanoi but not the city of Haiphong.) If the North Vietnamese responded with a similarly limited, measurable step toward de-escalation, the U.S. would immediately halt bombing north of the 20th parallel for 60 days. And the process would continue in a series of five steps until U.S. bombing of the north and North Vietnamese infiltration of the south came to an end.

Representative F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, spokesman for the Republican group, believes that if the plan is accepted and if it works—two very big ifs—"a spirit of confidence might emerge," providing an opportunity for fruitful negotiations, a similar staged deescalation in South Vietnam, or both.

Morse showed the plan to administration

officials before making it public, but said no firm interest was shown at the decision-making level. This is not surprising since the Republican congressmen criticize the administration's war policy as being "unyielding and inflexible, rigidly insisting that the first concrete step toward de-escalation be taken by North Vietnam." Furthermore, say the Republicans, "it is an attitude which may reflect a misunderstanding of limited war, for it asks the enemy to risk losing face," thus creating an "atmosphere of power" in which a limited war becomes impossible.

None of the eight Republicans is a national figure. None is a member of the GOP leadership in the House. And that leadership has not given the plan public support. It is doubtful, moreover, that North Vietnam would be interested since, according to most reports, Hanoi believes it is winning the war.

In short, the plan is a trial balloon that may never get off the ground. Domestically, however, it could give the Vietnam debate another dimension by substituting a flexible approach for hard-line arguments of hawks and doves.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Daily Herald, July 11, 1967]

"SMALL STEPS" IN VIETNAM

Increasing concern on the part of many Americans about the war in Vietnam is reflected in a proposal for de-escalation of the war which was released on Monday by a group of Republican Congressmen, including Vermont's Rep. Robert T. Stafford.

The eight Republicans proposed that the U.S. halt all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days in an effort to encourage responsive de-escalation by North Vietnam. If the desired result were achieved from the first step, U.S. bombing would be ended north of the 20th parallel.

The hope would be that by tying each successive stage to North Vietnamese reductions in its operations in the South, military risks would be minimized and the conflict would gradually be reduced to a point where peace negotiations could be undertaken in a spirit of mutual confidence.

The plan of the Congressmen was offered as an alternative to the present trend of the war which is calling for "rapid or steady escalation in the power applied against North Vietnam," more American troops and more money, and the growing hazard of total rather than limited war.

There would be five steps to the de-escalation plan, giving each side full opportunity to test the sincerity and intentions of the other side.

The first move should come from the U.S. because at this point we have the military advantage, and North Vietnam would know that the proposal would be advanced from strength rather than weakness. Since this country would be making the first move, North Vietnam would be able to accept the plan without loss of face, which is a highly important factor in any basis for peace negotiations.

Whether or not this proposal or something like it might break the Vietnam stalemate, it is an example of the kind of alternatives that there are to drastic stepping up of the war against the North or complete American withdrawal.

As the statement of Stafford & Co. says, "the best chance for peace lies not in giant power or in giant concessions. It lies in small steps, taken quietly—steps that make the position of each side credible to the other."

BOY SCOUTS FROM 74 COUNTRIES IN 12TH WORLD JAMBOREE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. **McCLURE**. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of this month, 12,000 Boy Scouts from 74 countries gathered at Farragut State Park in my district in Idaho for the 12th World Jamboree, the first ever to be held in this country.

The theme of the jamboree was "friendship," and it was only natural that the Boy Scouts should choose Idaho as the site for the meeting. If there is one thing Idaho has an abundance of—in addition to mountains for hiking, game for hunting, streams for fishing and the most breathtaking outdoor scenery in the country—it is friendship.

Playing hosts to so many young men from so many countries, with its implications for world peace and international understanding, placed a considerable burden on the shoulders of the citizens of Idaho. And they came through admirably.

If, as the saying goes, "today's Scouts are tomorrow's leaders," then the people of my State have enabled these young boys to return to their native lands with a view of the United States not seen in their countries' newspapers which talk mainly of race riots and other such American scandals. The Scouts surely take back with them some of the kindness, some of the generosity that is the true picture of America.

The preparation that paved the way for the conclave was enormous, and I wish to pay tribute to former Gov. Robert E. Smylie; Gov. Don Samuelson; Miss Louise Shadduck, executive secretary of the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development; and all of the others who worked so tirelessly to make the jamboree the success that it was. I would also like to thank the Post Office Department for their cooperation in issuing a special airmail postal card commemorating the event.

A number of newspaper articles have been printed concerning the jamboree, and I would like to include a few in the **RECORD** at this point. I call particular attention to the article by Dorothy R. Powers in the *Spokane, Wash., Spokesman-Review*. Mrs. Powers tells a warmly human story which probably captures the spirit of the jamboree more than any words that I could say.

The articles follow:

[From the *Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review*, Aug. 8, 1967]

SCOUTS FROM MANY NATIONS HONOR PIONEER OF RATHDRUM

(By Dorothy R. Powers)

RATHDRUM, IDAHO.—Effie is just sitting there inside her small house in this small town when the world walks up on the porch. What's more, it knocks—and asks that she come out to meet it.

Effie, does, too.

Because the world has never come to Rathdrum (population 710) before, much less to Effie's tiny house.

So Effie—who will be 90 in February—picks up her short, stubby crutch.

She hobbles painfully to her door, opens it—and gasps!

There stands the world—in 30 pieces with two arms and two legs each.

In other words, there stand 26 Boy Scouts and four adult leaders from all over the world, even from parts of it that hadn't even heard of back when Effie was town librarian.

It began with a newspaper story.

Brief days before the start of the World Boy Scout Jamboree at Farragut State Park, this writer visited several small towns to discover the impact of the forthcoming gathering of thousands of Scouts.

Among the towns visited was Rathdrum.

And in Rathdrum, the person who knows more about the town than anybody else—now, "back then," or ever—is Mrs. Effie A. Fields.

She should. Thirty and one-half years as town librarian and another stint of almost equal length as town treasurer taught her.

SHE TELLS ABOUT IT

Sure, say Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Dixon, Effie would talk to a reporter. They own the town's only drug store soda fountain, and what Effie doesn't know, they do. They point the way up the hill to Effie's.

It's a blisteringly hot day, but because she feels chilly, Effie has an electric heater going in her little sitting room.

Yes, she nods her head pertly, you bet she knows the Boy Scouts are having a World Jamboree right close by! Boys from all over the world, right here in North Idaho!

And, oh, she says wistfully, she wishes she could get a glimpse of just one of them.

She can't possibly, though.

Effie doesn't even go the few blocks to Rathdrum's main street unless somebody fetches her in a car. Her husband's death several years ago left her all alone. The years have left her the universal legacy of age—aching legs and a difficulty in getting about.

But she still wishes the world's boys all the best.

The whole town feels the way Effie does. Behind the drug store fountain, Mrs. Dixon recalls ruefully that although Rathdrum's only a few miles from Farragut State Park, they didn't see "even one Girl Scout when they were at Farragut" (for the Girl Scout Round-Up, 1965).

BUS BRINGS SCOUTS

The story of Effie's wistful wish was published Sunday, July 30.

Six days later, a big bus pulled up across the street from the Dixon's drug store.

Out of it tumbled Boy Scouts from countries all over the globe.

And everybody aboard had begged to get to come to Rathdrum—and Effie!

Leading the contingent was C. Walter Hooper of New Bunswick, N.H., World Jamboree transportation director.

Even with that title, the doing wasn't easy.

It's hard to get a Scout off the Jamboree site.

Adult Scout Hooper had read *The Spokesman-Review* story of Effie's wish.

There had to be a way to grant it.

First, he got in touch with a sub-camp at the Jamboree that "had the most nations represented." It was Ermelunden, so named for the site in Denmark where the Jamboree took place in 1924.

He got the Scout leaders together first and explained Effie's wish.

"When the boys themselves heard of it," laughs Hooper, "they all wanted to go. We could take only one bus load."

"Going to see Effie" became such a project that the adult leaders had to select the boys by Scout rank and age and outstanding achievement. They also chose boys who could speak English, so they could talk to Effie.

But adult Scouts wanted to go on the mission to Effie as much as the kids. When Hooper asked for a physician aboard the bus for safety's sake, doctors in the sub-camp drew straws for the privilege, so eager were they. Dr. Wilson Foust of New Holland, Pa., won. There was "rank" aboard, without

question! Only the best for Effie. Lee Shalhope, in private life the chairman of the board of Mid-American Trucking Company of Chicago but a volunteer baggage director for the Jamboree, asked to come. And Neils Engberg, Boy Scout commissioner from Denmark, wanted to be in on the fun, and was.

BIG WELCOME

"I think everybody in town was there to meet us," Hooper told a friend later.

Except for Effie, who still sat in her small house, unaware of the Scouts' arrival.

The Dixons ran out to meet the bus.

Would the Scouts walk across the street very slowly, so townspeople could get pictures as they did so? They would—and 20 minutes flew by as everybody in Rathdrum got their pictures of kids from everywhere.

"Miss Rathdrum," pretty Lynda Goodman, in a bright pink dress, was there to lead the Scouts to Effie's house.

Up over the dusty little hill to Effie's house they marched.

There were Scouts from Germany, England, France and Scotland. A kilt brought a sparkle to Effie's eyes. Cessell Pilgram was there from Guyana, South America, which in Effie's librarian days had been British Guiana. And Biarki Mortensen told her he came from the Faeroes Islands. In all this Danish group of isles, located in the Atlantic Ocean between the Shetland Islands and Iceland, there are only 31,664 people. Yet one of them stood right here, in Effie's yard!

There were Canadians and Danes and Swiss. Rock Marc represented tiny Luxembourg. Khedar Lutchman spoke in the soft tones of Trinidad. Terry Spousa brought a "hello" from Bermuda. Far-off Ceylon was "there," in the person of T. Rajeswaran. Victor Lee spoke of Honk Kong. And there were American Scouts, too.

SEATED IN GARDEN

They brought one of Effie's chairs out into her yard and seated her. Each Scout fled past, shook her hand and introduced himself. Effie repeated every boy's name out loud, and his country.

And then they told Effie their surprise.

They named her honorary "Mother" of the World Boy Scout Jamboree.

To make it official, Transportation Director Hooper bent over and placed a Boy Scout neckerchief around her throat.

She sat straight in her chair.

She fingered her cane.

"Oh, that's nice! That's so nice!"

Effie couldn't say any more.

Everybody cheered.

The crowd which had followed the Scouts to Effie's followed them back uptown.

A man walked up to Hooper to thank him, on behalf of all Rathdrum.

"Young man," he began, "what you did here today . . ." He couldn't finish. His eyes were full of tears.

TREAT FOR SCOUTS

At the drug store, Owner Dixon had his own treat for the Scouts. He took them to the far end of First Street, to show them the remains of the Pony Express station, where riders had changed horses. Overseas Scouts stared.

By now, the whole town was "walking with" the Scouts.

They opened the fire station door next, and showed the Scouts the town fire engine.

Back in the drug store, Dixon—somehow and somewhere—had managed to get a Kennedy half-dollar piece to give every Scout.

And then he treated everybody to American-type milk shakes.

Running into the drug store came a town resident.

"I need some film!" he cried urgently.

"You'll have to wait till the Boy Scouts leave," Mrs. Dixon, busily mixing milk shakes, told him. "They're our Rathdrum guests!"

"But they're why I need the film!"

"Oh," she smiled understandingly. "Just take it off the shelf. You can pay me later." In came another man.

"I'd like to treat all the Scouts, over at the drive-in."

They had to leave, Hooper explained regretfully. They must be back in Jamboree camp at noon.

WATCH THEM LOAD UP

The whole town watched as the Scouts loaded into their bus.

Rathdrum would never see so many Scouts again.

Just as they were about to pull out, a pleasant-faced woman scurried across the street. She was carrying a huge bowl of fresh raspberries she'd just picked.

"I thought," she said, poking the bowl through an open window, "the boys could eat these on the way back to camp."

They did, too.

En route to camp, Hooper tried to thank the boys for having given up so much camp fun to make the trip.

But the boys turned back the thanks.

"They thanked me for the privilege of going," Hooper said proudly. "They thanked me!"

In the sudden quiet of the modest little house where she lives all alone, so did Effie.

And she will, for a lot of long days to come.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1967]

SCOUTS OF WORLD MIX OLD AND NEW

(By Robert Windeler)

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, August 8.—They talk of tape recorders, Twiggy and traffic on the streets of Tokyo more than of tenting on the old camp ground.

When they were younger the Boy Scouts here from 74 countries for their 12th world jamboree, the first to be held in this country, came together for the adventure of camping and hiking. Now, at the advanced ages of from 14 to 20 their biggest interest by far is the opposite sex.

"There is one thing that all 12,000 of us have in common," said Danee Samonte, a 15-year-old Scout from Manila, the Philippines, "girls."

That is one commodity that is in short supply on the 5,000-acre jamboree campsite in Idaho's Farragut State Park, 20 miles north of here and 35 miles from the Washington State border.

[The jamboree ended Wednesday, United Press International reported, with a final round of fishing, boating, canoeing and archery.]

Visits to the jamboree by local young ladies—or anyone else—are limited to afternoons from 1 to 6 P.M. each day of the nine-day event, which began on Aug. 1, and two Canadian boys were expelled for being in the company of girls in the woods near their campsite at 1 o'clock in the morning, two hours after taps.

Most of the other necessities of the modern world, except hot water, are available to the young men of the non-Communist non-Arab world who are making their temporary home on the hard, dry ground (spikes had to be used in place of tent pegs) of this pine-forested part of the country.

And they themselves are a blending of the traditional values of the 60-year-old Boy Scout movement, and the contemporary themes, including that of the present jamboree—"For Friendship."

At their campfires here they sing everything from the African lullaby "Cumbaya" to the latest hits from London and Kuala Lumpur. Transistor radios are more prevalent than bugles to play taps.

"We've got to keep up with the world," said a 19-year-old Georgian. "We're behind in so many ways, like uniforms and formal ceremonies."

By pioneer standards, in camping out here at least they are pampered by the pressures of modern society. They cook over charcoal ("We are conservationists and it would take a national forest to supply us with firewood," explained one Montana school master), and a local lake was specially stocked with 20,000 trout trapped by a net to assure a catch by any amateur fisherman.

"A trout parlor in downtown Tokyo is more challenging," said one Japanese youth.

Yet the Scouts here won rigorous local competitions for the right to attend the jamboree and they are among the most committed youth of the 10,250,000-member movement. They share an interest in the outdoors and a strong loyalty to their individual conceptions of the ideals of world scouting.

"Only in the last two years have I been able to understand the real meaning of scouting," said Thomas Jansen, a 17-year-old West German youth from Krefeld, near Düsseldorf. "It is basically friendship and public service—but for five years I thought it was hiking."

"Nobody joins scouting to get their character built," said Matthew Mazer, 16 years old, of Scarsdale, N.Y. "But one day you wake up and realize that that is exactly what has happened."

The American and British Scouts attending this jamboree are at an age where their colleagues have largely lost interest in scouting and dropped out. Seventy-five per cent of American Scouts quit before they reach age 15, and only 1 per cent ever reach Eagle Scout, the highest ranking in the Boy Scouts of America.

The British Scouts recently revamped their uniforms to include long pants and four-in-hand ties instead of the traditional shorts and long socks and neckerchiefs. They also eliminated their program for 20- to 25-year-olds and dropped the word "boy" from their title.

American Scouts still wear shorts, to the dismay of most of them here who were requested not to bring civilian clothes in order "to create a good image of America for our visitors."

American Scouts account for 5,000 of the total of just under 12,000 here. The British sent 1,300 and the Canadians are represented by 1,200 Scouts. There are 5.8 million Scouts in this country.

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman, Aug. 6, 1967]

POMP OF WORLD JAMBOREE BOASTS SPECTRUM OF COLOR

(By John Ulrich)

FARRAGUT STATE PARK.—Green, tan, and predominant colors of the spectacle that is the 12th World Boy Scout Jamboree.

The greens are in the official jamboree uniforms and in the pines of the surrounding Idaho mountains. The tans also show up in the uniforms and in the gradually thickening layer of dust that falls on tents, boys and everything else.

The painful pink is most noticeable as a band around the knees of both boys and Scout leaders, a band of sunburn which extends from the tops of their knee high socks to the bottom of their uniform shorts.

ALL COLORS DISPLAYED

Discounting all that, the jamboree shows every imaginable color and color is displayed in every imaginable way.

The Scouts from Northern Ireland in sub-camp Makilling have decorated their entrance gate with travel posters glorifying Ulster and various maps of Ireland printed on Irish linen.

A Mexican troop in the same camp has panels made up of potatoes. Each square is a different bright color and the Scouts explain that the squares are hand woven of "ixtla" or jute.

United Kingdom Troop 32 from Warwickshire, Yorkshire and Norfolk decorate their entry with canvas panels on which are painted the symbols of the 12 world jamborees held to date. Their counterparts of U.K. Troop 22 from Yorkshire and Lincolnshire carry the crests of those two counties on their gate.

Tents come in every color including black, which is predominant in the tents of Scouts from Germany. The Germans explain that a founder of their movement brought back the black tents from Lapland. They are made up of triangular and square panels and look much like an American Indian tepee, complete with smokehole. The nomadic Lapps built fires in their shelters and the dark color helps warm the tent when the sun shines on it. At jamboree it needs no warming but is relatively cool when one panel is left open to the air.

The "hometown" troop . . . Troop 41, made up of boys from the Inland Empire in the immediate vicinity of jamboree decorates its gateway with a stylized 20-gallon hat wearing Western and "howdy, partner" in 10 languages.

FUJIYAMA DISPLAYED

One troop from Japan has built a plywood Fujiyama mounted atop a replica of a Japanese high speed train. The Japanese have the card-shaped windsocks that are the symbol of good luck for boys and are most frequently seen in Japan on Boys Day (May 5).

A Canadian troop from Calgary has reproduced a replica of Fort Calgary and during flag ceremonies red-coated Scouts man guard posts on either side of the gateway representing the 1875 outpost of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman, Aug. 6, 1967]

VIET SCOUTERS REMAIN QUIET ABOUT BATTLE

FARRAGUT STATE PARK.—The Vietnamese delegation to the Boy Scout World Jamboree says little about the war there.

Tony Do Van Ninh, Saigon commissioner for the Vietnamese boy scouts, said "We are not to talk about it, except we fight against aggression."

The five-member Vietnamese delegation, including three boys and two leaders, flew almost directly from Saigon to Spokane, then came to Farragut. Because of the direct route, Ninh said he had discovered no reaction among Americans toward the war.

Ninh explained his country sent only five scouts because "it is a long way to Saigon, and costs much."

Earlier, jamboree officials said one problem limiting the size of Southeast Asia delegations is transportation. "We can get them here, but we can't get them back," said Keith Kentopp. "It's hard to get a flight to Vietnam. They're all filled. Coming back is no problem though."

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman, Aug. 6, 1967]

IDAHO'S BEAUTY, FRIENDLINESS BLEND TO ENTERTAIN 12,000 WORLD SCOUTS

(By David Zarkin)

FARRAGUT STATE PARK.—This beautiful sprawling 5,000 acres of state park may soon replace the potato as Idaho's claim to fame and state symbol.

With the advent of the 12th Boy Scout World Jamboree, which is taking place now, the park has achieved a level of utility and diversity held by few outdoor facilities of this size in the nation.

Scouts and Scout officials from throughout the world acclaim Farragut's assets daily and say that it's the only place a tremendous scouting event could be held comfortably for more than 12,000 youths. Nestled in the pines of the Bitterroot Mountains of Northern

Idaho, this secluded area was a Navy training base during the 1940's, and then became a college. It was abandoned by the college and used as a wildlife refuge.

The site was used for the 1965 Girl Scout Roundup, but before the Boy Scouts could meet here this month improvements had to be made to meet their requirements.

After the Girl Scout event, former Gov. Robert E. Smylie took the lead in luring the Boy Scouts to Idaho for their first world jamboree in the United States. Idaho met their demands and made the needed improvements with a \$729,425 program, part of it paid in 50-50 matching funds by the State and U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. These improvements are permanent and will be enjoyed by Idahoans and others in years to come.

Smylie's efforts in making Farragut a suitable place for two such noteworthy international events were noted after 1965 when the main street was named "Smylie Boulevard." But this year the title of that shrubbery decked stretch was tagged "Friendship Boulevard."

CHANGE TEMPORARY

A State Park Department official said it was in connection with the Boy Scouts' event which uses "For Friendship" as its theme. Scout officials said that there was an agreement that names of the streets would be temporarily changed for the jamboree.

Smylie was not on hand this week for dedication ceremonies, but Jamboree Commissioner Irving Feist made mention of him. Gov. Don Samuelson dedicated the park in ceremonies attended by 14,000 visitors.

During the jamboree there has been talk that the 1969 National Boy Scout Jamboree might be held at Farragut. Sweden and Japan have been rumored as possible sites for the next world jamboree.

BEACH DEVELOPED

The state's most significant and costly contribution to the park and the jamboree is the \$194,338 beach development on Lake Pend Orielle. Half the funds for this man-made sandy cove came from the federal government. Also included in this project is a permanent brick bath house with restrooms, showers and a parking lot. A permanent restroom building was also constructed at Buttonhook Bay at a cost of \$6,960—also on a federal-state matching fund basis.

A permanent water system was installed for the Boy Scout event with federal and state funds at a cost of \$151,262. A 50,000 seat amphitheater, large enough to hold the national jamboree, was built with a total of \$74,930 in state funds. The state and federal governments shared the \$73,950 cost of the headquarters building which houses State Park Department offices.

BRIG CONVERTED

Other permanent developments include the entrance gate, kiosk and sign, seeding 194 acres, top soil and seeding for the Avenue of Flags, dock installation and renovation of the old Navy brig for the press. This building will be used later for maintenance and storage.

The State Parks Department is not the only state office that has played a big role at the jamboree. The Idaho State Police Department has one-third of its force located at Farragut with patrolmen in 18 cars cruising the park and nearby Highway 95.

The patrolmen have logged 1,200 miles a day on their blue and white cars and reunited 300 people with their families and friends during the hectic opening day.

SCOUTS BADGER POLICE

The state police have become "public relations men" for Idaho and have attracted the interest of many foreign scouts. These boys have offered to trade trinkets for the police officers' smart Stetson hats. The officers have

resisted making the exchange, but spend a good deal of time showing the youths the many gadgets on their patrol cars.

The state police have been joined in security work with Kootenai County Sheriff John Bender who maintains a trailer alongside the state officers' own mobile living quarters. The law enforcement officials said their work has consisted mainly of patrolling and incidents here have been minor.

The State Forestry Department is responsible for fire protection for the park. So far, only minor fires caused by careless cigarette smoking have been reported. The department has roving patrols, radio communications and lookouts reporting to a main office. About 600 garbage cans filled with water have been dispersed through the park, to extinguish fires.

TAUGHT FIRE PROTECTION

State Forestry Official Wilbur Atwood, Boise, said the scouts have been indoctrinated on fire protection and have kept the grounds free of litter.

The Idaho Bureau of Mines is sponsoring a "gold digging" exhibit here and the State Fish and Game Department has cordoned off a corner of the lake and stocked it with 20,000 catchable rainbow trout.

The boys attending this event are fairly unanimous in their praise for Idaho and western hospitality. Their only complaint—the ground here is too rocky and dusty for pitching a tent, but all of them have managed to keep their abodes in an upright position.

[From the Parma (Idaho) Review Aug. 3, 1967]

GOV. DON SAMUELSON DEDICATES FARRAGUT PARK

Governor Don Samuelson dedicated beautiful new Farragut State Park Tuesday, August 1, first day of the World Scout Jamboree "for the use and enjoyment of the people of Idaho, of the nation and the free world."

In his dedicatory remarks, the Governor said: "I wonder how many of you here today for these dedication ceremonies recall that we are on the location of what was once the largest 'city' in Idaho.

"The reason I remember so vividly is that 23 years ago I climbed off a troop train from Davenport, Iowa and became a resident of Camp Farragut along with 60,000 other sailors.

"This was the place I called home for two years during World War II, so there is a large amount of sentiment and affection included when I say what an unsurpassed pleasure it is for me to be here to participate in these ceremonies.

"As an ex-gunners mate in the Navy I can also report to you truthfully that boot camp at Farragut was never like this. I don't remember being called on to make too many speeches back in boot camp days.

"It is my high honor today to dedicate the permanent park facilities for the use and enjoyment of the people of Idaho, of the nation and the free world.

"With pride, I can say Idaho has done a tremendous job in the creation of Farragut State Park. I say this because monies have been wisely spent for the present and for the future. Facilities have been constructed that will not only serve the World Scout Jamboree, but also will be of lasting benefit to all the citizens who will hereafter visit this unexcelled spot.

"I should point out that without the excellent cooperation of everyone who has been associated with the state on this project, these facilities could not have become a reality. There are three entities who have cooperated so generously that I believe they merit special mention.

"I am indeed happy to acknowledge the splendid assistance, both financial and advisory, of the United States Department of

Interior and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

"The Boy Scouts of America certainly deserve special recognition and thanks from all of us for their extremely generous spirit of cooperation. The ultimate needs of the state park were given every consideration by Scout officials. The result of this fine spirit of cooperation will be to the lasting benefit of the general public.

"Finally, allow me to compliment highly the Idaho legislature and the all important role it played in the development of this project. Farragut State Park is a prime example of the fact that proposals and undertakings that are good for the entire state are met with enthusiasm by our legislators.

"It is my honest belief that Farragut State Park is rapidly becoming one of the most significant outdoor recreation areas in the Northwest. Its fame and renown will spread and I vision the day when this park's national reputation will underscore the fact that truly 'Idaho is the place to go.'

"It will take time and a great deal of energy on the part of the Park Board to realize the goal we work toward mutually for state parks in Idaho. That goal is to provide a major league quality state park system.

"Now, in reflection, we can observe that Farragut has run the complete cycle.

"From the largest city in the State nearly 25 years ago, the area became a ghost camp.

"But no longer.

"It emerges today in magnificence and splendor for the pure enjoyment of all peoples. Farragut ranks high on the list of attractions in a state like ours that is so richly blessed with an abundance of natural appeal. Mother Nature bestowed one of her most gracious smiles on this entire area," Governor Samuelson concluded.

[From the Parma (Idaho) Review, Aug. 3, 1967]

SAMUELSON TRACES HISTORY OF PARK IN DEDICATORY TALK

FARRAGUT STATE PARK, IDAHO.—From the "biggest city" of the state to a ghost town to the "most significant outdoor recreation area of the Northwest."

Tracing the evolution of Farragut State Park at dedicatory ceremonies for permanent facilities Tuesday, Idaho Gov. Donald W. Samuelson condensed the park's 25-year history.

The latest phase—outdoor recreation—is currently being provided for more than 11,000 Boy Scouts attending the World Jamboree—that first ever to be held in the United States.

Washington Gov. Dan Evans and Samuelson headed a delegation of State and Boy Scout officials in dedicating the \$750,000 facilities.

Boy Scouts have a tradition of swapping and the ceremonies Tuesday afternoon in front of the park's new headquarters building would have made any scout proud.

Jamboree Commissioner Irving Feist, Newark, N.J., passed out souvenirs to members of the Idaho Parks Board, Gov. Samuelson, and Idaho Commerce and Development Secretary Louise Shaddock.

Then Samuelson was presented with plaques by scouts from Mexico and Nepal. Samuelson then presented a plaque to William Frome, St. Anthony, chairman of the parks board, to dedicate the facilities.

Frome noted that the park had at various times been a naval training area, a college, a fish and game reserve and site for two prior jamborees.

Samuelson recalled that his first sight of Idaho was from a troop train in 1943 when he arrived at Farragut for two years of training as a gunner's mate during World War II.

"Boot camp was never like this," Samuel-

son quipped as he spoke from the platform in front of the administration building.

But in 1967, the governor contended, "Farragut State Park is rapidly becoming one of the most significant outdoor recreation areas in the northwest."

[From the Idaho Observer, Aug. 5, 1967]

HOW WE DAMNED THE TORPEDOES
(By Robert E. Smylie)

Now that the Boy Scouts are World Jamboreeing at Farragut State Park it is interesting to recall how hard it was to reclaim that concrete jungle on the shores of Lake Pend Oreille. There was a time when no one in Idaho's state government thought it could be done, except the Governor.

It all happened because the Girl Scouts were looking for a place to have a National Round-up in 1965. We invited them to look at old Camp Farragut and they were charmed. But they said the old concrete foundations of the city that had housed 50,000 naval trainees had to be caved in, broken up and buried. We said we would do it. Then they said the area had to be seeded to adequate ground cover. We said we would do it. Then they said they needed an amphitheater covered with grass to seat 14,000 people. We said we would build it. And they asked for a new water system and so on, and we promised them all of that, too.

We sent a team of experts to look it over. The price tag for cleaning up was 3 million dollars. Everybody wanted to give up. We turned to the National Guard. Two summers of training for the engineering troops and the help of a reserve outfit for their training session that same summer, and the clean up job was nearly done.

Then the Legislature was asked to appropriate funds to construct the water system, plant the grass, build the amphitheater and the other needed facilities. Herman McDevitt of Pocatello made a scathing speech in the House about how the Governor had got us in trouble, and now there was nothing to do but bail him out. He likened me to the ne'er do well brother-in-law who could never pay his bills and said that family honor required that the legislature meet the Governor's unwise and outrageous obligations. I was supposed to be upset by the speech, but it really came as a great help. I am sure the Legislature could never have been convinced to make such a wise investment in advance, and only when there was really no choice would they take the first step toward creation of a magnificent state park.

It is interesting to observe how fast attitudes change. Some of yesterday's most impressive handwringers are now bell-ringers for the new park. They should be. It's a beautiful northern anchor for our park and recreation system and it will bring national renown to Idaho on a continuing basis. Creation of the park and its development have saved a 4,000-acre playground with a mile and a half of lake shore for public use forever. This was more than sound conservation, it was creative conservation at its best.

This year there is a new swimming beach with facilities to accommodate 500 people. There is a 50,000-seat amphitheater that makes the park the greatest outdoor convention hall in all of America.

There are many without whose help the park would never have become a reality. General John Walsh, Col. James Brooks, hundreds of men of the National Guard, Roger Guernsey, the ex-state forester . . . and Jon Soderblom, are but a few. Louise Shadduck who sold the Girl Scouts on the idea of Farragut and Mrs. Warren Brown of McCall who had the idea in the first place are others. If you tried to write a list . . . you would give up. The only way you could be inclusive enough would be to say "All of Us," because all of Idaho with its tax dollars had a part of making the Farragut Park a reality.

This year the Park is playing host to the first World Jamboree of Boy Scouts ever held in the United States.

It is said that General McAulliffe who was commanding at Bastogne during World War II's Battle of the Bulge finally concluded that there was no way out of the encircling German ring. He called his staff together and when one of them asked how he was going to get out, he is said to have replied that he wasn't going to. What he planned to do he said, was to get deep enough in trouble that someone would rescue him.

That is about how Farragut was saved and built. If we had not invited the Girl Scouts we would never have made all of these commitments. If we had asked the Legislature in advance there would have been a thousand reasons for doing nothing, or doing less. So we issued the invitation, and the trouble commenced. First the National Guard came to the rescue, then several volunteer civic groups, then the Forestry Youth Camp. Finally the Legislature by nearly unanimous vote adopted the project as its own and Farragut state park was a reality once and for all.

Herman McDevitt was right, but as usual for the wrong reasons. It was wise to bail the Governor out. It's the best investment we have made in a long, long time.

Farragut is aptly named. It was the old Admiral at Mobile Bay who said "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead." That was the real spirit in which the Park was re-created.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 28, 1967]

A NOT-SO-RUGGED LIFE AWAITS SCOUTS HEAD-
ING FOR JAMBOREE IN IDAHO

(By James E. Bylin)

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO.—A Boy Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly and all those other wonderful things. And, judging from the setup here at the Scouts' World Jamboree, he is pampered.

Scouting apparently has changed. Remember how you spent hours foraging for firewood and then striking flint to make fire? Here, the scouts draw charcoal from a 70-ton supply and then ignite it with matches. Remember how you used to cook all your meals in your grubby mess kit pan and how as often as not you ended up with a plate full of twigs and grass and insects? Here, much of the food is precooked.

"The boys aren't coming here to spend their time over a hot stove," says Oren Felton, Jamboree food director.

What are the boys coming here for? One thing they're coming here for is to see some real live Indians perform those dances that Scouts have been imitating for decades. For pre-Jamboree festivities scheduled for Monday, officials passed up a performance by some well-trained Scout groups and elected to present real Indians who live in the Washington-Idaho area.

WANTED: INDIANS

The Redskins in the area, however, were less than familiar with war dances and picturesque incantations to the rain gods. "They haven't done a ceremonial dance in 100 years," moans a Scout official. "The one thing they have to go on for costumes are old National Geographic magazines," he says. Particularly worrisome was a sign he spotted on Spokane's skid row. It read: "Wanted—Indians for Boy Scout Jamboree."

Some 100 Indians did show up for dress rehearsals, and they proved to be apt, if not experienced pupils.

Besides the Indians, some 10,000 Boy Scouts and 1,000 adult leaders from 100 countries will gather for the quadrennial Jamboree, which starts Tuesday and runs through the following Wednesday. Each Scout has paid \$50 for the privilege of attending.

The World Jamboree will be the first ever held in the U.S. The site is the 5,000-acre Farragut State Park, a World War II Naval training center that is 50 miles northeast

of Spokane and 25 miles north of Coeur D'Alene. The state of Idaho and the Federal Government have spent \$740,000 to improve the park for the Jamboree and for the public's use afterward.

The Federal Government has helped in other ways, too. Some Army units were sent to the area to help raise 7,000 Scout tents, dig 400 latrine pits and ready the bank, hospital, fire station and post office. The military men and equipment will be gone, however, by the time the Scouts arrive. "We don't want people to think we're militaristic," says one of the 1,300 Jamboree staffers.

GIFTS FOR THE LITTLE SHAVERS

American corporations are doing their bit, too. Perhaps optimistically, Gillette Co. is giving visiting Scouts—who range in age from 14 to 18—a complete shaving kit, and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. is donating 5,600 cameras.

The state of Idaho has shipped in 12 tons of old Idaho license plates, which, it is presumed, will be highly prized by the foreign Scouts. "We really didn't want them, but people here have been so nice that we took them," says Jamboree coordinator Robert Billington.

Keith Kentopp, another Jamboree official, says the Jamboree won't permit "crass commercialism," although it is gladly accepting the gifts and 27,800 cans of soup from Campbell Soup Co. and other food from Thomas J. Lipton Co. Is that commercialism? No, says Mr. Kentopp. For instance, he says "Campbell is interested in kids eating and we're interested in kids being well fed."

While the Scouts eat their soup and their precooked fare, staff members and volunteers will be dining in style. Their meals, to be catered by a Spokane hotel, will include veal scallopini, grilled salmon and roast turkey. There also will be 100 pounds of chicken heads on hand—but those are to feed a contingent of falcons, hawks and eagles appearing in a demonstration.

FISH AND SQUIRRELS

Besides eating and playing with old Idaho license plates, the Scouts will be busy with archery, hiking, arts and crafts, conservation training and the like. They can fish in a lovely mountain lake specially stocked with 20,000 trout, and they can swim in one end of the lake that has been contoured so the sun will warm the water.

They apparently can take part in some unofficial activities, too. Pointing at one of the ground squirrels that swarm over the area, an official of the Jamboree chuckles: "By golly, I bet a lot of those little fellows get caught and cooked."

Most activities will be highly supervised, though. "We've learned safety precautions the hard way over the years," says a Scout official. "All we need, for example, is to lose a French kid and have Charles de Gaulle on our necks."

COLORADO RIVER WATER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WIGGINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the area which has more people dependent on the Colorado River for their water supply than any other, I must speak out strongly in opposition to S. 1004, recently passed by the Senate. It is an ill-considered and short-sighted approach to a problem of

paramount importance to a vast portion of our country.

There can be no argument that our sister State of Arizona is in need of water, not only for future development, but also for mere existence. Well and good. Let us provide her with water, but not at the expense of the other States which depend upon the Colorado River for their life as well. It would be absurd to legislate water away from one area of the country, where it is desperately needed, to create new water uses in another area.

We are not dealing with geography; we are dealing with people. Making Californians thirsty in order to quench the thirst of Arizonans does not reflect equity; it is an exercise in flagrant foolishness. If we were talking about the last available drops of water in the world, the raw political power play which the administration and Arizona have run in the Senate would, perhaps, be more understandable. Fortunately, we are not.

Our discussion should be about how we are going to bring additional water into a parched region which is the most rapidly growing part of our Nation. It is beneath the dignity of the Congress to participate in the approval of a project which merely shifts a water shortage from one region to another, while pretending that the Southwest does not really have critical needs for additional water sources.

If I were representing Arizona, I might have panicked also. Their needs are great. With the cooperation of all the basin States a solution seemed within reach last year. But, rather than continuing the quest for this solution to the problem which faces the entire Colorado River Basin, of which Arizona is a part, fear, I think, drove them to settle for Secretary Udall's scheme—a plan of questionable merit and feasibility.

The scheme embodied in S. 1004 is offensive to my State of California. It is offensive to Colorado. It is offensive to Utah. It is offensive to Wyoming. It is offensive to the Governor of Nevada.

The great majority of the basin States want to solve the big problem, which is basically that of an inadequate water supply, in a permanent, equitable, and meaningful way. We want Arizona to get water; not merely water to exist, but water to expand and grow. We want the States of the upper basin to develop without the political roadblocks which Arizona would surely throw up if the flow into a central valley project might be diminished thereby. We want to be absolved of the tremendous burden of the Mexican Water Treaty, which is clearly a national commitment. That burden should not be borne by just one section of the Nation when it is a burden that spells hardship and possible disaster to that section unless relieved.

S. 1004 lacks the major principles essential to a solution of the Southwest's water problems. These essentials are:

First. Recognition that the dependable water supply of the Colorado River system is insufficient to meet existing and committed use, including the Mexican Water Treaty obligation;

Second. Effective steps to augment the inadequate flow of the Colorado River;

Third. Adequate protection of existing

uses and investments against proposed new uses of the central Arizona project;

Fourth. Authorization of the Hualapai project; and

Fifth. Use of a financially sound development fund to help defray the costs of a future water augmentation project.

An agreement was reached 2 years ago between the authorized representatives of all basin States which embodied all of these essentials. A bill reflecting this agreement was introduced by the three Arizona Representatives and by 31 California Representatives. The central Arizona project was finally within the grasp of our friends from Arizona. There was not time to pass the bill in the 89th Congress, but most of us looked forward to introducing the bill in the 90th Congress and seeing it pass.

Unfortunately, Secretary Udall abdicated his responsibility and abjured his beliefs. Those Californians who rejoiced in supporting Arizona's bill of last year are now placed in the unpleasant, but necessary, role of opposing the new bill before us. The essentials necessary to the basinwide solution to this basinwide problem have not changed; they are merely now being ignored.

All of the experts who have testified before the House and Senate Interior Committees agree that there will be a drastic water shortage in the Colorado River. The river is barely adequate to meet present needs, let along the projected future demands. The question is when the crisis will be upon us. Given that situation, we have a solemn duty to augment the water available to the region which will suffer this shortage. In order to determine how best to supply this additional water, studies should be made first of the availability of surplus water from other areas of the country, and then studies of the feasibility of bringing that water to the areas of need.

Once the studies are accomplished, a sound basin development fund is required that will contain sufficient money to finance the bold efforts that will be needed. The only feasible way to accumulate this much money is to construct a huge hydroelectric power generating facility and to sell the power it produces. Such an ambitious development is the one proposed at Bridge Canyon, the Hualapai Dam. This dam and its power generating facilities would produce 5 million kilowatts of pump-storage peaking power. This is 10 times the amount of power which would be produced by the thermal generating plant proposed in S. 1004. Last year's regional bill proposed the construction of two dams, thus providing power revenues even more rapidly. We are content to build only one of the two.

I propose, and plead with my colleagues from Arizona, that we do something constructive about the problem now while there is still some time left. We should not let unfounded fears or sectional greed block progress for the benefit of the entire Pacific Southwest.

WHO SHOULD CUT THE LAWN?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WIGGINS] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, viewing the efforts of the 90th Congress in perspective, it appears to me that the principal battles have been waged to date over the issue of the extent of Federal responsibility in the problem-solving function of government.

I do not claim to know the precise boundaries of this responsibility, but surely there are limits.

Historically, the Federal Union was created upon the premise that only specific powers were to be granted to the Central Government. Admittedly those powers are stated in the Constitution in broad terms; and properly so, if our national charter is to remain a viable document suited to a changing society. But implicit in the federal system is a recognition that there are limits.

It is the function of government to respond to problems. But which government, and to which problems? That is the issue, Mr. Speaker. Let me illustrate.

At this moment, my lawn is badly in need of cutting. To me this is a nagging problem, but is it a community, State, or National problem as well? Doubtless there are millions of Americans similarly plagued this summer. Since the problem is national in scope, does it follow that the Federal Government must act to solve the national problem of unkept lawns? No one would seriously suggest that it should.

It is indeed possible that some lawns may have become veritable jungles, not only detracting from the appearance of the individual's yard, but affecting the neighbors' yards as well. A fire hazard may be created; property values may decline. The problem is more acute. Perhaps government at some level should intervene. But which level of government?

In some areas entire neighborhoods may become infested by weeds as the result of years of inattention. Perhaps, too, the citizens who reside there have little interest in maintaining the appearance of their lawns, or long ago had become discouraged by the indifference of most of their neighbors. Indeed, the problem in such areas may be critical, calling for drastic governmental action.

In this case, should Congress act? I think not. Cities can rise to the challenge of shaggy lawns if their people demand it. And if they do not, whose fault is it?

This brief discussion of the state of the Nation's lawns, Mr. Speaker, is not entirely irrelevant. Some say we should launch a multimillion-dollar program to eradicate rats. I am against rats, as well as shaggy lawns, but the question recurs: Is this a problem calling for a governmental solution, and if so, which government should respond?

To relate the very real problem of rat infestation in our major cities to the subject of unkept lawns is not to minimize its gravity. Rats are dangerous to health; they do spread disease; and they do bite children. But to recognize the seriousness of the problem does not settle the

basic question of what should be done about it, and by whom.

The cause of rat infestation is filth. Filth is caused by people—people who lack the responsibility to keep their environment clean. The solution is to kill the rats and clean up the filth. Who should do it?

One proposal is for the Congress to appropriate \$40 million to pay for a rat control program.

Another might be to issue citations to those who fail to place lids on garbage cans, who throw refuse in the street, or who permit their building to become dilapidated below minimum standards set by enlightened building codes.

The former proposal involves the Federal Government; the latter challenges the individual and local governmental units to attack the problem themselves.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any vitality left in the federal system, we should recognize that the control of pests, vermin, rats, and the like, is a matter with which the States can and should deal without direction or financial support from the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, Congress has already become involved in the rat business.

Under the Department of Interior, technical assistance exists for extermination of rats in urban areas.

Under the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Community Action portion of the poverty law provided approximately \$323 million of un earmarked money last year that can be used for, among other things, rat eradication. In the coming year, there is a proposal that this be boosted to \$420 million. Chicago alone has received \$2.9 million of Federal money for rat eradication in the past 3 years.

Under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Comprehensive Health Services Act of 1966 authorized \$125 million last year to States for a variety of public health problems, including rat extermination. A number of States and communities are in the process of applying for Federal funds to eradicate rats under this program.

Rather than further escalate the war on rats by the creation of another agency, it would be constructive to eliminate the existing Federal programs. Unless States and communities and the people in them are challenged to solve their own problems, rather than rely on Washington, they will surely never do so. Further centralization of essentially local control in Washington will, in the long run, work to the detriment of all of us.

I have little sympathy for those who suggest that the dimensions of the rat problems are so vast as to preclude an effective local solution.

The city of Los Angeles has all of the problems of a big city, including rats. But it is doing something about that problem, at least, besides sending its mayor to Washington to cry crocodile tears on the steps of the Capitol.

The total annual budget for the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and the city of Los Angeles for rodent control is \$200,000. Until 2 years ago, both the county and the city had separate pro-

grams for their areas of jurisdiction. In our area, I find that there has been a 35-year war on rats.

The vector control section of the bureau of environmental sanitation consists of 14 fieldmen plus a section chief, who devote 100 percent of their time to rodent control in Los Angeles.

The program has been in effect for over 35 years and extends throughout the area served by the Los Angeles County Health Department. The group is staffed by college graduates who are highly trained in the field of biology and ecology.

Their work does not stop with the investigation and abatement of citizen complaints, but includes surveys made to locate and control rodent population that might otherwise thrive. Control measures include poisoning, trapping, and even more importantly, stress the elimination of potential harborages and breeding places as well as a highly developed program of general sanitation.

Dr. G. A. Heidbreder, health officer for the Los Angeles County Health Department, reported as of August 7, 1967, that there were only 40 verified cases of rat-bite in the county for all of last year.

Dr. Heidbreder said:

We are justifiably proud of the results of our activities in this field, which have been reviewed very favorably by the United States Public Health Service, as well as by the (California) State Department of Public Health.

States and their subdivisions possess the most potent weapon for good known to government within the framework of the federal system: The police power. This is the power to enact needed regulations to protect the lives and property of its citizens. That power may be exercised in many ways. It may punish those who fail to conform to accepted community standards of conduct and it may appropriate funds to assist its citizens in the solution of problems beyond their individual capacities to solve.

A judicious use of this power can rid our cities of rats.

Surely, there are sufficient national responsibilities given to the Congress by the Constitution to occupy our attention without the necessity of usurping this essentially local function.

HIGHWAYS MUST NOT BE ROADS TO OBLIVION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Labor Day weekend, which begins in 2 days and is expected to set an all time high in holiday weekend traffic deaths and injuries, offers a dramatic reminder of the critical need for improved highways. Last year, on Labor Day weekend alone, 638 persons were killed while traveling on our Nation's highways. The American Automobile Association esti-

mates that the coming Labor Day weekend will see 25 million cars, carrying 70 million people, crowding this country's roads. We must do more than simply shudder at the thought of how many fatalities will be caused by this massive traffic jam.

Fifty-three thousand men, women, and children died in traffic accidents last year while 1,900,000 suffered disabling injuries.¹ The American public has suffered damages of \$10 billion as the direct result of automobile accidents.² All the wars ever fought by this country do not come close to having caused as many fatalities as have been caused by highway accidents. More than two and one-half times as many Americans have been killed on highways than have been killed in wars.³

During the 89th Congress this body passed, and I supported, a legislative milestone in automobile and highway safety. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act⁴ and the Highway Safety Act⁵ enacted by that Congress have made and will continue to make significant contributions in the areas of automobile and highway safety.

Today I am introducing legislation that will increase the effectiveness of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 by amending it so as to provide for additional research to be conducted under the direction of the Department of Transportation. My bill focuses upon the serious problems caused by improper road surfaces and highway design. I am asking that research be conducted to find a solution to the very serious problems caused by the blinding effects of road surface glare and the headlights of oncoming cars.

A major function of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 is the assistance it provides to State and local governments for the improvement and expansion of their highway safety programs, in accordance with uniform national performance standards. On June 27, 1967, Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, announced 13 such national standards pursuant to the Highway Safety Act. Each participating State's highway safety program must conform to these standards, and any State not complying after January 1, 1969, will be penalized by a 10-percent reduction of its allotment of funds under the Highway Safety Act.

These standards promulgated by the Department of Transportation in the areas of driver education, driver licensing, alcoholism, motor vehicle inspection and traffic control devices have created a solid foundation upon which we can build a safer network of roads. However, I believe that these standards set by the Department constitute only one aspect of a safe highway program. Federally sponsored research to determine the most modern techniques and materials that are available for highway design and construction is a must if we

¹ Statistics were supplied by the National Highway Safety Council.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Public Law 89-563.

⁵ Public Law 89-564.

are to reach our ultimate goal of stemming, and perhaps even stopping, the annual blood bath that takes place on our Nation's roads.

The Department of Transportation is at present compiling cost estimates from the various States of the implementation of the Department's national standards. We can encourage the speedy adoption of these standards by the States by offering the participating States the latest results of highway safety research.

In 1966, more than \$3½ billion was expended on a joint basis by the Federal Government and the States for expansion of the Interstate Highway System as part of an overall figure of \$30.6 billion⁶ in the Federal highway program. Is it not sheer madness to go on spending such sums on our highways without a proportionate expenditure for research to help us build the most modern and safest highways that man is capable of building? The research presently being carried on by the Department of Transportation is limited to:

First. The support work necessary to assist the States in establishing and operating safety programs under the standards developed by the National Highway Safety Bureau in cooperation with other States and interested groups;

Second. The support that will be needed by the States in setting up and operating uniform traffic safety activities, such as those dealing with driver education and licensing, law enforcement, vehicle inspection, accident investigation, and community support of safety programs;

Third. The development work needed to support the wide variety of activities being furthered by the Bureau: These will include planning and research in relation to traffic data and documentation centers, the investigation of crashes, the establishment of human impact tolerances, the role of alcohol and alcoholics to traffic safety, and the development of the necessary Government test facilities and equipment;

Fourth. The safety performance of new and used motor vehicles of all varieties.⁷

My bill calls for an enlargement of the scope of federally supported highway safety research projects. Merely to investigate some of the dangers and problems of automobile travel is to cover only part of the problem. Our country and people deserve a more concentrated effort to save those lives lost each year.

To cite only one example, it is well known that the temporary blindness of drivers brought on by the glare from road surfaces and the glare from oncoming headlights reflected by the road surface is a major cause of the deaths of the many thousands of Americans killed on our highways. The need is immediate and great to find an answer to this problem. Even the traditional belief that a dark road surface was best for the reduction of this glare is now being seriously challenged according to the National Highway Safety Bureau.

An evaluation is being made of a white, artificial siliceous aggregate called "Sy-

nopal." It is a surface aggregate which, it is claimed, has excellent skid resistance and nighttime visibility characteristics.⁸ It is presently being considered by at least one company for production in the United States.⁹ Activities such as this are presently only monitored by the Federal authorities. Instead of only monitoring these independent projects, the Federal Government should be encouraging their speedy development.

I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to this bill that I have introduced today. If the research that I am calling for is not conducted, the daily slaughter of human beings taking place on this country's roads will no doubt continue to grow.

TAX EQUITY ACT OF 1967

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 12706, the Tax Equity Act of 1967, to raise needed Federal revenues by tax reform amendments of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

At the end of my remarks, I will include the full text of the Tax Equity Act of 1967 for the information of Members. I invite my colleagues to join me in co-introducing this bill under their own names, to signal to the Nation that before the low- and moderate-income taxpayer is called upon to pay higher taxes, a series of 14 major loopholes should first be closed.

Mr. Speaker, I have drawn heavily upon some pioneering work of our colleagues, the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS and Mr. BYRNES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] in the preparation of this bill, as well as on the suggestions of Senator Paul Douglas.

I cannot in conscience call upon my constituents to pay more in Federal income taxes when the sacrosanct oil and gas depletion loophole remains as open as it has been for the last 40 years. I cannot see why other loopholes in the tax code, such as untaxed capital gains of decedents' estates, stock options, unlimited charitable deductions, dividend exclusions and the like, remain untouched in these days of higher revenue needs. I think that a minimum tax should also be imposed to remedy the situation whereby some of our wealthiest taxpayers pay little or no taxes each year.

Mr. Speaker, this comprehensive tax reform bill permits a much fairer basis for increasing Federal revenue than does a straight tax surcharge which perpetuates favoritism that now exists in the tax laws.

This measure incorporates most of the reform suggestions offered in recent

⁶ Letter from William Haddon, Jr., M.D., of the Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Safety Administration, National Highway Safety Bureau dated July 29, 1967.

⁹ See Newsweek magazine, August 28, 1967, at page 63.

years. Although some of the proposals are more urgent than others, if we are to perfect the principle of taxation based on ability to pay, this package points the way to reform. Present taxes place an unfair burden on the wage earner, the apartment dweller, and those of low and moderate income, while providing loopholes for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, in a period of rising taxes at the State and local level, and rising prices, this situation is intolerable. The proposal to raise Federal income taxes via a surcharge threatens the economic integrity of millions of industrious families trying desperately to make ends meet.

My bill would reinstate many of the wartime excise taxes on luxuries, while recognizing that some of the items previously taxed as luxuries are really essential. For example, I would not tax baby preparations, costume jewelry—up to \$10—or briefcases and handbags—up to \$10 retail price—but I do think that taxing the purchase of mink coats and country club dues is preferable to increasing the income tax of a family with three children and an income of \$6,000 to \$7,000.

I hope that the Congress will see this tax reform proposal as an alternative to the surtax.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 12706, is composed of 15 titles.

As indicated earlier, I have drawn heavily on the pioneering efforts of several of our colleagues in the preparation of this bill. I invite Members' attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] in the RECORD of August 16, 1967, for an extended discussion of nine major points, incorporated as titles II to X, inclusive. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] introduced H.R. 12445, to provide for a minimum tax of 10 percent on individual and corporate incomes over \$10,000; I have modified his proposal by raising the minimum tax for incomes over \$100,000 to 20 percent; this is title XII. Title XI, on arbitrage bonds and title VII, on municipal industrial development bonds, were drawn from bills introduced in this Congress by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to schedule early hearings on my bill. Since the committee is meeting presently to consider the administration's tax surcharge, I feel my bill could very well be included in the current revenue discussions. We could thus ease the current fiscal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include the full text of my bill:

H.R. 12706

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Equity Act of 1967".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a

⁶ The Federal Highway Administration.

⁷ Bureau of Public Roads.

section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 102. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.

The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall, as soon as practicable but in any event not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a draft of the technical and conforming changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which are necessary to reflect throughout such Code the changes in the substantive provisions of law made by this Act.

TITLE II—CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH
SEC. 201. CARRYOVER OF BASIS AT DEATH.

(a) **AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1014.**—Section 1014 (relating to basis of property acquired from a decedent) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(d) **DECEDENTS DYING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1967.**—In the case of a decedent dying after December 31, 1967, this section shall not apply to any property for which an adjusted carryover basis is provided by section 1023.”

(b) **ADJUSTED CARRYOVER BASIS.**—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by redesignating section 1023 as section 1024 and by inserting after section 1022 the following new section:

“**SEC. 1023. ADJUSTED CARRYOVER BASIS FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT DYING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1967.**

“(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, if—

“(1) carryover basis property is acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967, and

“(2) the gross estate at death of the decedent exceeds \$60,000,

then the basis of such property in the hands of the person so acquiring it shall be the adjusted basis of the property immediately before the death of the decedent, further adjusted as provided in this section.

“(b) **CARRYOVER BASIS PROPERTY DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘carryover basis property’ means any property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967, which is property described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), or (9) of section 1014(b), other than—

“(1) property acquired by the decedent before January 1, 1951,

“(2) property (not including property of extraordinary value) which is a personal or household effect,

“(3) property acquired by any person from the decedent before his death which was disposed of by such person before the decedent's death,

“(4) property described in section 2042 (relating to proceeds of life insurance), and

“(5) property which constitutes a right to receive an item of income in respect of a decedent under section 691.

“(c) **INCREASE IN BASIS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The basis of carryover basis property in the hands of the person acquiring it from the decedent shall be increased by its proportionate share of the Federal and State estate taxes attributable to the net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties.

“(2) **MINIMUM INCREASE.**—In the case of any decedent, the aggregate increase under paragraph (1) shall not be less than whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

“(A) the amount (if any) by which \$60,000 exceeds the aggregate bases of all property included in the gross estate (such bases to be determined after the application of section 1014 but before any adjustment under this section), or

“(B) the amount (if any) by which \$15,000 exceeds the amount by which the aggregate bases of all property to which section 1014 applies (such bases to be determined after the application of section 1014) is greater than the aggregate adjusted bases of such property immediately before the death of the decedent.

“(3) **MANNER OF ALLOCATION.**

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the increase under this subsection in the basis of each carryover basis property shall be that amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate increase determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) as the appreciation in value of such property bears to the aggregate appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties having appreciation in value.

“(B) **SPECIAL RULE FOR SECTION 303 REDEMPTIONS.**—To the extent the decedent provides by will, the increase in basis under this subsection shall be allocated first to stock which is carryover basis property and which after his death is redeemed under section 303 (relating to distributions in redemption of stock to pay death taxes). Any remaining increase in basis under this subsection shall be allocated among the other carryover basis property in accordance with subparagraph (A).

“(4) **FAIR MARKET VALUE LIMITATION.**—The increase under this subsection in the basis of any property shall not exceed the increase necessary to produce a basis equal to the fair market value of such property.

“(d) **FURTHER INCREASE IN BASIS FOR CERTAIN STATE SUCCESSION TAXES PAID BY TRANSFEREE OF PROPERTY.**—If—

“(1) any person acquires carryover basis property from a decedent, and

“(2) such person actually pays an amount of estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes with respect to such property to any State or possession of the United States or to the District of Columbia for which the estate is not liable,

then the basis of such property (after any adjustment under subsection (c)) shall be increased (but not above its fair market value) by the portion of such amount which is attributable to the appreciation in value of such property.

“(e) **TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY PROPERTY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The surviving spouse's interest in all community property—

“(A) for purposes of subsections (a) (2) and (c) (2), shall be treated as included in the gross estate of the decedent.

“(B) for purposes of this section (other than subsection (d)), shall be treated as property acquired from the decedent, and

“(C) for purposes of subsections (b) (1) and (e), shall be treated as property held by the decedent.

“(2) **COMMUNITY PROPERTY DEFINED.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘community property’ means property—

“(A) held by the decedent and the surviving spouse as community property under the laws of any State or possession of the United States, or any foreign country, and

“(B) at least one-half of the whole community property interest in which was includible in determining the value of the decedent's gross estate under chapter 11.

“(f) **SPECIAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS FOR APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION (c).**—For purposes of subsection (c)—

“(1) **FEDERAL AND STATE ESTATE TAXES.**—The term ‘Federal and State estate taxes’ means only—

“(A) the tax imposed by section 2001 or 2101, reduced by (i) any credit allowable with respect to a tax on prior transfers by section 2013 or 2102, and (ii) any credit allowable with respect to State death taxes under section 2011 or 2102, and

“(B) any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes, for which the estate is

liable, actually paid by the estate to any State or possession of the United States, or to the District of Columbia.

“(2) **FEDERAL AND STATE ESTATE TAXES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NET APPRECIATION IN VALUE.**—The term ‘Federal and State estate taxes attributable to the net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties’ means that amount which bears the same ratio to the Federal and State estate taxes as the net appreciation in value of the carryover basis properties bears to the value of the gross estate (as defined in section 2031 or section 2103).

“(3) **NET APPRECIATION.**—The net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties is the amount by which the fair market value of all such property exceeds the adjusted basis of such property immediately before the death of the decedent.

“(4) **GIFTS.**—In the case of carryover basis property acquired from the decedent by gift, the increase in basis under subsection (c) shall not exceed the amount by which the increase under such subsection is greater than the increase allowable under section 1015(d).

“(5) **CHARITABLE GIFTS.**—If—

“(A) a deduction is allowable under section 2055 or 2106(a) (2) with respect to any property, and

“(B) such property is specifically identifiable as passing from the decedent to a use specified in such section,

then, to the extent of such deduction, such property shall be treated as property which is not carryover basis property.

“(g) **OTHER SPECIAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS.**—

“(1) **FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—For purposes of this section, when not otherwise distinctly expressed, the term ‘fair market value’ means fair market value determined under chapter 11 (including section 2032, relating to alternate valuation).

“(2) **PROPERTY PASSING FROM THE DECEDENT.**—For purposes of this section, property passing from the decedent shall be treated as property acquired from the decedent.

“(3) **DECEDENT'S BASIS UNKNOWN.**—If the facts necessary to determine the basis (unadjusted) of carryover basis property immediately before the death of the decedent are unknown to the person acquiring such property from the decedent, such basis shall be treated as being the fair market value of such property as of the date (or approximate date) at which such property was acquired by the decedent or by the last preceding owner in whose hands it did not have a basis determined in whole or in part by reference to its basis in the hands of a prior holder.

“(4) **CERTAIN MORTGAGES.**—For purposes of subsections (c) and (d), if—

“(A) There is an unpaid mortgage on, or indebtedness in respect of, property.

“(B) such mortgage or indebtedness does not constitute a liability of the estate, and

“(C) such property is included in the gross estate undiminished by such mortgage or indebtedness,

then the value of such property to be treated as included in the gross estate shall be the value of such property, diminished by such mortgage or indebtednesses.

“(5) **DECEDENTS NONRESIDENT AND NOT CITIZENS.**—In the case of a decedent nonresident not a citizen of the United States—

“(A) this section shall be applied by substituting for the figure ‘\$60,000’ wherever it appears the amount of the exemption determined under section 2106(a) (3), and

“(B) subsection (c) (2) (B) shall be applied by substituting for the figure ‘\$15,000’ the amount which is equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ of the amount of the exemption determined under section 2106(a) (3).

“(h) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as

may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

(c) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1016(a).—Section 1016(a) (relating to adjustments to basis) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(22) to the extent provided in section 1023, relating to adjusted carryover basis for certain property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967."

(d) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 691(c).—

(1) Section 691(c)(2)(A) (relating to deduction for estate tax in case of income in respect of decedents) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'estate tax' means Federal and State estate taxes (within the meaning of section 1023(f)(1))."

(2) Section 691(c)(2)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) The estate tax attributable to such net value shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the estate tax as such net value bears to the value of the gross estate."

(e) INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 (relating to information concerning persons subject to special provisions) is amended by inserting after section 6039 the following new section:

"Sec. 6039A. INFORMATION REGARDING BASIS OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Every executor (as defined in section 2203) shall furnish with respect to the property of the decedent such information as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations relating to—

"(1) the name and last address of the decedent;

"(2) the name and address of each person acquiring property from the decedent or to whom the property passed from the decedent, and a description of each item of such property;

"(3) the adjusted basis (within the meaning of section 1011) of each such item in the hands of the decedent immediately before his death; and

"(4) any other information similar or related in nature to that specified in this paragraph.

If an executor is unable to furnish all of the information required under this paragraph with respect to an item of property, he shall include in his return as much of such information as he is able to, including a description of such item and the name of every person holding a legal or beneficial interest therein, and, upon notice from the Secretary or his delegate, such person shall be treated with respect to such item as if he were an executor for purposes of this section.

"(b) STATEMENTS TO BE FURNISHED TO PERSONS WHO ACQUIRE PROPERTY FROM A DECEDENT.—Every executor who is required to furnish information under subsection (a) shall furnish in writing to each person described in subsection (a)(2) such information with respect to each item of property acquired from the decedent or passing from the decedent to such person as is required under subsection (a) and which the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations."

(2) PENALTIES.—Subchapter B of chapter 68 (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6684. FAILURE TO FILE INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO BASIS OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT.

"(a) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FURNISHED TO THE SECRETARY.—Any executor who fails to furnish information required

under section 6039A(a) on the date prescribed therefor (determined with regard to any extension of time for filing) shall pay a penalty of 1 percent of the fair market value of the property described in section 6039A(a)(2), or \$5,000, whichever is less, for such failure, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect.

"(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FURNISHED TO BENEFICIARIES.—Any executor who fails to furnish in writing to each person described in section 6039A(a)(2) the information required under section 6039A(b), unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, shall pay (upon notice and demand by the Secretary or his delegate and in the same manner as tax) \$50 for each such failure, but the total amount imposed for all such failures shall not exceed \$1,000."

(f) DISCHARGE OF EXECUTOR FROM PERSONAL LIABILITY.—Section 2204 (relating to discharge of executor from personal liability) is amended by striking out "notified," where it appears in the second sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "notified or on furnishing of a bond pursuant to section 6165 in circumstances in which the Secretary or his delegate is satisfied that such payment will be made."

SEC. 202. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 201 shall apply only with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1967.

TITLE III—REPEAL OF UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION

SEC. 301. REPEAL OF DEDUCTION.

Sections 170(b)(1)(C) (relating to unlimited deduction for certain individuals) and 170(g) (relating to application of unlimited deduction) are repealed.

SEC. 302. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 301 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE IV—REPEAL OF STOCK OPTION PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. REPEAL OF PROVISIONS.

(a) QUALIFIED STOCK OPTIONS.—Section 422 (relating to qualified stock options) is repealed.

(b) RESTRICTED STOCK OPTIONS.—Section 424 (relating to restricted stock options) is repealed.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 401 shall apply with respect to options granted after December 31, 1967.

TITLE V—REPEAL OF DIVIDEND EXCLUSION

SEC. 501. REPEAL.

Section 116 (relating to partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals) is repealed.

SEC. 502. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 501 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE VI—MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTION

SEC. 601. REPEAL OF PRIVILEGE OF GROUPS TO ELECT EXEMPTION.

Section 1562 (relating to privilege of groups to elect multiple surtax exemptions) is repealed.

SEC. 602. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 601 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE VII—MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

SEC. 701. ELIMINATION OF EXEMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL. Section 103 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS.—

"(1) SUBSECTION (a)(1) NOT TO APPLY.—Any industrial development bond (as defined in paragraph (2)) issued after December 31,

1967, shall not be considered an obligation described in subsection (a)(1).

"(2) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOND DEFINED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'industrial development bond' means an obligation the payment of the principal or interest on which is—

"(i) secured in whole or in part by a lien, mortgage, pledge, or other security interest in property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation, or

"(ii) secured in whole or in part by an interest in (or to be derived primarily from) payments to be made in respect of money or property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation

which is or will be used, under a lease, sale, or loan arrangement, for industrial or commercial purposes.

"(B) EXCEPTIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), property shall not be treated as used for industrial or commercial purposes if it is used—

"(i) to provide entertainment (including sporting events) or recreational facilities for the general public;

"(ii) to provide facilities for the holding of a convention, trade show, or similar event;

"(iii) as an airport, dock, wharf, or similar transportation facility;

"(iv) in the furnishing or sale of electric energy, gas, water, or sewage disposal services; or

"(v) in an active trade or business owned and operated by an organization described in subsection (a)(1).

"(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any obligation issued before January 1, 1969, for a project assisted by the United States under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1450 and following, relating to slum clearance and urban renewal) or under title I or title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131 and following)."

(b) CERTAIN URBAN RENEWAL BONDS.—Section 102(g) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452(g)), is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Obligations, including interest thereon, other than industrial development bonds (within the meaning of section 103(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), issued by local public agencies for projects assisted pursuant to this title, and income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States."

SEC. 702. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 701 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE VII—PERCENTAGE DEPLETION RATES FOR OIL, GAS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MINERALS

SEC. 801. REDUCTION IN RATES.

Section 613(b) (relating to percentage depletion rates) is amended—

(1) by striking out "27½ percent" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent"; and

(2) by striking out "23 percent" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent".

SEC. 802. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 801 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE IX—INCREASE IN GIFT TAX RATES TO ESTATE TAX LEVEL

SEC. 901. INCREASE IN RATES.

The table in section 2502(a) (relating to computation of tax) is amended to read as follows:

"RATE SCHEDULE

"If the taxable gifts The tax shall be:
are:
Not over \$5,000----- 3% of the taxable gifts.

Over \$5,000 but not over \$10,000.	\$150, plus 7% of excess over \$5,000.	
Over \$10,000 but not over \$20,000.	\$500, plus 11% of excess over \$10,000.	
Over \$20,000 but not over \$30,000.	\$1,600, plus 14% of excess over \$20,000.	
Over \$30,000 but not over \$40,000.	\$3,000, plus 18% of excess over \$30,000.	
Over \$40,000 but not over \$50,000.	\$4,800, plus 22% of excess over \$40,000.	
Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000.	\$7,000, plus 25% of excess over \$50,000.	
Over \$60,000 but not over \$100,000.	\$9,500, plus 28% of excess over \$60,000.	
Over \$100,000 but not over \$250,000.	\$20,700, plus 30% of excess over \$100,000.	
Over \$250,000 but not over \$500,000.	\$65,700, plus 32% of excess over \$250,000.	
Over \$500,000 but not over \$750,000.	\$145,700, plus 35% of excess over \$500,000.	
Over \$750,000 but not over \$1,000,000.	\$233,200, plus 37% of excess over \$750,000.	
Over \$1,000,000 but not over \$1,250,000.	\$325,700, plus 39% of excess over \$1,000,000.	
Over \$1,250,000 but not over \$1,500,000.	\$423,200, plus 42% of excess over \$1,250,000.	
Over \$1,500,000 but not over \$2,000,000.	\$528,200, plus 45% of excess over \$1,500,000.	
Over \$2,000,000 but not over \$2,500,000.	\$753,200, plus 49% of excess over \$2,000,000.	
Over \$2,500,000 but not over \$3,000,000.	\$998,200, plus 53% of excess over \$2,500,000.	
Over \$3,000,000 but not over \$3,500,000.	\$1,263,200, plus 56% of excess over \$3,000,000.	
Over \$3,500,000 but not over \$4,000,000.	\$1,543,200, plus 59% of excess over \$3,500,000.	
Over \$4,000,000 but not over \$5,000,000.	\$1,838,200, plus 63% of excess over \$4,000,000.	
Over \$5,000,000 but not over \$6,000,000.	\$2,468,200, plus 67% of excess over \$5,000,000.	
Over \$6,000,000 but not over \$7,000,000.	\$3,138,200, plus 70% of excess over \$6,000,000.	
Over \$7,000,000 but not over \$8,000,000.	\$3,838,200, plus 73% of excess over \$7,000,000.	
Over \$8,000,000 but not over \$10,000,000.	\$4,568,200, plus 76% of excess over \$8,000,000.	
Over \$10,000,000-----	\$6,088,200, plus 77% of excess over \$10,000,000."	

SEC. 902. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 901 shall apply with respect to calendar years after 1967.

TITLE X—USE OF UNITED STATES BONDS TO PAY ESTATE TAXES**SEC. 1001. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO USE BONDS FOR TAX PAYMENTS.**

(a) **REPEAL.**—Section 14 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C., sec. 765) is repealed.

(b) **PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF BONDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no bond or other obligation of the United States may be accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury in satisfaction of any amount of Federal estate tax liability greater than the fair market value of such obligation at the time it is presented as payment of such liability.

SEC. 1002. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 1001 shall apply with respect to obligations acquired after December 31, 1967.

TITLE XI—ARBITRAGE BONDS**SEC. 1101. REMOVAL OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS.**

Section 103 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) (as added by section 701 of this Act) the following new subsection:

"(d) ARBITRAGE BONDS.—

"(1) Subsection (a) (1) not to apply.—Any arbitrage bond (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall not be considered an obligation described in subsection (a) (1).

"(2) 'ARBITRAGE BOND' DEFINED.—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'arbitrage bond' means any obligation if, under the terms of the obligation or any underlying agreement, any portion of the proceeds of the issue of which the obligation is a part may be invested, directly or indirectly, in any securities (other than obligations the interest on which is excluded from gross income under subsection (a) after the application of this subsection) which yield a higher return (taking into account any discount or any premium) than the obligation being issued, and such securities are required to be held as security for any obligations the interest on which is excluded from gross income under subsection (a) before the application of this subsection.

"(B) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an obligation—

"(i) if under the terms of the obligation or underlying agreement all of such securities (other than those described in (ii) and (iii) below) in which the proceeds may be invested may not be held longer than 2 years from the date of the issuance of the obligation;

"(ii) if the obligation or an underlying agreement limits the amount of the proceeds which may be invested in such securities as of the beginning of any annual accounting period provided for in the obligation or underlying agreement to not more than the amount of interest and principal payments required to be made with respect to such obligation within such annual accounting period and the accounting period following such annual accounting period;

"(iii) to the extent that the proceeds of such obligation are to be used to construct a facility the actual construction of which (other than acquisition of land) must commence within 2 years from the date of such issuance if under the terms of the obligation or underlying agreement the portion of the proceeds to be used in connection with such construction may not be invested in such securities for a period in excess of 5 years from the issuance of such obligation.

"(3) **SPECIAL SERIES OF OBLIGATION.**—At the request of an organization described in subsection (a) (1), the Secretary is authorized under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C., sec. 752 and following), to provide for the issuance of a special series of obligations of the United States the yields on which shall not exceed the yields on obligations described in paragraph (2)."

SEC. 1102. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 1101 shall apply with respect to interest on bonds issued after December 31, 1967.

TITLE XII—MINIMUM TAX**SEC. 1201. IMPOSITION OF TAX.**

Subchapter A of chapter 1 (relating to determination of tax liability) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART V—MINIMUM TAX**"SEC. 51. MINIMUM TAX.**

"(a) **IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL TAX.**—In addition to any other tax imposed by this chapter—

"(1) **INDIVIDUALS.**—In the case of an indi-

vidual whose section 51 income equals or exceeds \$10,000 (or \$5,000 in the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return) in a taxable year, there is hereby imposed for such taxable year a tax equal to the amount (if any) by which 10 percent of his section 51 income for such taxable year exceeds the tax imposed on him by this chapter (other than this section) for such taxable year, and to the extent that such income exceeds \$100,000 (or \$50,000) respectively, the tax on the income in excess of these amounts shall be at the rate of 20 percent.

"(2) **CORPORATIONS.**—In the case of a corporation the section 51 income of which equals or exceeds \$10,000 for a taxable year, there is hereby imposed for such taxable year, a tax equal to the amount (if any) by which 10 percent of the section 51 income of such corporation for such taxable year exceeds the tax imposed on such corporation by this chapter (other than this section) for such taxable year, and to the extent that such income exceeds \$100,000, the tax on the income in excess of this amount shall be at the rate of 20 percent.

"(b) **SECTION 51 INCOME.**—For purposes of this section, the term 'section 51 income' means adjusted gross income (taxable income in the case of a corporation), plus—

"(1) any item excluded from gross income by reason of section 103(a) (1) (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations).

"(2) any deduction allowed the taxpayer under section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains),

"(3) an amount equal to the amount by which the allowance for depletion under section 611 for the taxable year was greater than it would have been but for the application of section 613 (relating to percentage depletion) to such taxable year, and

"(4) an amount equal to the amount by which the allowance under section 167 (relating to depreciation) for real property for the taxable year was greater than it would have been under the straight line method of depreciation (applied to such property for such taxable year)."

SEC. 1202. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 1201 shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

TITLE XIII—EXCISE TAXES**SEC. 1301. RETAILERS EXCISE TAXES.**

Chapter 31 (relating to retailers excise taxes) is amended by inserting immediately after the table of subchapters the following new subchapters:

"Subchapter A—Jewelry and Related Items

"Sec. 4001. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4002. Definition of sale includes auctions.

"Sec. 4003. Exemptions.

"SEC. 4001. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail at a price in excess of ten dollars a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold:

"All articles commonly or commercially known as jewelry, whether real or imitation.

"The following stones, by whatever name called, whether real or synthetic:

"Amber

"Beryl of the following types:

"Aquamarine

"Emerald

"Golden Beryl

"Hellodor

"Morganite

"Chrysoberyl of the following types:

"Alexandrite

"Cat's eye

"Chrysolite

"Corundum of the following types:

"Ruby

"Sapphire

"Diamond

"Feldspar of the following type:

"Moonstone
"Garnet
"Jadeite (Jade)
"Jet
"Lapis Lazuli
"Nephrite (Jade)
"Opal

"Pearls (natural and cultured)
"Peridot

"Quartz of the following types:

"Amethyst
"Bloodstone
"Citrine
"Moss agate
"Onyx

"Sardonyx
"Tiger-eye
"Spinel
"Topaz
"Tourmaline
"Turquoise
"Zircon.

"Articles made of, or ornament, mounted or fitted with precious metals or imitations thereof.

"Watches.

"Clocks.

"Cases and movements for watches and clocks.

"Gold, gold-plated, silver, or sterling flatware or hollow ware and silver-plated hollow ware.

"Opera glasses.

"Lorgnettes.

"Marine glasses.

"Field glasses.

"Binoculars.

"SEC. 4002. DEFINITION OF SALE INCLUDES AUCTIONS.

"For the purposes of section 4001, the term 'articles sold at retail' includes an article sold at retail by an auctioneer or other agent in the course of his business on behalf of (1) a person who is not engaged in the business of selling like articles, or (2) the legal representative of the estate of a decedent who was not engaged in the business of selling like articles. In the case of articles so sold, the auctioneer or other agent shall be considered the 'person who sells at retail'.

"SEC. 4003. EXEMPTIONS.

"(a) SPECIFIC ARTICLES.—The tax imposed by section 4001 shall not apply to any article used for religious purposes, to surgical instruments, to watches designed especially for use by the blind, to frames or mountings for spectacles or eye-glasses, to a fountain pen, mechanical pencil, or smokers' pipe if the only parts of the pen, the pencil, or the pipe which consist of precious metals are essential parts not used for ornamental purposes, or to buttons, insignia, cap devices, chin straps, and other devices prescribed for use in connection with the uniforms of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(b) CERTAIN AUCTION SALES.—

"(1) In the case of an auction sale held at the home of a person whose articles are being sold, any taxable article (as defined in paragraph (2)) of such person sold by the auctioneer shall be exempt from the tax imposed by section 4001 except to the extent that the price for which such article is sold, when added to the sum of the sale prices of all other taxable articles of such person previously sold at the same auction, exceeds \$100.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'taxable article' means an article which, by reason of section 4002 and without regard to the exemption provided in paragraph (1), is taxable under section 4001 when sold at auction; and

"(B) in the case of articles of a decedent sold on behalf of the legal representative of his estate, an auction sale held at the home of such decedent shall be considered as 'held at the home of a person whose articles are being sold'.

"(c) CLOCKS SUBJECT TO MANUFACTURERS TAX.—The tax imposed by section 4001 shall not apply to a clock or watch, or to a case or movement for a clock or watch, if a tax in respect of such clock, watch, case, or movement was imposed under chapter 32 by reason of its sale (1) as a part or accessory, or (2) on or in connection with or with the sale of any article.

"Subchapter B—Furs

"Sec. 4011. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4012. Definitions.

"Sec. 4013. Exemption of certain auction sales.

"SEC. 4011. IMPOSITION OF TAX

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold: Articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value, but only if such value is more than three times the value of the next most valuable component material.

"SEC. 4012. DEFINITIONS.

"(a) MANUFACTURE FROM CUSTOMER MATERIAL.—Where a person, who is engaged in the business of dressing or dyeing fur skins or of manufacturing, selling, or repairing fur articles, produces an article of the kind described in section 4011 from fur on the hide or pelt furnished, directly or indirectly, by a customer and the article is for the use of, and not for resale by, such customer, the transaction shall be deemed to be a sale at retail and the person producing the article shall be deemed to be the person selling such article at retail for the purposes of such section. The tax on such a transaction shall be computed and paid by such person upon the fair retail market value, as determined by the Secretary or his delegate, of the finished article.

"(b) SALE INCLUDES AUCTIONS.—For the purposes of section 4011, the term 'articles sold at retail' includes an article sold at retail by an auctioneer or other agent in the course of his business on behalf of—

"(1) a person who is not engaged in the business of selling like articles, or

"(2) the legal representative of the estate of a decedent who was not engaged in the business of selling like articles. In the case of articles so sold, the auctioneer or other agent shall be considered the 'person who sells at retail'.

"SEC. 4013. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN AUCTION SALES.

"(a) In any case of an auction sale held at the home of a person whose articles are being sold, any taxable article (as defined in subsection (b)) of such person sold by the auctioneer shall be exempt from the tax imposed by section 4011 except to the extent that the price for which such article is sold, when added to the sum of the sale prices of all other taxable articles of such person previously sold at the same auction, exceeds \$100.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'taxable article' means an article which, by reason of section 4012(b) and without regard to the exemption provided in subsection (a), is taxable under section 4011 when sold at auction; and

"(2) in the case of articles of a decedent sold on behalf of the legal representative of his estate, an auction sale held at the home of such decedent shall be considered as 'held at the home of a person whose articles are being sold'.

"Subchapter C—Toilet Preparations

"Sec. 4021. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4022. Exemptions.

"SEC. 4021. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail at a price in excess of two dollars a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold—

"Perfume.

"Essences.

"Extracts.

"Toilet waters.

"Cosmetics.

"Petroleum jellies.

Hair oils.

Pomades.

Hair dressings.

Hair restoratives.

Hair dyes.

Toilet powders.

"Any other similar substance, article, or preparation, by whatsoever name known or distinguished; any of the above which are used or applied or intended to be used or applied for toilet purposes.

"SEC. 4022. EXEMPTIONS.

"(a) ITEMS FOR BABIES.—The tax imposed by section 4021 shall not apply to lotion, oil, powder, or other article intended to be used or applied only in the care of babies.

"(b) BARBER SHOPS AND BEAUTY PARLORS.—For the purposes of section 4021, the sale of any article described in such section to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof, or for resale, shall not be considered as a sale at retail. The resale of such article, at retail by such person shall be subject to the provisions of section 4021.

"(c) MINIATURE SAMPLES.—For the purposes of section 4021, the sale of miniature samples of any article described in such section for demonstration use only to a house-to-house salesman by the manufacturer or distributor, shall not be considered as a sale at retail. The resale of such sample at retail by such house-to-house salesman shall be subject to the provisions of section 4021.

"Subchapter D—Luggage, Handbags, Etc.

"Sec. 4031. Imposition of tax.

"SEC. 4031. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles, by whatever name called, sold at retail (including in each case fittings or accessories therefore sold on or in connection with the sale thereof) at a retail price in excess of ten dollars a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold—

"Bathing suit bag.

"Beach bags or kits.

"Billfolds.

"Briefcases.

"Brief bags.

"Camping bags.

"Card and pass cases.

"Collar cases.

"Cosmetic bags and kits.

"Dressing cases.

"Dufflebags.

"Furlough bags.

"Garment bags designed for use by travelers.

"Hatboxes designed for use by travelers.

"Haversacks.

"Key cases or containers.

"Knapsacks.

"Knitting or shopping bags (suitable for use as purses or handbags).

"Makeup boxes.

"Manicure set cases.

"Memorandum pad cases (suitable for use as card or pass cases, billfolds, purses, or wallets).

"Musette bags.

"Overnight bags.

"Pocketbooks.

"Purses and handbags.

"Ring binders, capable of closure on all sides.

"Salesmen's sample or display cases, bags, or trunks.

"Satchels.

"Shoe and slipper bags.

"Suitcases.

"Tie cases.

"Toilet kits and cases.

"Traveling bags.

"Trunks.

"Vanity bags or cases.

"Valises.

"Wallets.

"Wardrobe cases."

SEC. 1302. MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES.

Chapter 32 (relating to manufacturers excise taxes) is amended by adding immediately after subchapter A the following new subchapters:

"Subchapter B—Household Type Equipment, Etc.

"Part I—Refrigeration equipment

"Sec. 4111. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"There is hereby imposed upon the sale of the following articles (including in each case parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection with the sale thereof) by the manufacturer, producer, or importer a tax equivalent to the specified percent of the price for which so sold:

"ARTICLES TAXABLE AT 5 PERCENT—

"Household type refrigerators (for single or multiple cabinet installations) having, or being primarily designed for use with, a mechanical refrigerating unit operated by electricity, gas, kerosene, or gasoline.

"Household type units for the quick freezing or frozen storage of foods operated by electricity, gas, kerosene, or gasoline.

"Combinations of household type refrigerators and quick-freeze units described above.

"ARTICLES TAXABLE AT 10 PERCENT—

"Self-contained air-conditioning units.

"Subchapter C—Entertainment Equipment

"Part I—Phonograph records

"Sec. 4141. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"There is hereby imposed upon the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of the following articles (including in each case parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection with the sale thereof), a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold:

"Phonograph records.

"Subchapter D—Recreational Equipment

"Part I—Photographic equipment

"Sec. 4171. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4172. Definition of certain vendees as manufacturers.

"Sec. 4173. Exemptions.

"Sec. 4171. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"There is hereby imposed upon the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of the following articles (including in each case parts or accessories of such articles sold on or in connection therewith, or with the sale thereof) a tax equivalent to the specified percent of the price for which so sold:

"ARTICLES TAXABLE AT 10 PERCENT—

"Cameras.

"Camera lenses.

"Unexposed photographic film in rolls (including motion picture film).

"ARTICLES TAXABLE AT 5 PERCENT—

"Electric motion or still picture projectors of the household type.

"SEC. 4172. DEFINITION OF CERTAIN VENDEES AS MANUFACTURERS.

"Any person who acquires unexposed photographic film not subject to tax under this part and sells such unexposed film in form and dimensions subject to tax hereunder (or in connection with a sale cuts such film to form and dimensions subject to tax hereunder) shall for the purposes of section 4171 be considered the manufacturer of the film so sold by him.

"Sec. 4173. EXEMPTIONS.

"The tax imposed under this part shall not apply to—

"(1) CAMERAS.—X-ray cameras or cameras weighing more than four pounds exclusive of lens and accessories;

"(2) LENSES.—Still camera lenses having a focal length of more than one hundred and twenty millimeters, or motion picture camera lenses having a focal length of more than thirty millimeters;

"(3) FILM.—X-ray film, unperforated microfilm, film more than one hundred and fifty feet in length, or film more than twenty-five feet in length and more than thirty millimeters in width."

SEC. 1303. CLUB DUES.

Chapter 33 (relating to facilities and services) is amended by adding immediately after the table of subchapters the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter A—Club Dues

"Sec. 4241. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4242. Definitions.

"Sec. 4243. Exemptions.

"SEC. 4241. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"(a) RATE.—There is hereby imposed—

"(1) DUES OR MEMBERSHIP FEES.—A tax equivalent to 20 percent of any amount paid as dues or membership fees to any social, athletic, or sporting club or organization, if the dues or fees of an active resident annual member are in excess of \$25 per year.

"(2) INITIATION OF FEES.—A tax equivalent to 20 percent of any amount paid as initiation fees to such a club or organization, if such fees amount to more than \$25, or if the dues or membership fees, not including initiation fees, of an active resident annual member are in excess of \$25 per year.

"(3) LIFE MEMBERSHIPS.—In the case of life memberships—

"(A) a tax equivalent to the tax upon the amount paid as dues or membership fees by members (other than life membership) having privileges most nearly comparable to those of the person holding the life membership; or

"(B) at the election (made at such time not later than the day on which the first amount is paid for life membership, and made in such manner and form, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) of the person holding the life membership, a tax equivalent to 20 percent of any amount paid for the life membership. Any election under this subparagraph shall be irrevocable.

If subparagraph (A) applies, no tax shall be paid under this subsection on amounts paid for the life membership, and the tax under subparagraph (A) shall be paid at the time for the payment of dues or membership fees by members (other than life members) having privileges most nearly comparable to those of the person holding the life membership. Any tax payable under this paragraph shall be in addition to any tax payable under paragraph (1) or (2). No tax shall be payable under this paragraph on any life membership for which no charge is made to any person.

"SEC. 4242. DEFINITIONS.

"(a) DUES.—As used in this part the term 'dues' includes any assessment, irrespective of the purpose for which made, and any charges for social privileges or facilities, or for golf, tennis, polo, swimming, or other athletic or sporting privileges or facilities, for any period of more than six days; and

"(b) INITIATION FEES.—As used in this subchapter the term 'initiation fees' includes any payment, contribution, or loan, required as a condition precedent to membership, whether or not any such payment, contribution, or loan is evidenced by a certificate of interest or indebtedness or share of stock, and irrespective of the person or organization to whom paid, contributed, or loaned.

"SEC. 4243. EXEMPTIONS.

"(a) FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS.—There shall be exempted from the provisions of section 4241 all amounts paid as dues or fees to a fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, or to any local fraternal organization among the students of a college or university.

"(b) PAYMENTS FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, there shall be exempted from the provisions of section 4241 any amount paid as dues or membership fees or as initiation fees—

"(1) for the construction or reconstruction of any social, athletic, or sporting facility, or

"(2) for the construction or reconstruction

of any capital addition to, or capital improvement of, any such facility, or

"(3) for furnishings or fixtures (including installation charges) for any such facility, to the extent that such furnishings or fixtures are required, by reason of the construction or reconstruction described in paragraph (1) or (2), for the use of such facility upon completion of such construction or reconstruction; except that, in the case of any such amount which is not expended for such construction, reconstruction, furnishings or fixtures including installation charges) within 3 years after the date of payment of such amount, the exemption provided by this subsection shall cease to apply upon the expiration of such 3-year period, and the club or organization, rather than the person who made such payment, shall be liable for any tax imposed by section 4241 in respect of such payment, as if such payment had been made on the first day following the expiration of such 3-year period.

"(c) NONPROFIT SWIMMING OR SKATING FACILITIES.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, there shall be exempted from the provisions of section 4241 all amounts paid as dues or fees to any club or other organization organized and operated primarily for the purpose of providing swimming or skating facilities for its members, if no part of the net earnings of such organization inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual. This subsection shall apply with respect to an organization only if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that—

"(1) children will be permitted to use the swimming or skating facilities, on the basis of their own membership or the membership of adults;

"(2) no beverage subject to tax under chapter 51 (distilled spirits, wines, and beer) will be served or permitted to be consumed on any premises under the control of such organization;

"(3) no dining facilities (other than facilities for light refreshments), and no dancing facilities, will be provided on any premises under the control of such organization; and

"(4) such organization is not controlled by, or under common control with, any other organization."

SEC. 1304. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) RETAILERS AND MANUFACTURERS TAXES.—The taxes imposed by this title shall apply to all sales occurring after December 31, 1967.

(b) CLUB DUES.—The taxes imposed by this title shall apply to all club dues paid after December 31, 1967.

TITLE XIV—GAINS FROM THE DISPOSITION OF DEPRECIABLE REALTY

SEC. 1401. INCLUSION OF REALTY AS SECTION 1245 PROPERTY.

(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1245.—Section 1245(a)(3) (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable property) is amended by redesignated subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) any real property which is or has been property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167, or"

(b) REPEAL OF SECTION 1250.—Section 1250 (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable realty) is repealed.

SEC. 1402. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to dispositions occurring after December 31, 1967.

TITLE XV—REPEALING TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES

SEC. 1501. APPEARANCES, ETC., WITH RESPECT TO LEGISLATION.

(a) Section 162 (relating to tax deductions for certain trade or business expenses)

is amended by striking all of subsection (e) and redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

SEC. 1502. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to trade and business expenses occurring after December 31, 1967.

**IRS—READER'S DIGEST
CONTROVERSY**

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

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I come before this body to discuss something that weighs heavily on my mind.

The August issue of the Reader's Digest carried an article, "Tyranny in the Internal Revenue Service," which charged the IRS with lawless tactics against the public.

Since publication of the article my office and the offices of several of my colleagues have received many inquiries about these charges. That is why I was glad when I learned that the distinguished Representative from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] had announced his House Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, of which he is chairman, would probe the charges.

The hearing, to which he summoned IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen and his staff, was closed.

Because of the interest expressed in mail I have received, I requested and received a copy of the hearing.

To my amazement, I found that "the investigation" by this subcommittee consisted only of testimony by witnesses representing the Internal Revenue Service and nine letters praising the IRS, and that none of the individuals who had been allegedly "damaged" by the actions of the Internal Revenue Service was present. Nor was anybody present from the Reader's Digest.

Because of this unusual procedure by the committee, I inquired of the Reader's Digest Washington representative as to whether or not they had offered the committee any documentation concerning the charges contained in their article. I was informed that Mr. John Barron, an associate editor of the Reader's Digest and author of the article, had offered documentation to the chairman of the subcommittee prior to the hearing. However, Mr. Barron informed me, he had no response from the chairman.

I then requested that the Reader's Digest provide me with their evidence concerning this serious matter.

The document which I intend to insert into the RECORD today is a statement prepared by Reader's Digest which indicates some very serious matters which were overlooked by the committee. The rebuttal of Reader's Digest is directed at a 29-page press release issued by the Internal Revenue Service on August 10, the day of the hearing. The Reader's Digest document, when carefully compared with everything IRS said in its press release, which is part of the committee record, charges, first:

The IRS has made a number of deliberately false statements—statements clearly disproved by Federal court decisions as well as by previous admissions of the Government

itself. In one case, IRS has fabricated a quotation and attributed it to the written decision of a Federal judge.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], a member of this Investigative Subcommittee, placed into the RECORD of the House on Monday, August 14, the answer to the allegations provided by IRS. In that testimony on page 22502 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in language attributed to District Judge Wyzanski, it was stated:

IRS is not in contempt . . . I dismiss the petition with respect to civil contempt as well as with respect to criminal content.

However, in the printed subcommittee report, the words attributed to Judge Wyzanski "IRS is not in contempt" do not appear. Obviously someone has altered the committee record. I would submit that this is not in keeping with the high standards of the House in arriving at a fair decision.

Second, IRS has in another case revealed information more damaging to itself than the Digest reported, and while berating the Reader's Digest for allegedly being wrong in "15 of 16 cases," IRS in many of these cases simply confirms what the Digest said.

I deeply resent a committee of Congress being swerved from its primary constitutional responsibility of providing checks and balances between the various branches of Government, and instead be allowed to be used for self-serving propaganda by the bureaucracy.

We are all interested in seeing that everybody pays his fair share of taxes, and the IRS must use every legitimate means to collect these taxes, but this sort of investigation by a committee of this Congress only increases the credibility gap between our Government and its people.

The chairman of this committee, in conclusion, stated on page 65 of the committee report, that "the probable bad results from such an attack made on the service has been minimized, we hope"—by this investigation.

This does not, in my opinion, indicate a proper congressional investigation of a serious charge.

This can only indicate an attempt to whitewash a serious situation which the Reader's Digest brought to the attention of millions of American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that, at your call, this committee should be reconvened immediately under impartial direction in order to conduct a proper investigation of the charges brought by the Reader's Digest and to hear any additional complaints of taxpayers around the country. I call upon the Speaker to reconvene such a committee.

I include the rebuttal prepared by the Reader's Digest at this point in the RECORD:

THE READER'S DIGEST REBUTTAL

The Internal Revenue Service on August 10 issued a 29-page press release denouncing the Reader's Digest article "Tyranny in the Internal Revenue Service" by Associate Editor John Barron. The same day, IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen convened an extraordinary press conference to assail the article, which appears in the August issue.

Before publication, the accuracy of the article was exhaustively checked by the Research and Legal Departments of the Digest as well as by the editors. However, as mistakes are possible despite the greatest care, a line-by-line analysis of the IRS charges has been made. The Digest research data has been scrutinized anew and carefully compared with everything IRS said in its press release. The results show the following:

IRS has made a number of deliberately false statements—statements clearly disproved by federal court decisions as well as by previous admissions of the government itself. (See attached analysis, pages 19-24, 27, 31, 36)

In one case, IRS has fabricated a quotation and attributed it to the written decision of a federal judge. (See pages 24-26)

IRS has in another case revealed information more damaging to itself than what the Digest reported. (See pages 31-33)

While berating the Digest for allegedly being wrong in "15 of 16 cases," IRS in many of these cases simply confirms what the Digest said. (See pages 10-13, 14-18, 29, 34)

Overall, IRS offers neither a denial nor an explanation of some of the most shocking and lawless tactics it has used against the public. (See pages 35-36)

IRS in its press release tries to make capital of the fact that the Digest cited only 16 specific examples of abuses or wrongdoing. The truth is that the Digest investigation uncovered numerous other IRS abuses, but obviously a single article can contain only so much. IRS knows this well because it has had lengthy conferences and correspondence with Digest representatives this summer. Moreover, there has been a remarkable response to the article from troubled taxpayers all across the country. The Digest has been deluged with hundreds of letters from individuals complaining of the same kind of bureaucratic tyranny the article describes. So have members of Congress and the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. And IRS itself admits that it too has been inundated with protests from indignant citizens.

Commissioner Cohen was quoted as complaining at his press conference that the Digest did not consult IRS concerning most of the "cases" involved. Partial details of some of these cases were related in sworn testimony before the Senate subcommittee, and IRS had ample opportunity to try to refute the testimony. Indeed, on several occasions it attempted to do so by investigating the testimony of witnesses, then releasing so-called "fact sheets" concerning what they said. As for the other cases, however, IRS acknowledges in its press release that it could not have discussed them because they were not yet in the public domain.

A primary thesis of the article is that IRS has become infected with a totalitarian spirit. We regret that the IRS reaction lends confirmation to this thesis. Typical of its tone is this declaration, which appears on page 4 of the IRS press release:

"The fact that a court may acquit the individual means only that the government was unable to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that criminal tax fraud was committed."

According to American tradition, a man acquitted by a jury of his peers must be regarded as innocent. But here IRS says that once it accuses you of something, even if a court finds you not guilty, that really doesn't clear you.

THE CASE OF MRS. MICHAEL DARRAH

The Reader's Digest said:

"In Kansas City, Mo., two IRS agents intruded upon Mrs. Michael Darrah while she was nursing her six-week-old baby. The young mother pleaded with the men to come back another time. Instead, for four torturous hours they questioned her about an in-

come-tax charge against her father, Kenneth R. Layne. When she sought to call him for advice, one man ordered, "Don't touch that phone." Unsure of her rights, Mrs. Darrah asked permission to call a lawyer. "That will only make it worse for your father," an agent threateningly told her. For the terrified woman, it was tantamount to being held a prisoner in her own home. Ultimately, a jury unanimously concluded that Layne was innocent of any crime. But his daughter, never accused of anything, suffered a nervous breakdown."

The IRS response:

"Mrs. Darrah invited the IRS agents to come to her residence at a time when her husband could be present. She . . . set up a definite appointment. . . . by appointment the agents met Mr. and Mrs. Darrah at their home, arriving about 9:30 a.m. . . . After reading it (a proposed affidavit typed by the agents on the scene) and discussing it with her husband, and with her father or his attorney, Mrs. Darrah signed the corrected affidavit at 1:30 p.m. Mr. and Mrs. Darrah, who were pleasant and cordial during the entire visit at their home, served the group coffee around the noon hour, and did not ask the agents to leave or to return at another time. Mr. Darrah was present the entire time. Neither agent, at any time, attempted to prevent her from telephoning her father or anyone else. As a matter of fact, she did telephone her father or his attorney."

What happened:

On October 18, 1965, Kenneth R. Layne testified *under oath* before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure as follows:

"But I think the biggest penalty of all is what my wife and children have gone through. Two of my older daughters were interrogated extensively by these agents. . . . they were certainly not gentlemen. They caused one of my daughters to have an upset, and she had to go to the doctor. They told my daughters. . . . they had to sign these affidavits. They even told my daughter, Linda (Mrs. Darrah), when they took one out to the home here where she had just had a baby and everything and she was nursing this child, they stayed there for four hours and harassed her, made her sign an affidavit. She wanted to call me to let me know they were there and to find out if she could have an attorney or something. They wouldn't let her do this. . . . She had nothing to say. All she wanted to do was tell the truth, but they said she had to make the statement, so they took an affidavit and she signed it. They would not even let her call me. This is just one of my family."

After the subcommittee hearings, IRS issued "fact sheets" which the Senate subcommittee put in the official record commenting on or challenging testimony from some of the witnesses summoned by the committee. *But the IRS did not do this as far as Mr. Layne was concerned. It did not see fit, for the record, to dispute a single word of Mr. Layne's testimony.*

Subsequently, the Reader's Digest author interviewed Mrs. Darrah, members of her family, and consulted with Mr. Layne's attorney, who was familiar with what happened. Still later, the Reader's Digest Research Department independently checked the accuracy of the author's account by examining the aforementioned sworn testimony and re-interviewing Mrs. Darrah.

Moreover, after IRS issued its press release denying the Reader's Digest account, the IRS version of its interrogation of Mrs. Darrah was read to Mrs. Darrah. She replied:

"It's a big fat lie. . . . I did not invite them to come, I was just suddenly advised that they were coming. My husband only happened to be home because he worked the night shift. . . . It was not a pleasant time. I was scared stiff. My husband was upset. He or I did not know what to do. They kept

telling us and giving the impression that if we didn't do what they wanted, it would hurt my father.

"I didn't call anybody. I was not allowed to use my telephone. They told me not to touch the phone. They said I couldn't be telling the truth if I wanted my father or a lawyer to see the statement. They said that if I were telling the truth, I would just go ahead and sign it.

"I most certainly did ask them to leave, twice or more. I had the baby to worry about, and I wanted to talk to my father to see if I was doing the right thing. But they wouldn't leave until I signed the statement.

"I did serve coffee about noon. They had been there so long, and I wanted something to steady my nerves."

The IRS version of what transpired during the interrogation also was read to Mr. Darrah. He said:

"They wanted a statement that day, and they said we had the choice of driving downtown, or if we didn't, they were coming out. They reminded me that if we didn't they could get us with a subpoena. . . .

"When they came out, they had a whole bunch of bank account records and stuff which my wife had never seen. She asked if she could call her dad to find out about this stuff. But they wouldn't let her use the phone. . . . No, she most certainly never did call anyone while they were there. . . .

"They kept saying, 'This is the way it had to be. It couldn't be any other way. And we want a statement to that effect.'

"She asked them to come back another time so she could talk to her dad. But they were determined not to leave until they got the statement, and that was the only way we could get rid of them.

"I don't know how they can say it was pleasant and friendly. We knew they were trying to put her dad in jail, and we didn't like the way we were being treated, but we didn't know what to do."

The issue thus is one of credibility. What is to be believed—the unsworn, belated denials of IRS via press release or the detailed repeated statements of the young couple and the sworn testimony which IRS never saw fit to challenge for the official sworn record?

THE CASE OF LEW M. WARDEN, JR.

The Reader's Digest said:

"In Oakland, Calif., attorney Lew M. Warden, Jr. patiently answered questions about his tax return until an IRS agent demanded all his records. 'Those files contain confidential information about some of my clients,' Warden protested. 'You have no right to them.' So IRS arbitrarily disallowed his legitimate business deductions for three years and claimed he owed \$19,501.41 in back taxes. It seized his bank account, ordered tenants of a cottage he owned to pay their rent to the government, confiscated his sailboat. Worse still, the constant IRS harassment took him away from his law practice so much that his income plummeted.

"Insisting on a day in court, Warden spent his last savings preparing for his tax trial scheduled April 5, 1965. But on April 1, after hounding him for 33 months, the IRS suddenly dropped all charges. For, as it should have known all along, Warden had done nothing wrong and owed it nothing."

The IRS response:

"When an examination of Mr. Warden's tax matters was begun in June 1962, he refused to answer questions about his tax returns and refused to make his records available to the examining officer. *The records requested were those relating only to his personal financial activities and his personal tax situation*, not, as the Reader's Digest says, records which contain 'confidential information' about Mr. Warden's clients. For over two years Mr. Warden refused to produce his business records to verify certain items on his return, and twice refused a conference to discuss his tax situation. . . .

Lacking Mr. Warden's records to support his claimed deductions, IRS proposed certain adjustments calling for additional tax on the returns at issue. Mr. Warden wrote to the San Francisco IRS office refusing to accept the deficiency findings." (Italics supplied)

The IRS response notes that Mr. Warden subsequently filed suit in Federal District Court against IRS officials, contending they were denying him constitutional rights by arbitrary action. The court ruled his rights had not been denied and that the acts of IRS agents were undertaken solely in an effort to determine correct tax liabilities for 1959, 1960 and 1961. "At a pre-trial conference in November 1964, Mr. Warden gave the first indication of cooperation by informing members of the IRS Regional Counsel's staff that he was compiling records to substantiate expenses on his return. Two months later, in January and February 1965, Mr. Warden finally made them available for examination at his place of business.

"With the records thus available, it was at last determined that no additional tax was due. But this occurred only after Mr. Warden made his records available, a reasonable action which, if taken at the time of the initial request for them, might have saved both taxpayer and government time and money."

What happened:

The Digest account was based on: (1) a federal court decision declaring that Mr. Warden did not have to surrender his records to IRS; (2) the court decisions IRS mentions; (3) voluminous official correspondence from IRS; (4) records of court proceedings; (5) three interviews with Mr. and Mrs. Warden; (6) the U.S. Tax Court decision affirming that Warden owed no taxes whatsoever. These documentary data as well as the results of the interviews were independently verified by the Digest Research Department.

Warden insists that he initially answered IRS questions which first were addressed to him by telephone, then by an agent who visited his office.

IRS claims, "The records requested were those relating only to his personal financial activities and his personal tax situation. . . ." Yet in the very next sentence IRS says, "For over two years Mr. Warden refused to produce his business records. . . ." Thus, IRS by its own statement proves that it certainly did seek Warden's business records which did contain information about his clients. These Mr. Warden as a matter of principle refused to surrender to IRS.

IRS thereafter issued a summons commanding him to give up his records. But IRS neglects to report that on August 29, 1962, the Federal District Court for the Northern Division of California quashed the summons and declared that Mr. Warden did not have to surrender his records. However, the court in the same ruling decreed that Mr. Warden did have to answer oral questions from IRS and ordered him to report on September 6, 1962, for IRS interrogation. In light of this injunction, Mr. Warden never refused to attend any conference with IRS. On the contrary, he spent innumerable hours at such conferences.

Confronted by a federal court ruling that it could not take Mr. Warden's records away from him and thwarted by his refusal voluntarily to surrender them, IRS retaliated by disallowing his business deductions and claiming that he owed \$19,501.41. The records of the Federal District Court in San Francisco (Civil No. 41882) reveal that IRS itself stated: "The principal cause of changes is the taxpayers' refusal to make their books and records available for examination."

IRS alleges: "At a pre-trial conference in November 1964, Mr. Warden gave the first indication of cooperation by informing members of the IRS regional counsel's staff that

he was compiling records to substantiate expenses on his return." IRS further alleges that he ultimately did make his records "available" for examination and that then everything was efficiently settled.

But Warden's own account is to the contrary. He says:

"First of all, I demanded a trial in open court. But to get a trial, you have to go through a pre-trial conference. At this conference, which IRS talks about, I warned those birds I was getting my records in order so I could prove them wrong in court, point by point. But I never intimated I was going to turn my records over to them. . . .

"Before a tax trial, you have to try to stipulate as many facts as possible. And if you don't try to make stipulations with IRS, the judge is likely to throw the book at you. I compiled some summaries of some of my records, just so we could make stipulations. . . . Early in 1965 I showed IRS these summaries plus a few canceled checks. But I never showed IRS my records. That was the whole principle we were fighting about, and I never gave in. IRS is just looking for a face-saving device when it says I did."

Thus, after pursuing Warden for nearly three years, IRS on the eve of his scheduled tax trial was confronted by the prospect of having to go into court without any evidence whatsoever. IRS recognized that if it did this, the fact that it had been pressing empty claims against Mr. Warden would be exposed. So, just before the scheduled trial, IRS admitted in writing that Warden owed not one penny. Pursuant to this admission, the U.S. Tax Court at San Francisco on April 1, 1965, issued a decision (Docket No. 627-64) which says:

Ordered and decided: That there are no deficiencies in income tax due from, or overpayments due to, the petitioners (Mr. and Mrs. Warden) for the taxable years 1959, 1960 and 1961.

The IRS response continued:

"The Reader's Digest says Mr. Warden unfairly had his bank account 'seized' by the IRS, which also 'confiscated his sailboat.' Mr. Warden owed taxes reported by him on his original returns. He was seriously delinquent in payment of these taxes; taxes which were not in question. The Collection Division, in activities entirely distinct from the examination of his tax returns, made numerous efforts to collect these taxes, admittedly owed by Mr. Warden. Only after he refused to submit financial data which would have enabled IRS to determine whether collection could be deferred, he was informed in June 1964 that action to collect the tax would be necessary. On June 25, 1964, a levy was served on his bank account, and on July 17, 1964, his auxiliary sloop was seized in the yacht harbor where Mr. Warden kept it moored. These actions were unrelated to the examination of his tax returns and proposed additional tax. They took place as part of enforcement action to collect taxes seriously delinquent in payment. On August 4, 1964, Mr. Warden made full payment on all existing tax liabilities, and his boat was released to him."

What happened:

When Mr. Warden filed his 1962 tax return on April 15, 1963, he owed \$5,946.93. However, the controversy with IRS increasingly consumed so much of his time that he had less and less left for his law practice, and his earnings consequently plummeted (evidenced by the fact that his total income taxes and social security taxes for 1963 totaled only \$440, and for 1964 only \$633.59). Thus, in April 1963, Mr. Warden did not have the money to meet his 1962 tax bill.

But he did struggle to pay. He sent \$750 on July 17, 1963, \$1000 on August 26 and \$300 on October 29. Nevertheless, on November 8, 1963—eight days after Mr. Warden had indicated good faith by volunteering the partial payment—IRS confiscated his office bank account. As IRS indicates, it subse-

quently made additional seizures of his bank accounts and property. IRS neglects to mention that on June 26, 1964, it also confiscated his lawyer's trust account, which contained \$1500 that Mr. Warden had deposited in behalf of a client. IRS thus took money which did not even belong to Warden.

IRS insists that this seizure of money and property did not constitute harassment and had nothing to do with the other dealings with Warden. Such insistence, however, is open to question in light of the fact that IRS has let big corporations and even an ex-convict go untouched for years without paying much larger sums than Mr. Warden owed (as in the cases of Webb & Knapp, Stavros Niarchos and Lawrence L. Callanan report on elsewhere in this document).

THE CASE OF THE TENNESSEE BUSINESSMAN

The Reader's Digest said:

"In a small Tennessee town, an IRS agent rifled through mail on a businessman's desk, pried open an envelop and found a letter linking him with 'another woman.' The agent showed a copy to the man's wife, trying to anger her so that she would agree to inform against her husband."

The IRS response:

"This allegation is substantially true. An investigation made by IRS at the time of the incident, which occurred on October 15, 1962, confirmed that the agent did show a copy of the letter to the taxpayer's wife."

What happened:

The Digest account is not merely "substantially true." It is utterly true and accurate.

THE CASE OF ROGER LOGAN (ALIAS)

The Reader's Digest said:

"After contracting to sell his home in suburban Detroit, businessman Roger Logan (not his real name discovered that IRS had slapped liens of \$210.07 and \$400.07 on it for alleged non-payment of taxes. Logan's wife presented canceled checks and copies of past returns to prove no taxes were due, but without avail. 'The best thing to do,' an IRS clerk advised, 'is to pay off the liens. Then, if you're telling the truth, you can sue to get your money back.' Only after Logan got help from a lawyer friend would IRS even take the trouble to verify that he indeed owed nothing. The agency had tied up his home simply because it had two old claims against someone with a similar name."

The IRS response:

"Does not dispute one single aspect of the Digest account. It simply confirms in detail what the Digest said, as for instance, it stresses that the IRS advised Mrs. Logan 'the only way' for her to get rid of the liens was 'to pay the tax and file a claim for refund.' IRS' only excuse is 'mistaken identity.'"

THE CASE OF NOEL SMITH

The Reader's Digest said:

"IRS can merely claim that a citizen owes taxes; then, if he fails to pay instantly, it can immediately confiscate his salary or all the money he has deposited in a bank, or seize everything he owns."

"Nobody knows this better than farmer Noel Smith of Taylor, Mo. IRS checked Smith's books for nine years without telling him it suspected any significant irregularity. Then one morning a friend ran up to him with a newspaper report that IRS was taking over his farms. Smith rushed to town, only to learn that IRS had confiscated all his money in the bank, the contents of his safe-deposit box, even an insurance policy belonging to his 70-year-old mother. Five days later, IRS formally demanded that he pay it a staggering \$501,000."

"With help from friends, Smith hired lawyers and accountants to unravel the fantastic IRS claims. Meanwhile, the agency began selling off his stored grain, using sledgehammers to batter apart his bins. 'Highhanded,' 'unlawful,' declared the U.S. Court of Appeals upon hearing what IRS had done.

"Nevertheless, IRS kept custody of Smith's property and denied him income from it for four years before deciding that he actually owed \$54,573 in taxes. Smith paid this 'ransom,' as he termed it, so that he could recover his land. Another year Smith overpaid his taxes but had to sue to force IRS to give him back \$7,820 the government owed him. And to this day IRS is still after him. 'I did not think it could happen in the United States,' Smith told Senate investigators."

The IRS response:

"Does not contest the essential factuality of the Digest account beyond saying, 'There is no evidence of destruction of Mr. Smith's property by anyone.' Instead, it seeks to justify its seizures on the premises that it 'learned' Smith 'was attempting to dispose of his principal holdings, thus jeopardizing eventual collection of any tax,' and it 'learned' that Mr. Smith was transferring his assets to another country. It also mentions that 'there were a series of court actions initiated by Smith to restrain the collection of his taxes.' IRS explains that Smith's grain was seized and sold 'to avoid destruction of the grain by flooding of the storage units.'"

What happened:

The evidence that Smith's property was damaged consists of his sworn testimony to Senate investigators October 20, 1965, and of photographs showing his battered storage bins.

The remainder of the Digest account is based on decisions by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (No. 16,065), the Tax Court of the United States (Docket No. 65410), and detailed statements made to the author and Digest representative by IRS officials in Washington.

The \$501,000 sum mentioned by the Digest (which is at variance with the \$375,688 sum mentioned by IRS) is derived from the U.S. Court of Appeals ruling which found that IRS originally claimed Smith owed \$341,000 in back taxes plus "approximately \$160,000" in penalties.

The Digest article recounted Smith's experience to illustrate the enormity and arbitrary character of powers entrusted to IRS. IRS claims that it confiscated Smith's property because it learned he was "attempting to dispose of his principal holdings" and later because it learned he was "transferring his assets to another country." However, IRS never presented one shred of evidence to any court, to any judge or to anyone else that this was so. Furthermore, in its reply IRS even now offers no evidence whatsoever in support of this claim.

Thus, IRS by its own statement proves the point of the article that the agency can seize anyone's property without justifying its action to anybody; that IRS can seize any person's property without affording him an opportunity to prove its claim false; that IRS can fabricate as large a claim as it wishes against an individual without first offering any evidence that the claim is valid. In this case, for example, IRS claimed Smith owed \$341,000 in back taxes (plus \$160,000) whereas later it conceded he only owed \$54,000.

THE CASE OF GORDON W. WARREN

The Reader's Digest said:

"Look at what happened not long ago in Richland, Mo., a small town in the Ozark foothills. As he told the Senate committee, the local bank president, Gordon W. Warren, was alone in his office when two IRS agents marched in and demanded the records of a depositor. 'I'll just notify this customer,' Warren said, reaching for the phone. 'If you do that,' an agent told him, 'you'll be liable to a \$10,000 fine and a ten-year imprisonment.' The threats were as illegal as they were inexcusable. But how could Warren know?"

The IRS response:

"The agents cited their legal authority to have the information and in fact read to Mr. Warren the exact language of the law in-

cluding the provisions which state the penalty for violation. Mr. Warren was not threatened in any way."

What happened:

Contrary to what IRS implies, there is no law whatsoever which would prevent a banker from notifying a depositor that IRS wants to look at records of his account.

Testifying under oath before the Senate subcommittee October 20, 1965, Mr. Warren said:

"I had one experience which was not very pleasant. . . . In this case, it was during a saturation investigation in that area, and these were special agents in charge, I presume, but two of these agents came into my office and demanded information regarding a certain customer. I said, 'I will just notify this customer. I will call him.' I had the phone right there at my desk. One of these agents said, 'Now, we don't want you to do that.' He said, 'In this case we don't want that done, and furthermore, if you do it, you are liable to a \$10,000 fine and a ten-year imprisonment.'

"Anyway, I contacted the attorney for our bank, and he, in turn, wanted to be absolutely sure on this, and he contacted a tax attorney at Jefferson City. We received a letter from him advising us there was no such provision in the Internal Revenue Code that would call for that type of punishment."

Subsequently, when IRS inserted into the official sworn record of the committee hearings a "fact sheet" commenting in detail on Mr. Warren's testimony, it did not see fit to deny that its agents threatened him nor to dispute one word of his testimony regarding their visit. Furthermore, IRS confirmed the accuracy of Mr. Warren's testimony regarding other matters.

Thus, again the issue is one of credibility. What is to be believed—the belated, unsworn denials of IRS put out now in a press release, or the sworn, heretofore undisputed testimony of a reputable banker?

THE CASE OF THE WAITRESS

The Reader's Digest said:

"Down the street an IRS agent confronted a waitress with a \$275 tax claim. When she protested, the agent threatened to confiscate and 'dispose of' her old car unless she paid up *that day*. Near tears, she went to see Warren, who agreed to lend her the \$275 necessary to hold IRS off. Only after she spent days getting a sworn affidavit to document her deductions did IRS admit she didn't owe the bill which it tried to intimidate her into paying."

The IRS response:

"Does not in any way challenge the accuracy of the Digest account. It only claims that before threatening to seize the waitress' property, it sought in vain to interview her, and sent her four letters requesting payment of the money (which, as it admits, was not owed)."

What happened:

In her original interview with the author of the article, the waitress denied that any IRS representative ever explained what she needed to do to prove she did not owe the money IRS demanded. She said it was not until she got advice from banker Warren that she understood what was required of her. Expressing fear of IRS retaliation, the waitress now refuses to discuss the matter further, saying only "they know what they did."

Richland has a population of 1665. The whereabouts of anyone in this village is no great mystery. The waitress is at work each day in the little cafe, and her husband regularly works 1½ blocks away. Thus, the professed difficulty of IRS in locating the waitress or her husband is baffling.

THE TOMLINSON CASE

The Reader's Digest said:

"Across the railroad, Fred and Katherine Tomlinson run a one-room Dairy Queen Shop. They have never made a lot of money,

but enough to rear their children and make their own way. On March 31, 1965, a worried bank cashier ran to see them. 'The IRS has seized your bank account,' he reported. 'They claim you didn't pay your taxes last year.' Tomlinson couldn't understand: 'The Government's never said anything to us about owing any money.' That night, he and his wife dug out a canceled check proving they had paid in full, and mailed it to IRS. Meanwhile, checks they previously had written bounced because of the IRS seizure of their funds. 'I'm so ashamed,' Katherine told her husband. Not until eight days later would IRS restore their money—without the least apology."

The IRS response:

"On July 30, 1964, it sent the Tomlinsons a letter requesting information regarding their income tax return. It also claims that on January 29, 1965, it sent them a 'balance due notice'—when nothing was due. Otherwise, IRS does not dispute anything the Digest says, nor does it deny that it seized the Tomlinsons' bank account without any warning whatsoever."

What happened:

Concerning what happened to the Tomlinsons, IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen on May 19, 1965, wrote the Senate Judiciary subcommittee: ". . . I find that the Internal Revenue Service did err, and we apologize. The tax liability had been paid in full, and notice of levy should not have been served."

Both Mr. and Mrs. Tomlinson deny that they ever received the letter IRS claims to have sent in January 1965, and they deny that after they made their last tax payment in 1965 they never received any notice of any kind that they owed any money. And in spite of the Commissioner's admissions and "apology" to the subcommittee, the Tomlinsons also assert that they have never received any apology of any kind.

THE CASE OF JERRY G. PFNISTER

The Reader's Digest says:

"This callous disregard of the rights, feelings and welfare of ordinary people goes on all the time. Last March 28, IRS without forewarning attached the salary of Chicago salesman Jerry G. Pfnister. Thus Pfnister was branded as 'financially irresponsible' in the eyes of his associates. Only later would IRS give him a letter admitting that it had made an error and he owed nothing. But that has failed to restore Pfnister's reputation."

The IRS response:

"Does not dispute a single fact in the Reader's Digest article. Its explanation is simply that it did not have a record of Pfnister's payments because one of these was inadvertently sent to the wrong IRS office; that therefore because 'the collection office was unaware this payment had been made. . . . IRS had no other course of action left but to levy on his salary. . . . Immediately on learning the situation (one week later), IRS contacted the employer by telephone, offered a verbal apology in behalf of Mr. Pfnister and an explanation. . . . Mr. Pfnister then was given a Release of Levy for his employer, with a written explanation. . . . This is a far cry from the Reader's Digest conclusion that 'this callous disregard of the rights, feelings and welfare of ordinary people goes on all the time.'"

What happened:

IRS merely verifies what the Digest said. Because Pfnister's tax payment was "misdirected" within the labyrinth of IRS bureaucracy, IRS without so much as a phone call of warning attached his salary and thereby defamed him in the eyes of his colleagues and employer. Its willingness to "offer a verbal apology" a week later and its assertion that this alone disproves the conclusions drawn by the author of the article do not erase the damage done.

THE CASE OF CLAUDE F. SALTER

The Reader's Digest said:

"Claude F. Salter, for example, is a dis-

tinguished veteran of 34 years with IRS. His record as chief of its San Francisco audit division was so outstanding that IRS admits "we cannot deny that he did perform well." Salter was stubborn, though, when it came to principles. To superiors who asked special treatment for certain taxpayers, he consistently said no. So, in the spring of 1964, these officials tried to have him declared unfit by ordering him to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital and sending along a letter implying that he was mentally ill. A battery of psychiatrists and physicians told Salter that he was well adjusted, intelligent and healthy. Nevertheless, IRS soon demoted him to a lesser job where he could not influence policy."

The IRS response:

"Is chiefly to the point that the record of hearings and appeals 'does not indicate any evidence that Mr. Salter's superiors ever asked for special treatment of certain taxpayers. . . . It additionally alleges that Mr. Salter used 'loud and profane language. . . . displayed increasingly intemperate conduct,' and that therefore 'he was referred for a complete checkup to the U.S. Public Health Service. As a result of the examination, he was declared medically fit for duty,' but 'believing that the best interests of the IRS required reassignment of Mr. Salter to a position of less responsibility, the Regional Commissioner in San Francisco transferred him to a non-managerial position in the Appellate Division.'"

What happened:

IRS does not deny that Salter was pressured by his superiors. It also omits any reference to the letter its regional commissioner in San Francisco sent to the Public Health Service physicians. This letter, a copy of which is in Digest files, portrays Mr. Salter as "a seriously ill man," as "antagonistic, rash, loud, argumentative, threatening and totally unreasonable." Additionally, the letter reveals that Salter's superiors searched his personnel file all the way back to the early 1930's in an effort to find something bad to say about him.

One of the physicians at the Public Health Service Hospital so resented the letter that he arranged for Mr. Salter to obtain a copy.

Ever since, IRS has refused to permit Mr. Salter, his lawyer or Senate investigators to see the record of his examination at the hospital. This record shows that in spite of his superior's letter accusing him of irrationality and intemperate conduct, the psychiatrists and physicians found nothing to support such charges.

THE CASE OF DONALD R. LORD

The Reader's Digest said:

"In Dedham, Mass., 31-year-old accountant Donald R. Lord responded to a knock on his front door one Saturday morning, still in his pajamas, and three IRS agents pushed past him into his home. They ordered him to get out corporate records entrusted to him by a local businessman. 'You'd better cooperate if you expect to stay in business,' Lord was warned. 'Don't make any phone calls, or you'll be subject to prosecution.'"

"After interrogating him most of the day, the agents confiscated boxes of papers, threatening him with a jail sentence if he resisted, and drove away."

"Soon thereafter, a neighbor phoned: 'Some IRS men were here today, asking questions about you.' Meanwhile, IRS agents went to Lord's bank and copied his financial records. Others hounded his relatives with interrogations and even tried to question his 88-year-old grandmother."

The IRS response:

"On a Wednesday at 10:15 a.m., having made an advance appointment with Mr. Lord (not a surprise visit, as Reader's Digest implies), three IRS agents arrived at his house, and Mr. Lord fully clothed (not in his pajamas) admitted the agents. . . . The agents inventoried the records, then removed them with authority of a summons given to Mr.

Lord. At no time was Mr. Lord threatened with a jail sentence if he resisted.

"This neighbor who phoned was Mr. Lord's mother . . . about eight months later. On that occasion and later, still seeking additional records in the principal case, IRS agents contacted Mr. Lord's relatives. There was no 'hounding' of anybody by anybody. . . . By pre-arranged appointment with Miss (Marie A.) Lord (Lord's aunt), and at her invitation, an agent called at her home. Miss Lord's aged mother was in the house, but was at no time questioned." (Italics supplied)

What happened:

The Reader's Digest article erred only in reporting that the incident described occurred on a Saturday rather than a Wednesday.

The article says nothing regarding whether the three agents had an appointment. However, inasmuch as IRS indicates that Lord expected a three-man visitation, it must be pointed out that the IRS statement is contrary to the sworn public record.

The three IRS agents who went to Lord's house were Donald Young, John B. Flattery and Charles R. McNally. On July 13, 1965, Young testified under oath before the Senate subcommittee as follows:

"I talked to Mr. Flattery and found out what he wanted to do. He instructed me to make sure the appointment was in the home. In the afternoon I called Mr. Lord back, and the appointment was arranged for April 18, 1962. I made another phone call to Mr. Lord on April 16, 1962, to confirm the appointment and also to state that we would be a little late.

"Q: Did you indicate that anyone was coming with you?

"Mr. Young: No, at no time did I do that, sir; I was under instructions not to do that.

"Q: What was the purpose of those instructions?

"Mr. Young: Well, I was under the guise of continuing my routine audit, supposed to go out there, and this is the impression that I gave to Mr. Lord.

"Q: That was a false impression?

"Mr. Young: Yes, it was.

"Q: What happened when you did go out there?

"Mr. Young: Well, we arrived at his house, Mr. Lord's house, on April 18, 1962, at approximately quarter past 10. I knocked on the door; Mr. Lord answered. I introduced myself, and Mr. Flattery and Mr. McNally brushed past me into the house." (Italics supplied)

Thus, contrary to what IRS now states, two of the agents had no appointment with Mr. Lord. They arrived at his house and entered it in accordance with a planned ruse.

Mr. Lord reaffirms that he was attired in pajamas. He explained that he was fatigued because of preparing many tax returns for the filing deadline just expired, expected only Young, regarded his visit as routine and had slept late. He states that he dressed after the agents were inside his house.

IRS claims that the records confiscated from Lord were removed with the authority of a summons given to Mr. Lord. Two separate federal court decisions as well as two written government briefs show this claim to be false.

On November 19, 1963, the Federal District Court in Boston expressly ruled that the records were illegally seized and ordered them returned. It declared:

"In the instant case no adequate basis for the seizure of the client's records existed. . . . The seizures having been unlawful, this Court must grant the prayer that there shall be returned to the clients, or, rather, their agent, Lord, their records. . . . So that the complainants may be as well off as, but not better off than, before the unlawful seizures, this Court's order will enjoin any defendant or federal agent in concert with him from using in any proceeding, criminal, civil, or administrative, federal

or state, information or clues derived from the records while Flattery and his associates in the Federal Revenue Service were holding them."

This decision subsequently was upheld by the United States Court of Appeals.

In a brief submitted to the U.S. Court of Appeals (No. 6420, *Mc Garry v. Rose*, 344 Federal Reporter 2nd 416), the Department of Justice admitted: "Instead of serving this (the summons) at the outset, they first prevailed upon Lord to turn them over by threats. . . ."

In still another brief submitted to the Court of Appeals (No. 6307, *Lord v. Kelley*, 334 Federal Reporter 2nd 742), the Department of Justice admitted:

"As the court below observed in its opinion, Flattery's mistake was that he did not serve the summons and patiently await the outcome of such service. . . ."

IRS claims, "At no time was Mr. Lord threatened with a jail sentence if he resisted." Again, the Federal District Court decision of November 19, 1963, shows that Lord was subjected to repeated threats by the IRS agents. Declared the Court:

"Nonetheless, Flattery, after informing Lord that it would be prudent for him to cooperate with the special agents unless he himself wished to get into trouble, demanded the right to take his clients' records to the Office of Internal Revenue Service. Lord, after indicating that he lacked authority voluntarily to surrender the documents, complied with the demand because he feared that if he did not do so, he himself, regardless of his innocence, would be investigated or subject to proceedings initiated by the government. His compliance was not voluntary, but responded to Flattery's threats. . . . Intimidated by Flattery's statements and implied threats, Lord did not regard himself as having a free choice whether to allow Flattery to remove the records. When a special agent of the Internal Revenue Service tells an accountant who, so far as appears, is quite innocent of wrongdoing that unless he turns over his clients' records and cooperates with the Internal Revenue Service, the accountant will be in trouble, the agent is close to extortion. That Flattery did exercise unlawful pressure is proved by Lord's credible testimony."

Additionally, under oath before the Senate subcommittee, Lord said:

"Q: Did they threaten you about not making any telephone calls while they were there?

"Mr. Lord: Yes, sir. . . . Mr. Flattery told me not to make any phone calls to any of the principals involved or to anyone else while they were out to lunch. At various other times during the day he intimated that I had better cooperate with him; otherwise, I would be in real trouble and would be subject to prosecution and possibly a jail sentence. He also intimated that if I intended to stay in public accounting, I would have to live with the IRS as long as I did."

Mr. Lord, adjudged a credible witness by the federal court, affirms that several neighbors other than his mother telephoned him to report IRS inquiries about him.

The article did not say that IRS agents questioned Mr. Lord's elderly grandmother but that they attempted to do so. They were thwarted by the outraged protests of Miss Marie Lord.

THE CASE OF LAWRENCE O'DONNELL

The Reader's Digest says:

"Angered and worried, Lord engaged a distinguished Boston lawyer, Lawrence O'Donnell. Subsequently IRS, by its own admission, subpoenaed Lord to appear at a conference in a secret office which had been carefully bugged in advance. Suddenly O'Donnell, too, was subjected to hostile IRS examination. An employee at Boston's Carney Hospital, where O'Donnell had undergone five critical operations, tipped him off that IRS

was questioning his medical expenses. Moreover, as IRS later admitted, agents pored over his tax returns covering six years, hunting futilely for some error.

"The Federal District Court in Boston declared that IRS's 'unlawful pressures' against Lord came 'close to extortion.' It ruled the seizure of the business records completely illegal, and forbade IRS to make any further use of them. Yet, as O'Donnell subsequently proved with testimony of one agent who resigned in disgust, IRS made copies of these records and continued to use them—in arrogant contempt of the court order."

The IRS response:

"Mr. O'Donnell's income tax returns for the years 1962 and 1963 were being audited. He sought through the courts to prevent the audits."

Then IRS reports a Court of Appeals finding that Mr. O'Donnell's 1962 return was picked for audit because he had made a large bank deposit in cash and that his 1963 return was selected for audit because of routine procedures.

What happened:

IRS omits the fact—admitted in open court by its own agents—that Mr. O'Donnell's tax returns for 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960 and 1961 were intensely examined, which is hardly routine.

Testifying under oath before the Senate subcommittee July 19, 1965, IRS agent John B. Flattery swore that the returns "were not investigated." He said: "Merely pulled his returns, looked them over, put them aside like we do many other returns. There was nothing further done with respect to his returns." But another IRS agent, testifying under oath in Federal District Court in Boston December 29, 1965, admitted that in fact a detailed analysis of O'Donnell's returns for the years 1956 through 1962 was made. And O'Donnell forced IRS to produce a document entitled "Analysis of Federal Tax Returns, 1956 to 1962" which proved that his returns in fact were scrutinized in detail.

Furthermore, agent Young testified under oath:

"Well, in the summer of 1963, Mr. O'Donnell's tax returns were requisitioned. When they came into the office, Mr. Flattery showed me the tax returns and asked me my opinion of them. He pointed out specifically the medical expense, which appeared to be high. I know that an inquiry was made by Mr. Ferrick to the Carney Hospital to find out whether or not such expenditures had happened. . . ."

"We also discussed at the time that Mr. O'Donnell would have to have his tax returns audited. We also talked about whether or not we would recommend a special revenue agent who we had in mind who we thought would be the toughest to put on the case."

The IRS response continued:

"Concerning 'arrogant contempt' of court, the Reader's Digest alleged that the Federal Court in Boston ruled 'seizure of the business records completely illegal. . . .' but in that case District Court Judge Wyzanski on April 13, 1965, ruled as follows:

"IRS is not in contempt. . . . I dismiss the petition with respect to civil contempt as well as with respect to criminal contempt."

What happened:

IRS here seeks to imply that the court in Boston did not rule seizure of the business records illegal, as the Reader's Digest reported. Yet IRS knows that in his decision of November 19, 1963 (see pages 20 and 21), Judge Wyzanski unequivocally ruled that the records had been illegally seized and ordered them returned. IRS knows that the Court of Appeals sustained Judge Wyzanski's ruling. IRS knows that the government subsequently twice admitted that the records were not obtained legally.

Before returning the illegally confiscated

records, IRS made copies of some of them. Then it continued to exploit them in clear defiance of Judge Wyzanski's order of November 19, 1963. Learning of this, O'Donnell again complained to the court. So on April 13, 1965, Judge Wyzanski issued a second ruling, the one to which IRS now refers. In this second ruling Judge Wyzanski found that two IRS agents "in willful defiance" of his earlier order had continued to exploit some of the illegally seized records.

On the basis of this finding of "willful defiance," the Reader's Digest felt justified in characterizing the IRS actions as "arrogant contempt." To refute this characterization, IRS quotes Judge Wyzanski's ruling:

"IRS is not in contempt . . . I dismiss the petition with respect to civil contempt as well as with respect to criminal contempt."

Here, IRS has fabricated a quotation and attributed it to the written decision of a federal judge. The judge's decision was made in writing. It is forever recorded (Lord v. Kelley, cite as 240 F. Supp. 167 (D. Mass. 1965)) for anyone to examine. And anyone who reads it will see that nowhere in the entire decision does Judge Wyzanski say, "IRS is not in contempt." But, as it would now be convenient for IRS if the judge had said this, IRS merely makes up a statement, puts quotation marks around it and attributes it to the judge's ruling. Thus, IRS conveys the impression that Judge Wyzanski on April 13, 1965, exonerated it of all wrongdoing and that the Reader's Digest article is wholly inaccurate.

Here, however, is the wording of Judge Wyzanski's conclusions:

"1. Defendant John B. Flattery, one of the agents of the Internal Revenue Service, who was directed by this Court to return McGarry's unlawfully seized records (those confiscated from Lord) and to suppress all data in connection with those records, in willful defiance of this Court's order used a part of those records relating to AAA Vending Company to pursue a lead to Bay State Security Corporation and another part of those records relating to 'Ye Olde Brown Jug' to pursue a lead to S. D. Breen, an insurance broker, and to Curry's Woodworking Company.

"2. Defendant John B. Flattery, acting through his subordinate, Robert M. Ferrick, who himself is not a defendant, in willful defiance of this Court's order used the cash receipts and disbursements book of 'Ye Olde Brown Jug' (being part of the unlawfully seized records heretofore mentioned) to pursue leads with respect to checks and other financial transactions.

"No evidence was offered to show that in any respect whatsoever defendant Kelly, . . . or McNally was involved in any violation of this Court's Order.

"But Flattery's deliberate violations must be weighed against his and other government agents' scrupulous compliance in other respects with the procedure required by my Order.

"(2) I, therefore, conclude as a matter of law that while an Internal Revenue agent intended to step very close to defying the clear lines of my Order and, indeed, in a few places, more probably than not, consciously walked over the border, this degree of defiance does not quite rise to the level of criminal contempt.

"(3) Criminal contempt is a matter in which the complaining party has the burden of proving his case beyond a reasonable doubt. While I am persuaded that more probably than not Internal Revenue Agent Flattery in this case did willfully act contrary to my order in certain specific respects, I have just that margin of uncertainty which constitutes a reasonable doubt. Therefore, I acquit him (as well, of course, as the defendants against whom no evidence was offered) of the charge made against him that he was in criminal contempt.

"(4) So far as concerns the aspect of this

case which involves civil contempt, the Court is in an anomalous position. No evidence whatsoever has been offered that the complaining party has sustained any damage which would appropriately give rise to a justified claim for economic compensation. Hence, there is wanting the foundation appropriate to allow a civil recovery. On that basis I dismiss the petition with respect to civil contempt as well as with respect to criminal contempt." (240 F. Supp. 167, 170, 171 (D. Mass. 1965))

The IRS attempt to convey the impression that on April 13, 1965, Judge Wyzanski exonerated it of any wrongdoing or unethical conduct should be considered in light of this comment which appears in the same written decision to which IRS refers:

"More than once the judges of a court have been indirectly reminded that they personally are taxpayers. No sophisticated person is unaware that even in this very Commonwealth the Internal Revenue Service has been in possession of facts with respect to public officials which it has presented or shelved in order to serve what can only be called political ends, be they high or low. And a judge who knows the score is aware that every time his decisions offend the Internal Revenue Service, he is inviting a close inspection of his own returns. But I suppose no one familiar with this Court believes that intimidation, direct or indirect, is effective."

(Italics supplied)

The decision of Judge Wyzanski on November 19, 1963, the Court of Appeals (for the First Circuit) ruling upholding his decision, the decision by Judge Wyzanski on April 13, 1965, the admissions made by the government in two separate written briefs to the Court of Appeals, and the sworn admissions by IRS agents themselves clearly established the accuracy of everything the Reader's Digest said regarding Mr. O'Donnell.

The IRS response continued:

"IRS correctly reports:

"On January 5, 1966, Federal District Judge A. J. Julian found Mr. O'Donnell in civil contempt of court. On July 11, 1966, Circuit Court Judge Coffin sustained the civil contempt finding on grounds that Mr. O'Donnell had obstructed a tax investigation. IRS further states:

"Mr. O'Donnell's tax client, convicted on April 7, 1967, of tax evasion of \$40,425, was sentenced to a five-year jail term and fined \$30,000. The records, legitimately obtained on April 18, 1962, from Mr. Donald R. Lord (see case above) by IRS agents, were taken from IRS by Mr. O'Donnell in defiance of a court order."

What happened:

Here again, IRS repeats its false statement that the records seized from Mr. Lord were "legitimately obtained on April 18, 1962." Again it is necessary to emphasize that the Federal District Court and the Court of Appeals expressly ruled that the seizure of the records from Mr. Lord was completely unlawful, and ordered them returned. It is also necessary to emphasize again that the government in written briefs twice admitted that these records were illegally obtained in April 1962.

Here is what actually happened. Subsequent to any event described by the Digest, the court ruled that IRS was entitled to examine the records provided it requested them in accordance with lawful procedures. Accordingly, Mr. O'Donnell delivered the records to IRS. However, after IRS made known its intention to photograph the records, Mr. O'Donnell removed them, contending that the court had not authorized IRS to copy them. The court then ruled that removal of the records by Mr. O'Donnell constituted civil contempt of the order granting IRS access to them.

However, in this case "civil contempt" constituted a technical violation for which no penalty was imposed against Mr. O'Donnell,

as IRS neglects to point out. Mr. O'Donnell's personal and professional reputation as a distinguished New England attorney remains undiminished. This is evidenced by the fact that after the civil contempt finding, the federal court in Boston appointed him to represent a conscientious objector in an important case which raises fundamental legal issues. And over the years Massachusetts courts have appointed Mr. O'Donnell to represent indigent defendants accused of capital crimes. Such appointments are reserved for attorneys possessing impeccable professional reputations.

IRS knows that the civil contempt finding has nothing to do whatsoever with anything mentioned in the article. In raising this issue, it is merely continuing a dispute it has waged against Mr. O'Donnell for more than four years. Court records* show that in addition to the two tax returns legitimately examined, IRS requisitioned many other of O'Donnell's returns and minutely scrutinized them for the least error. They show that IRS went out of its way to tell his fellow members of the bar that he was under criminal income tax investigation. They show that IRS attempted to lure Mr. O'Donnell and a client into a conference room which had been clandestinely bugged so as to record his conversations without his knowledge. Despite all its efforts, IRS never has found any grounds to accuse Mr. O'Donnell of owing one cent in back taxes.

The IRS response continued:

Finally, IRS says of the O'Donnell case:

"The Reader's Digest said Mr. O'Donnell proved 'with testimony of one agent who resigned in disgust' illegal use by IRS of the tax records.

"Regarding this testimony by the ex-agent, Federal Judge Andrew Caffrey on April 7, 1967, said:

"Former revenue agent Donald Young left his employment at IRS to take the position at the dog track because his superiors denied him a promotion to which he felt he was entitled.

"On direct examination Mr. Young testified glibly as to minute details of conduct that occurred approximately five years prior to the date he testified. . . . On cross-examination his manner was markedly different, and even more different when queried by the Court at the conclusion of redirect and re-cross-examination."

What happened:

The Reader's Digest actually said:

"Yet, as O'Donnell subsequently proved with testimony of one agent who resigned in disgust, IRS made copies of these records and continued to use them—in arrogant contempt of the court order."

As previously stated, the Federal District Court on April 13, 1965, declared that IRS "in willful defiance" of the court order had continued to use the records in question. On this basis the Digest characterized IRS conduct as "arrogant contempt." Irrespective of the testimony of the former agent, Mr. Young, the finding of the court simply is not in dispute.

However, had IRS wished to be fair to its former employe, Mr. Young, it would have included in its press release the conclusions of Judge Wyzanski concerning him. Judge Wyzanski is the chief federal district judge in Massachusetts and a jurist with a national reputation. In his ruling of April 13, 1965, Judge Wyzanski wrote:

" . . . The record before me does not reveal whether Young left the Service voluntarily. However, there is no indication that anything could have been said against his character or his governmental service. While he was on the stand, though government counsel had adequate opportunity to examine

*No. 6699, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, O'Donnell v. Sullivan, Record Appendix to Brief for Appellant.

him, no question was put in which he was subjected to the slightest reproach. . . .

"I believe what Young said, and therefore find it more probable than not that on at least the following specific matters agents of the Internal Revenue Service disobeyed the order of this Court. . . ."

THE CASE OF WEBB & KNAPP

The Reader's Digest said:

"And now, consider undisputed evidence which Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (R., Del.) has unveiled on the floor of the Senate. It shows that while mercilessly trying to take the last cent of some taxpayers, IRS has treated others quite differently.

"Over a period of seven years, IRS allowed the New York-based real estate firm of Webb & Knapp to pile up tax debts of more than \$27 million, while the Federal Housing Administration lavished on it \$67 million in government-insured loans. Upshot? Webb & Knapp defaulted on the loans, and IRS in December 1965 wrote off a whopping \$26 million as 'uncollectible.'"

The IRS response:

"IRS wrote off as uncollectible almost \$26 million. This is an administrative action which means that there are no assets or prospects of assets from which to collect. The tax liability is not discharged by the 'write-off.'"

What happened:

IRS professes that the whole issue is quite complicated, but does not dispute one single word that the Digest said.

THE CASE OF STAVROS NIARCHOS

The Reader's Digest said:

"Similarly, IRS last year simply wrote off as 'uncollectible' a tax bill of more than \$23 million owed by six American shipping companies controlled by Greek magnate Stavros Niarchos."

The IRS response:

"The Reader's Digest is as wrong about this situation as it was about Webb & Knapp, and furthermore nothing could be more dissimilar than the two situations.

"Mr. Niarchos owned or controlled six American corporations, which owed about \$17 million in federal taxes plus interest. . . . These taxes are not written off as uncollectible.

"The government was unable to collect these taxes. Faced with an imminent expiration of the statute of limitations for collection, IRS in 1962 went to court to get a judgment against the corporations for \$17 million plus interest. As a result of this action, the court in April 1966 granted judgments totaling \$25 million. To date the government has received \$1,501,022.27 in return for not seizing assets worth far less than this.

"Thus, the six corporations admittedly still owe the government some \$23 million. This debt is outstanding, and the government may seize any corporate assets discovered in the U.S. in the future."

What happened:

In reporting that IRS had written off the bulk of the tax bill owned by Niarchos' six corporations, the Digest simply relied on IRS' own written statement.

Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware on October 18, 1966, read on the floor of the Senate excerpts from a letter sent to him October 4, 1966, by Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue William H. Smith. The letter, excerpts of which are reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 20, page 27332, states:

"These assessments, which the Internal Revenue Service had been unable to collect and most of which have therefore been written off as uncollectible, consisted primarily of corporation income taxes. . . ." (Italics supplied)

IRS did not dispute anything Sen. Williams said until after publication of the Digest article. Then it reversed its written statement

and claimed the taxes had not been written off as uncollectible.

THE CASE OF LAWRENCE L. CALLANAN

The Reader's Digest said:

"As Senator Williams notes, still harder to explain is the treatment of people like Lawrence L. Callanan. An official of the Steamfitters Local No. 562 in St. Louis, Callanan was convicted in 1954 of extortion, received a 12-year sentence. He was paroled in 1960, and in April 1964 President Johnson commuted his sentence, thereby enabling him to become a union leader again. The same month, IRS settled his unpaid tax debt of \$40,219.84 for a token \$17,000 plus an agreement that he would pay more if his income rose. 'No prospect of any material increase (in income),' said IRS. A few months later, Callanan's union lieutenant, John L. Lawler, handed over \$25,000 to 'Friends of L.B.J.' Next Callanan, supposedly without money for his taxes, kicked in \$2000 to the Democratic National Committee. Then he emerged as director of the lush 'voluntary' political funds of Local No. 652, his salary reported at \$15,000 and \$20,000."

The IRS response:

"Contrary to the article's statement of a total payment of \$17,000, Mr. Callanan, in accordance with the collateral agreement, paid \$3,586.14 on May 18, 1966, and on October 25, 1966, paid the final balance of \$10,138.09 in taxes and penalties and \$11,874.36 in interest to the date of payment.

"Instead of settling his tax debt for \$17,000 as the Reader's Digest said, he was required to pay the full \$40,219.84 plus \$2,437.40 in additional interest."

What happened:

The Digest of course did mention the arrangement which IRS describes as a "collateral agreement," and the Digest of course did not state, as IRS incorrectly alleges, that Callanan's entire tax bill was settled for "a total payment of \$17,000."

There are two significant points about the Callanan case. The first is that IRS, which annually seizes the bank deposits and property of thousands of ordinary taxpayers, would accord such gentle treatment to Callanan. In sentencing Callanan to prison, Federal Judge Ruby Hulien said of him:

"The evidence of merciless use and betrayal of people who labor for their livelihood, and were members of unions supposed to be represented by these defendants, is shocking. . . . Unless I had heard the facts under oath, I would not have believed them. . . . (Callanan) hasn't shown one bit of remorse. Indifference to the welfare of union workmen is glaring. . . . Callanan took from the funds of the union, of which he is an officer, funds to pay for his defense. . . . Callanan was the brains of the racketeering conspiracy."

The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* on October 2, 1965, reported that in 1964:

"The Internal Revenue Service granted him (Callanan) a favorable settlement of his \$40,000 tax debt from the kickback period.

"Because of his allegedly modest finances, he was permitted to pay \$17,000 cash and a percentage of anything he earned above \$7,500 a year for ten years. The IRS summary of the case noted he was then earning \$150 a week as a steamfitter and added a doleful note:

"There are not prospects of any material increase in his income."

Yet Callanan, who according to IRS was earning \$150 a week, was able to save enough to make big political contributions. And even after he made these contributions and thereby provided clear evidence that he had access to money from some other source, IRS at first did nothing to collect back taxes from him.

The second significant point is that IRS now reveals new facts which are more dam-

aging still. They show that IRS did not collect one extra cent from Callanan until well after the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* in October 1965, then Senator Williams on January 19, 1966, exposed what IRS had done. IRS acted only after Senator Williams took the floor of the Senate to demand a Justice Department investigation. *IRS, by its own statement, let more than two years—from April 1964 until May 1966—pass without bothering to collect a single additional penny from this politically influential extortionist.*

THE CASE OF POLICEMAN CAMPBELL

The Reader's Digest said:

"In Kansas City, Mo., policeman Paul R. Campbell halted a speeding car driven by an IRS agent. 'We'll just have to check your taxes,' the agent was quoted as saying, after other arguments failed to stop the officer from writing a ticket. Sure enough, soon after Campbell filed his next tax return, IRS ordered him to report for an examination which lasted two hours. Unable to find anything wrong, it nevertheless pestered him for another four months with phone calls, letters and more interrogations before admitting he owed nothing."

The IRS response:

"The IRS is unable to identify the employee allegedly charged with a traffic violation. However, an investigation shows that Mr. Campbell's 1960 income tax return was selected for audit by normal selection procedures.

"Mr. Campbell was asked on May 8, 1961, for a form which was required to complete his 1960 return. He was also contacted on February 1, 1962, as a result of comparison of data on his return with information documents required by law to be furnished the IRS. This comparison led to the return's assignment for examination in May 1962.

"Mr. Campbell was requested to bring his records in for examination on June 6, 1962. The return was found to be correct as filed and the taxpayer was so informed on June 20, 1962, two weeks later."

What happened:

Officer Campbell, who made the arrest in late fall of 1961, testified under oath before Senate investigators as follows:

"Q: What was your procedure upon observing this car speeding?

"Mr. Campbell: I checked the vehicle through a speed check and pursued it and stopped it and issued a summons.

"Q: Did you ask the driver to identify himself?

"Mr. Campbell: Yes, sir; I asked for his driver's license.

"Q: . . . Do you recall any of the conversations that took place between yourself and the operator of this vehicle after that?

"Mr. Campbell: Well, I asked the driver for his license and started writing a summons, and he identified himself as a member of the Internal Revenue Service. I issued the summons, and he said, 'Well, we'll have to check your taxes. . . . I said, 'I don't care. I have paid them.' Following this, shortly thereafter, I received a phone call to bring some information to the Tax Bureau. Then there was a second trip, by phone, and then a third time I got a letter for me to bring all my information on 1960 and 1961. It was just a matter of a few weeks after that that I received another letter that stated the taxes would stand as they were filed, no change."

Subsequently, officer Campbell was interviewed in detail regarding his experiences by the author of the Digest article. The Digest version of what happened is based upon officer Campbell's sworn testimony and this interview. The accuracy of the Digest account was independently checked with officer Campbell by the Digest Research Department. Further investigation by the Digest confirmed that officer Campbell is a decorated policeman and a respected member of his community.

In addition to its "summaries of cases," the 29-page IRS attack on the Reader's Digest article contains ten pages of commentary. Much of this commentary consists of assertions and generalizations flattering to IRS. However, the following should be pointed out:

The Reader's Digest said:

"The ensuing Senate hearings produced astounding testimony disclosing that: IRS has defied court orders, criminally picked locks, stolen records and threatened reputable people. It has illegally tapped telephones, seized, opened and read personal letters while spying on the private mail of tens of thousands of citizens. It has illegally bugged phone booths and hidden microphones where taxpayers talk with their lawyers."

The IRS response:

"Wiretaps, bugs, spying equipment, lock-picking devices were used."—The article does not say that Congress is considering a dozen bills on the subject of electronic surveillance because the law is unclear. Nor does the article point out that in over 300,000 criminal investigations over eight years, there were only 94 wiretaps, 32 bugs and 29 phone booth bugs—all in connection with investigation of racketeers, gamblers, moonshiners and other criminal evaders."

The New York Times of July 13, 1967, reported: "The Internal Revenue Service acknowledges today that during the eight years from July 1958 to July 1966, its agents made 'improper' or 'questionable' use of electronic eavesdropping devices on 287 occasions."

"In addition, there were 723 uses of 'pen registers' (which record the telephone numbers dialed but not the conversations). Mr. Cohen declined to say how many of these installations were 'illegal' as distinguished from 'improper' or 'questionable,' because of what he called 'the presently unsettled posture of the law.'"

Thus, during the eight years in question there were 1010 instances of "questionable" or "improper" use of snooping equipment as opposed to the 155 that IRS reports in its press release. IRS was first asked for this information in September 1964.

In this particular response, IRS again makes up a quotation. The article nowhere contains the sentence "Wiretaps, bugs, spying equipment, lockpicking devices were used." This is relatively unimportant except insofar as it provides another illustration of the IRS tendency to be unhampered by the printed record.

What does seem significant is that IRS does not deny the explicit charges that it has defied court orders, criminally picked locks, stolen records, threatened reputable people, seized, opened and read personal letters and used hidden microphones where taxpayers talked with their lawyers.

The Reader's Digest said:

"Moreover, such lawlessness has been encouraged from high levels of IRS. Its Washington headquarters has bought elaborate spying equipment for use about the country. IRS sent many agents to an official Treasury School near the White House to learn how to commit such illegal acts as wiretapping and lockpicking."

The IRS response:

"Quite the contrary, all questionable use of electronic devices was stopped in July 1965 as soon as it became known to top managers of the IRS."

IRS does not deny that prior to July 1965 it bought and shipped expensive eavesdropping equipment around the country for use by agents. IRS does not deny that it regularly took many agents away from their regular duties and brought them to Washington where they were trained in eavesdropping and lockpicking. It seems baffling that all this could have been done without the knowledge and assent of "top managers" of IRS, and it also seems that the undenied actions of IRS headquarters in Washington consti-

tuted encouragement to eavesdrop and pick locks. Moreover, the official IRS manual long in use specifically declared that "electronic devices as well as all other technical investigative aids shall be used."

No less a "top manager" than Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen himself was aware that his organization as a matter of policy was intercepting the personal mail of private citizens until Congress made it stop. Rep. Durward G. Hall (R., Mo.) quotes Cohen as writing about the seizure of one citizen's mail thus:

"He refused to cooperate with the district director, and, as a last resort, his mail was seized. This action persuaded the taxpayer to come forward with full payment of his outstanding tax liability."

The Internal Revenue Service says that "In several cases the article makes the point that suspected tax evaders were found not guilty, implying they should not have been brought to trial."

This statement is simply untrue, as anyone may verify for himself merely by reading the article. Of all the people mentioned in the article, only one, Kenneth R. Layne, ever was charged with and brought to trial for tax evasion. It happens that he was found innocent. But nowhere does the article imply that people against whom there is legitimate and persuasive evidence should not be brought to trial.

On the contrary, the article at its very outset declares: "In fairness to the great majority of honest Americans, we must encourage the Internal Revenue Service to use every honorable means to collect what is owed the government."

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

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I rise solely to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH], now in the well of the House, for his statements and in bringing this information before the House today.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for his general service, his belief in and observations upon public trust and, particularly, for his service on the Committee on Armed Services during this year.

It is certainly important at this time that matters like this be called to the attention of the House, because we have been charged with repeated attempts at "whitewash" insofar as any reasonable effort by a committee of the Congress to secure all the facts surrounding the Reader's Digest article on the Internal Revenue Service, or any other department or agency of the Government, is concerned.

I, too, have received a myriad of letters asking if, in effect, such a condition could and, in fact, does exist in these United States, because our people are trained to believe in the highest echelons of the Government.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] knows, I made disclosure here almost 3 years ago on the floor of the House, in the same well, that the Internal Revenue Service was seizing an opening or had placed a levy, through cooperation of other departments, on first-class mail, violation of every known existing law, without benefit of search warrant or other due process of law.

I might point out further to the gentleman that under the Legislative Reorganization Act, now stymied by the House leadership, minority members of any committee would have a right to call their own witnesses in an investigation such as the one referred to in this instance. If that bill could be pried loose, the Appropriations Subcommittee might well have entertained or at least listened to the Reader's Digest documentation of the original article. I notice that there have been no libel suits filed and I predict there will be none.

It is most unfortunate that the "other side of the coin" was not heard and that a committee of the Congress has conducted an investigation which subsequent events suggest was not an investigation at all, but a self-serving "whitewash."

There is another side to this story. I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for calling it to the attention of this House and through it to the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. As in the gentleman's normal manner, his forthrightness comes forward on this issue of today in a very effective way.

I appreciate very much the service of the gentleman here while I have been in the Congress, and along the line of our mutual desires that the taxpayers receive true representation and fair treatment, and in recognition of the fact that the IRS has a difficult job to do, that both sides will have a hearing before the committee and that they will be reconvened at the proper time.

THE MOB

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine has performed an outstanding service to the Nation by exposing—in the September 1 issue—the brazen empire of organized crime.

Coming on the heels of the report of the Republican task force on crime which criticized the Attorney General for a full-scale retreat in the war on crime, and also on the heels of the Republican leadership's charge that the war against crime is being lost, this article should be must reading for every American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, most alarming is Life's charge that "the mob"—"mob" in quotation marks—through the mechanism of the "fix," can and often does "control Congressmen, State officials, and law-enforcement men."

If this is true, and the Life article clearly establishes a reasonable basis for the charge, and I understand there are

more than one, then a full-scale investigation by specifically and specially selected Members of the Congress is called for.

Many years ago the McClellan committee in the Senate drew nationwide praise for its exposure of an organized crime syndicate in the United States.

Perhaps—just perhaps—we should now seriously consider including registration of “the mob” under the Subversive Activities Control Act.

Recently in hearings it has been recommended that we include those who cross State lines for the purpose of inciting riot, insurrection, and anarchy under the Subversive Activities Control Act. Why not “the mob”?

The shocking impact of the Life article is the fact that this public exposure has not lessened the grip of organized crime and that in fact it seems to grow stronger.

Obviously, in these days of national strife, turmoil—of a no-win war in Vietnam and a no-win war against crime, and indeed a no-win war against Communist aggression—organized crime has to grow stronger. But is this America?

It should be obvious to one who reads the article, that much of the information is based on electronic surveillance by dedicated agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Yet the Attorney General of the United States has all but eliminated and has all but wiped out this means of crime detection by his “order”—by a regulatory fiat—an implementing regulation—by his order of last June making it almost mandatory that he personally approve—he of all people—personally approve any use of electronic detection devices.

Thus, the highest law-enforcement official in the land has, in effect, taken away one of the most important weapons in the war against crime, which obviously is another of the administration’s no-win wars.

Mr. Speaker, the message and the warning in this Life series is clear. If new laws are needed to break up “the mob” then let the President advise the Congress what new laws are necessary. I can only hope that he will not send the current Attorney General up here to tell us that what is needed are more poverty funds, more public housing, more rent supplements and more of the other “tired bromides” of the Great Society.

If the existing laws are sufficient to break up this menace to our society, then the present Attorney General of the United States ought to be retired and replaced with a crime fighter instead of a powder puff; perhaps even replaced by his father, in a last ditch effort to gain support for the constabulary by the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, Life Reporter Sandy Smith has surely qualified for a Pulitzer Prize award for a story which obviously required months of nationwide research and probably even personal danger.

The American people are ready to make the correction. The question now is, What is this Congress, this judiciary, and this administration going to do about it, now that the facts have been

laid out on the table, the names named and the enemy within located?

I have asked and gained unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD. My colleagues would surely agree that this article makes “The Untouchables” seem like a kiddie cartoon show by comparison.

The article is as follows:

THE MOB

(By Sandy Smith)

Call it the Mob. The name fits, although any of a half-dozen others—the Outfit, the Syndicate, La Cosa Nostra, the Mafia—serves about as well. Whatever it’s called, it exists, and the fact of its existence is a national disgrace. In this issue and the next, LIFE reveals the structure, tactics, ruthlessness and alarming strength of this brazen empire.

The Mob is a fraternity of thugs, but it holds such power, wealth and influence that in one way or another it poisons us all. It rigs elections and in so doing destroys the democratic process. More and more it is muscling into legitimate business—local, national and international—to the extent that nearly every American is paying into its treasury in countless unsuspected ways.

The 5,000 members of Cosa Nostra are all of Italian background, and most of them are Sicilians. Abetting them is a larger army of nonmembers—of many creeds and origins—who wittingly or unwittingly do the Mob’s bidding. The scale and sophistication of its operations challenge the imagination: the President’s Crime Commission estimates the Mob’s annual profit from illegal gambling alone at \$6 to \$7 billion. “Loan sharking,” narcotics, labor racketeering, “skimming” and all the varieties of extortion in which it deals bring in enormous additional sums wrenched out of the poor and those least able to resist the exploiters. Through the mechanism of “the fix,” it can, and too often does, control congressmen, state officials and law enforcement men. The Mob is in fact a government of its own, with its own laws, enforced with torture and murder. It is organized with ruthless efficiency to achieve its ends and protect its members from prosecution. At the top is a ruling body which settles internal disputes and preserves discipline. Beneath this supreme council are the officers and troops, the men who do the corrupting, bribing, extorting, terrorizing, robbing and killing.

The crime syndicate of today came into being with Prohibition and has continued to thrive and grow despite sporadic bursts of public concern. One of the principal reasons for this is that existing legal machinery is simply unable to cope with it. Criminal laws deal with individual crimes, not an international association. The Mob’s multitiered hierarchy insulates its leaders from direct participation in the crimes they order. To the continuing despair of police agencies, it has also benefited vastly from recent court decisions limiting the admissibility of evidence. Most of all, the Mob has fattened itself on the public’s appetite for its services—dope, sex and gambling—and apathy toward its evil.

MACABRE HOME OF A “CAPO,” MONUMENT TO MOB MURDER

From the gateposts, topped by menacing bronze swans with wings angrily outspread, the driveway leads up about two blocks to the great stone mansion near Livingston, N.J. The drive is overhung by trees and flanked with flowers in gargoyle-shaped pots. The style might be called Transylvania traditional, with overtones of the owner’s native Sicily. At a jog in the road is a cluster of painted family statues dominated by one of the squire himself, Ruggiero Bolardo, astride a horse.

It is a chilling place even in the warmth

and sun of an August morning. A lot of Mr. Bolardo’s fellow gangsters are mortally afraid of going up that driveway alone. Some who did never returned.

As mobsters go, Ruggiero Bolardo—or Richie the Boot, as he is called—is not a very big shot. Nonetheless, he is a significant figure in organized U.S. crime and his estate, literally, is one of its monuments. Bolardo is a capo (captain) in the 600-member Cosa Nostra Family of Vito Genovese. Now a stoop-shouldered man of 76, he patters in his flower beds and mutters imprecations against the world in general: “They call Bolardo a thief, a killer,” he complained to one recent caller. “They call him Cosa Nostra. Trouble.”

Two other New Jersey gangsters, Angelo “The Gyp” DeCarlo and Anthony Russo, once babbled like schoolboys about the foul deeds that have been committed beyond those colorful gates. As an informant was to relate, the conversation went like this:

“Stay away from there!” said Russo. “So many guys have been hit there. There’s this furnace” way up in back. That’s where they burned ‘em.”

DeCarlo, fascinated, asked for details. Russo cheerily ticked off victims by their first names: “Oliver . . . Willie . . . Little Harold . . . Tony . . .” He himself, Russo bragged, had carried Little Harold to the furnace by a chain tied to the dead man’s throat.

Authorities are convinced Russo was not exaggerating. Certainly, the number of victims incinerated at Bolardo’s estate exceeds the number buried on the much-publicized chicken farm near Lakewood, N.J., where remains of two bodies and traces of a third were found last March. But no corpses have ever come to light at Bolardo’s; people thought to have died there are listed officially as Missing Persons.

Even the big shots of Cosa Nostra, approach Bolardo’s notorious estate with respect. In November 1957, when the high council met there to whack up the territory of the late Albert Anastasia, they came and left all in a group—thus avoiding the path described by Russo, “way up in back.”

Richie Bolardo—and the two fellow mobsters who discussed the crematorium as casually as two men might compare golf scores—are alive and free men at this writing. They conduct various legal and illegal enterprises in New Jersey and are notably prosperous.

Deep in the rackets since Prohibition days, with a reputation for unabashed savagery, Bolardo gets paid \$4,000 a month out of the Mob’s Las Vegas “skimming” profits. He also runs a legitimate wrecking business (much of the nonfamily statuary on his estate was salvaged from buildings he wrecked; his house is built of stones from the old Newark post office). He presently is awaiting trial on a gambling charge and simultaneously is dueling with Internal Revenue.

Russo, 48, is the gambling and rackets boss of Monmouth County, N.J. and also has interests in Florida. Gyp DeCarlo, 65, an obese character who detests his nickname, like Bolardo is a capo in the Genovese Family. He grows fat off gambling and loan-shark rackets in Union County, N.J. and operates crap games that float from borough to borough in New Jersey.

Like countless others in the rackets, Bolardo, Russo and DeCarlo are virtually laws unto themselves, answerable only to the invisible government to which they owe their sole allegiance—Cosa Nostra.

HOW JOE BONANNO SCHEMED TO KILL—AND LOST

If Cosa Nostra has a failing at all from the standpoint of efficiency, it is the fact that it is composed at all levels of total scoundrels. Loyalty, as most men understand it, simply does not exist. Though elaborate oaths are required for membership in most cities, the members hang together mainly

for the enormous profit this makes possible, and also out of fear of the consequences if they do otherwise. Consider, for example, the case of Joseph "Joe Bananas" Bonanno, the New York mobster whose greed almost broke up the Syndicate.

The Mob's ruling council was organized in 1931 by Lucky Luciano and Al Capone, and Bonanno, then a mean, ambitious 26-year-old, was given charter membership as the representative of a Brooklyn gang. It was not until 1963 that the name Cosa Nostra became part of the American idiom. That was the year Joe Valachi, a small-time killer for the Mob, decided to spill the brotherhood's secrets to federal agents and then, on network television, to a congressional committee. As Valachi detailed it—and as some lawmen were already aware—each of the "Commissioners" serving on the ruling council is the head of a subdivision called a "Family" which more or less has free rein over the rackets in its own territory. Any disputes over territorial jurisdictions are settled by the Commission.

At present, there are eight Commissioners on the ruling council: Vito Genovese of New York and New Jersey, now in the federal penitentiary at Leavenworth; Carlo Gambino of New York; Steve Magaddino of Buffalo; Joe Colombo of New York; Joe Zerilli of Detroit; Momo Salvatore "Sam" Giancana of Chicago; Angelo Bruno of Philadelphia—and the aforementioned Joe Bonanno. (There was a ninth member, Thomas "Three-Finger Brown" Luchese, who died—of natural causes—in July; the vacancy is still up for grabs.)

Collectively, they are not a physically imposing lot, nor even frightening. Five of them are over 60. Magaddino, at 75, is widely spoken of—though never to his face—as a senile and autocratic windbag. Giancana is 59. Bruno, a tubby hypochondriac to whom the greeting "How are you?" is an invitation to deliver an organ recital, is 57. Even Colombo, at 43, doesn't stack up as much of a headbreaker. Yet the thing to remember is that they got where they are—and have managed to stay there—by killing people.

The troublemaker in the executive club was Joe Bonanno, a fact that stemmed from his aggressive and inventive nature. A lot of his innovations worked out very well—for instance, the "split-level coffin." As the Boiardo incinerator disclosure points out, disposal of the bodies of victims has always been a problem taxing the mobsters' ingenuity. Bonanno solved it in Brooklyn by acquiring a funeral home. To get rid of unwanted corpses he had them stuffed into the lower compartment of a specially built casket of his own design. The corpse of record lay in the upper compartment, with family and cemetery keepers none the wiser. When such a tandem burial was to be held, Bonanno supplied muscular pallbearers who could carry the extra weight without strain. Bonanno's victims in the lower berths were put underground before police even became aware they were missing.

By 1963, at the age of 58, Bonanno had lost none of his ambition and had developed a vast disdain for his fellow Commissioners—some of whom had been mere car thieves when he was already on the council. He habitually staked out for himself areas deemed "open" by the Commission—such as the U.S. Southwest and Canada. "He's planting flags all over the world!" fumed Commissioner Magaddino when Bonanno muscled into Magaddino's Canadian preserves.

The greedy Bonanno was doing more than planting flags. Seeing a chance to seize control of the brotherhood, he issued contracts for the murders of three fellow Commissioners—Magaddino, Luchese and Gambino—and another contract for slaying of the head of a Family in California, Frank DeSimone. Bonanno assigned the New York murders to one Joe Magliocco, a fat hood-

lum with high blood pressure. Magliocco in turn farmed the New York murder contracts out to an ambitious young torpedo named Joe Colombo.

Colombo turned out to be more of an angler than a triggerman. He tipped off the Commission to Bonanno's planned coup, and they hurriedly convened a meeting to deal with the treachery. Magliocco and Bonanno were summoned to face charges. Magliocco appeared in a panic, made a full confession, was banished from Cosa Nostra, fined \$50,000 and sent home. Shortly thereafter he died of a heart attack. Meanwhile, his Family and his Commission seat were given to the stool pigeon Colombo.

Joe Bonanno never showed up for trial. He hid out on the West Coast, using the name "J. Santone." Then, in 1964, he went to Canada to poach once more on Magaddino's grounds. Magaddino went into a frenzy, calling a Commission meeting for Sept. 18, 1964, in the Englewood Cliffs, N.J. home of gangster Thomas Ebohi. Bonanno ignored that meeting, too, despite the entreaties of the Commission's emissary Sam DeCavalante, whose biggest previous distinction had been in trying to develop a garbage disposal unit that would reduce a human body to a meatball. In the face of Bonanno's insults, the council accepted the advice of its Chicago Commissioner, Momo Giancana: "Kill—kill! Why don't you just kill the guy?"

On Oct. 14, Magaddino met in Buffalo with two men. An informant has recalled bits of the conversation: "New York . . . the lawyer . . . we got the car."

Seven nights later, Bonanno and four lawyers dined in a New York steak house. A sixth man joined them about 11 p.m. He left the table twice, walking out in a rainstorm to use a corner phone.

Shortly after midnight, Bonanno's party left the restaurant in taxis. The sixth man, who took a separate taxi, got out at 37th Street and Park Avenue and beckoned to two men standing on the corner. A few minutes later, Bonanno arrived at an apartment house a block away. The two men stepped up and forced Bonanno into a car at gunpoint. Though there has been all sorts of speculation about the kidnaping—including a theory that Bonanno staged the whole thing to avoid an appearance before a grand jury—the fact is that he was held for about six weeks somewhere in the Catskills. There he talked his captors out of killing him by raising the specter of a nationwide gang war if they knocked him off. But if they let him go, he promised to turn over his gang and his rackets in gratitude. Apparently the Commissioners' lust for loot exceeded their lust for vengeance, for they turned him loose in December 1964.

Bonanno was only fooling. He went to Haiti to bide his time, then returned to New York last year to rally his gang, claim his place on the Commission and continue his invasion of Canada. Magaddino still howls about it, but the other Commissioners, perhaps afraid of the guns in Bonanno's Family, seem intent on trying to ignore him, hoping he'll go away, or something.

YOUR LAND IS HOODLAND

The disturbing fact is that the Mob today is spread across the land and has been able to insinuate itself into the core of society. Most Americans are just not aware of the extent of its influence.

Cosa Nostra is a cartel of 24 semi-independent Families that vary widely in size (from 20 to 1,000 members) and their importance in the rackets. Each Family unit is headed by a Boss and several of these Bosses—the current number is eight—sit on Cosa Nostra's ruling Commission. The other Family heads (shown flanking the map) are not necessarily less powerful than individual Commissioners—Raymond Patriarca in New England and Carlos Marcello in Louisiana, for example, are more powerful than some

who sit on the ruling body. But they generally follow the Commission's edicts.

Second in command in each Family is the Underboss. Beneath him are squads known as *regimes*, each headed by a *capo* (captain) and staffed by younger or less accomplished thugs known as *soldati* (soldiers). When a member grows old or infirm he may become a *consigliere*, sort of a mobster emeritus who serves only as an adviser to the Boss. The Boss passes orders down the chain of command—a system designed to screen the top man from the police. The Boss has tremendous authority in his own territory, presiding over all gangland enterprises—he is a partner in everything—and also umpiring intra-gang frictions, as New England Boss Patriarca is shown doing in the Boston gang war in the map at left. The membership rolls of Cosa Nostra supposedly have been closed since 1957—an attempt by the Commission to prevent a recruiting race that might upset the delicate balance of power within the fraternity. Nevertheless, some Families continue to add new members when an old one dies and, despite the decrepitude of the present Commissioners, there is no shortage of ambitious younger talent waiting to take over.

In the old days, a recruit had to take part in at least one murder before he was accepted. But during the World War II manpower shortage, standards slipped and later, as murder became a less popular tactic, many gangsters were let in who never had made a fatal score. This irks some oldtimers. As one graying hood complained, "Today you got a thousand guys in here that never broke an egg."

THE BRAZEN ATTEMPT TO SPRING HOFFA WITH A \$1 MILLION BRIBE: A CASE OF "THE FIX"

At the heart of every successful gangster's operation is the Fix—the working arrangement with key police and elected officials and business and union executives. It guarantees the racketeers room to swing and a certain amount of acceptance in "respectable" circles. For sheer audacity and sweep, few Fixes the Mob has ever undertaken could top a plot just now unfolding in New Orleans, where the Cosa Nostra is ruled over by Carlos Marcello. Its hoped-for objective is liberty for James Hoffa, the imprisoned boss of the Teamsters Union.

LIFE has found conclusive evidence that Hoffa's pals—some in the union, some in the Mob, some in both—dropped \$2 million into a spring-Hoffa fund late last year. The money was placed at the disposal of Cosa Nostra mobsters, and it was to be payable to anyone who could wreck the government's jury-tampering case on which Hoffa had been convicted.

In due course, the money was made available to Marcello to do the job. The chief government witness in the trial, which took place in 1964 in Chattanooga, had been Edward Grady Partin, leader of a Teamster local in Baton Rouge, La. As the Mob saw it, Partin was a logical target for a Fix. If he could be persuaded somehow to recant his own testimony, or to "taint" it by claiming that wiretaps had been used against Hoffa, the conviction would surely be reversed. By last January, the Mob might have assumed that Partin already had been softened up. A series of dynamite explosions had wrecked construction sites, trucks and oil-drilling rigs of companies whose employees were members of Partin's union. Partin got the message all right, but ignored it.

Then another ploy was made to Partin. It was arranged by Aubrey Young, 45, who for years had been an aide and confidant of Louisiana Governor John J. McKeithen.

Though the governor did not know it, Young had some curious contacts outside of the executive suite. One of these was Marcello, about whose empire you will read more in next week's instalment.

In January, Young set up a meeting with Partin at the request of still another man

of influence in Louisiana politics, a sometime public relations specialist and all-around operator named D'Alton Smith.

Members of Smith's family are well-placed in Louisiana. His brother, A. D. Smith, is a member of the state board of education. His sister, Mrs. Frances Pecora, is an official of the state insurance commission. Mrs. Pecora is also the wife of Nofio Pecora, former operator of the Marcello-owned Town and Country Motel in New Orleans.

The meeting with Partin took place at Young's house in Baton Rouge. Smith was there when Partin arrived.

"D'Alton had told me he wanted to see if he could straighten out Partin's testimony to help Hoffa," Young has since told LIFE. "When I saw what they were talking about in the parlor, I took a walk because I didn't want any part of it. After the meeting, D'Alton told me that he couldn't budge Partin; that Partin said his testimony was true."

Partin confirmed to LIFE that this indeed was the subject of the conversation, and has added these details of the inducements he says were held out to him: The initial offer for the changing of his testimony was \$25,000 a year for 10 years. He turned it down. The ante was hiked until it reached an overall total of \$1 million. Still Partin refused. When Smith gave it up as a bad job and went away, Partin called the Justice Department.

A short time later, Young, who had been drinking heavily, sought sanctuary for three days in the Town and Country Motel, which is Marcello's rackets headquarters. Young has offered this explanation: "I go to the Town and Country because there's always lots of politicians there. I didn't see Carlos or talk to him. I know I didn't, because there was a state policeman with me all the time."

Meanwhile, in response to Partin's call, the Justice Department began an investigation into the bribery attempt. Young returned to the capitol at Baton Rouge. When the governor asked him to explain his absence, Young blurted out the story of the attempted bribery of Partin. Furious, McKeithen threatened to fire him. Young resigned.

As to what has happened to the \$2 million, Marcello, of course, isn't talking. And Hoffa remains in federal prison.

This is a fair example of the intricate forces involved in a particular sort of Fix. But a Fix doesn't have to entail an exchange of money. It can be accomplished by putting in fear, through means as unobtrusive as a crack over the head, an arm broken by twisting, an implied disclosure of family skeletons, a hoarse voice on the phone, a timely murder. It can be accomplished by campaign "contributions" or by outright bribes. It can be attained through employment of public relations counsels who stress things like the good name of a city or the amount of money donated to charity by Mob enterprises, or who plant in newspaper columns evidences of the charm, wit and good connections of key mobsters as they are seen about the spots where expensive people gather. It can be helped immeasurably with cheap devices like easy "loans" to a reporter whose tastes outrun his income.

A big-city mayor may have nothing but loathing for mobsters. Yet if disclosure of corruption in his city threatens the tenure of his political machine, he may make every effort to suppress the story—rationalizing that the city would be much worse off with the opposition in control. This is a solid dividend of the Fix. Ask any gangster.

THE FAT MAN WHO DIED ON A MEAT HOOK

The information and entertainment media, and ultimately the public themselves, play their part in all of this. Too often they take a scriptwriter's view of gangsters, viewing them as one would look at tenants of the great ape house at the zoo—with vague thrills of identity but with amused tolerance. When Frank Sinatra appears in public with Sam

Giancana, who is a killer and a crook, the tendency is to see Sinatra as a bigger swinger than ever—not just another entertainer who has some crummy friends.

Giancana is a pretty good exhibit when it comes to illustrating the manicuring of gorillas. Despite his absence from the country, his Fix in Chicago remains as tight and traditional as any you could find.

Giancana took over the 300-member Chicago Cosa Nostra Family—the Outfit, as it is called locally—in 1957, after it became apparent to him that the incumbent Boss, Tony Accardo, was getting too slow and too rich. Giancana's decision was brought home to Accardo by a bullet fired over his head as Tony was entering his spacious \$500,000 estate in suburban River Forest. He understood.

Sam Giancana is a frail, gnomelike man whose constant cigar smoking has deformed his upper lip into a permanent sneer. Back in World War II, when asked by the draft board what he did for a living, he replied, "I steal." He was adjudged a psychopath, and Sam figures it was a bad rap. "I was telling them the truth," he said. Before he was old enough to vote, he'd been arrested three times for murder. He likes the girls—for one he purchased a remounted 30-carat stolen diamond from a fence in New York—and has made international headlines as the recurrent escort of Singer Phyllis McGuire. He likes to play golf, and when FBI agents began bothering his game when they had him under surveillance in 1963, he went to federal court and got an order stipulating that the agents must stay two foursomes back.

Ultimately, the agents won that round. Giancana was called before a grand jury, granted immunity from prosecution stemming from anything he might say and, when he refused to answer questions, served a year in jail for contempt. Fearing another such sentence, he has stayed pretty much out of the country ever since. For a time, control of the Outfit fell to Giancana's lieutenants, but as federal prosecutions sent several of them to jail, family matters demanded a more experienced hand at the helm. One current theory is that Accardo has come out of retirement to resume active control.

The truth is that Giancana is still running things by remote control from a hideout in Mexico, a posh castle near Cuernavaca where he poses as Riccardo Scalzetti. The real Scalzetti, Giancana's erstwhile chauffeur and courier, is more familiar to Chicagoans as Richard Cain, a well-known former Chicago policeman and more recently a private investigator.

In Chicago, where racketeering was perfected, the connection between the Mob and the politicians remains extensive and arrogant. From an office across from City Hall, there are men ready to carry out Giancana's wishes and attend to the clockwork of the Fix.

It is a matter of particular pride to Giancana and his boys that they are firmly in control of both the Democratic and the Republican political organizations in Chicago's famous First Ward, which includes the Loop with its glittering commerce and the West Side campus of the University of Illinois as well as a warren of flophouses, honky-tonks, pool halls, pawnshops and slums. It also enfolds City Hall, the Cook County courthouse, police headquarters, the federal courthouse, the Chicago Stock Exchange, the Board of Trade, most of the major office buildings, the largest hotels and the terminals or major railroads. The Democratic organizations of two other West Side wards—the 28th and the 29th—are also nominally chattels of the Mob. But the real gangster operative power, for obvious reasons, is in the First.

The First Ward Republican apparatus is a joke. Giancana's men permit it to exist

only so they can have a foot in both parties. The hoods have been known to round up a few thousand G.O.P. votes in certain elections just to avoid embarrassing Democratic winners with heavy pluralities from a gangster-dominated political organization. But aside from being something to scratch matches on, Republicans in the First Ward are handy in other ways. In Mexico City this year, for example, Giancana and Miss McGuire toolled around in a white Oldsmobile licensed to Peter Granata, the present Republican committeeman in the First Ward.

Although Cosa Nostra control over the three wards is as well-known to many Chicagoans as the Water Tower, Mayor Richard J. Daley, the longtime guru of Cook County's Democrats, stays aloof. As Chicago mayors have always done, Mayor Daley tends to bristle at allegations of organized corruption in his city as being something less than patriotic. Leadership of ward organizations, he contends, is the exclusive concern of the people in the wards.

First Ward Democratic headquarters, just across La Salle Street from City Hall, is a handily located, permanently established center of political corruption. Here politicians, policemen, newsmen and other useful people troop into the office for favors given and received. (As in few other cities, certain journalists are part and parcel of the First Ward Fix. The First Ward Democratic organization, if it serves the gangster's needs, can—and on occasion does—swing enough influence in city rooms to get a story killed or softened to the point where it is almost an apology.) The principal disbursing officer, and Giancana's main liaison with the First Ward-healers, is Pat Marcy, who served a prison term for robbery back before he became secretary of the First Ward Democratic organization.

Details of the First Ward's bribe trafficking were spelled out in a 1963 report on police corruption in Chicago by the U.S. Department of Justice. The report, naming names, disclosed specific payoffs that kept police from cracking down on centers of vice operated by the Giancana Mob. But Police Superintendent Orlando W. Wilson, a man with a reputation for incorruptibility, reacted in much the same manner as Mayor Daley, scoffing at the report as "gossip" and refusing to take any action against accused bribe-takers on the police force—including his administrative assistant, Sgt. Paul Quinn. (Wilson retired August 1. Quinn remains on the force as administrative assistant to Wilson's successor, James B. Conlisk Jr.)

Giancana rules the First Ward like a Tartar warlord. He can brush an alderman off the city council with a gesture of his hand—as he did in 1962, when he ordered the resignation of Alderman John D'Arco. (It was all brought to a head by a D'Arco *faux pas*. He and Giancana were seated at a restaurant table when an FBI agent, well-known to both men, approached. D'Arco, reacting as a politician, leaped to his feet and shook hands with the agent. Giancana disapproved. Exit Alderman D'Arco.) State Senator Anthony DeTolve, a relative of Giancana's late wife, was nominated to succeed D'Arco. Four days before the aldermanic election, the gang Boss capriciously decided that DeTolve would not do, either. In the ensuing confusion, the First Ward wound up without an alderman for a year. Not many constituents could discern any difference.

For seven years, U.S. Representative Roland Libonati was one of the tame congressmen from the First Ward. "Libby" got on the powerful House Judiciary Committee and became something of a Capitol Hill landmark. Tony Tisci, Giancana's son-in-law, was on the government payroll at \$11,829.84 a year as Libonati's assistant. In 1962, for reasons still undisclosed, Giancana decided that Libonati was a liability. The hapless congressman submitted without a protest and, for stated reasons of his wife's ill health, obediently did

not run for re-election in 1964. Tisci stayed on as assistant to Libonati's successor, Frank Annunzio.

The grand jury investigation that jailed Giancana eventually dislodged Tisci from Annunzio's payroll. The disclosure that Tisci had refused to talk to the jury, pleading fear of self-incrimination, was followed by his resignation as Annunzio's aide. Marcy and D'Arco were also Fifth Amendment witnesses. But there, as might be expected, the matter rested. U.S. Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan, a Democratic appointee, did not extend immunity to Tisci, Marcy and D'Arco even though they, like Giancana, had balked at testifying. Immunity for them might have been embarrassing for Mayor Daley's Democratic machine. It would have given the three the choice of exposing the workings of Giancana's captive organization or, like him, going to jail.

For some years, Giancana's political courier was the master fixer of the Chicago Mob, the late, notorious Murray Humphreys. Using the name "Mr. Pope," he frequently delivered messages and packages to Libonati and other members of the Illinois congressional delegation. Humphreys died in 1965, and some of his political duties now fall to Gus Alex, who runs the rackets for Giancana in the First Ward.

Giancana, perhaps spellbound by his acquaintances among celebrities and his control over paid-for political hacks, has been known to overstep his own influence. Once, during a time of tight surveillance by the FBI, he dispatched his aide-de-camp, a hoodlum named Charles English, with a message for the G-men who were waiting outside for him to leave a saloon. The message was an invitation to Robert F. Kennedy, then the Attorney General, to sit down and talk over calling the agents off. English made quite a sales pitch. "Elected officials all over the country, hundreds of 'em, owe their jobs to 'Moe,'" he explained proudly. His parting words were equally blithe: "Moe says if Kennedy wants to talk, he should get in touch with Frank Sinatra to set it up."

Kennedy passed up the bid—and along about that time Sinatra fell out of New Frontier favor. The FBI continued its investigations, resulting in a 1965 jail sentence for Giancana.

Some of Giancana's lieutenants have their own connections with politicians, officials and important people. Gus Alex has an especially warm relationship with Chicago's city treasurer, Marshall Korshak, and his brother, Attorney Sidney Korshak. Sidney is a pal of other leading Chicago gangsters—"a message from him [Sidney]," a prominent mobster once was quoted on a witness stand, "is a message from us." On Alex's application in 1957 for an apartment on exclusive Lake Shore Drive, he described himself as a \$15,000-a-year employe of Marshall Korshak, then a state senator.

Among political favors rendered by paid-for officials to Cosa Nostra are the passing along of information that comes over their desks and the sending up of storm signals whenever official action against the Mob is threatened.

In 1962, for example, Attorney General Kennedy sent his federal prosecutors a list of gangsters to be investigated, stipulating that the list be held in strict secrecy within the Department of Justice. In a matter of weeks a copy of the list turned up in a Michigan Avenue office used by Giancana and Alex.

Fans of Sinatra and Miss McGuire might reconsider their acceptance of Giancana as a social figure if they had heard a conversation which took place in Miami a few years ago among three Giancana employes. So, for that matter, might Sinatra and Miss McGuire. The subject was William Jackson, a grotesque slugger for the Outfit who weighed well over 350 pounds. Jackson somehow had gotten out of line and had to be dealt with. As faithfully related by an informant, James

Torella and Fiore Buccieri were telling John (Jackie) Cerone with some glee how they'd gone about it.

"Jackson was hung up on that meat hook," said Torella. "He was so—— heavy he bent it. He was on that thing three days before he croaked."

Buccieri began to giggle. "Jackie, you shoulda seen the guy. Like an elephant, he was, and when Jimmy hit him in the—— with that electric prod . . ."

Torella interrupted excitedly. "He was floppin' around on that hook, Jackie. We tossed water on him to give the prod a better charge, and he's screamin' . . ."

The conversation turned animatedly to other methods of dispensing Giancana's brand of justice—except for the revolting subject matter, they might have been men sitting around a bait shop discussing favorite fishing lures. "The stretcher is best," insisted Torella. "Put a guy on it with chains and you can stretch him until his joints pop. . . Remember the guy that sweat so much he dried out? He was *always* wantin' water, water. . . I think he died of thirst."

Once again, a reminder: these men are members of Giancana's Cosa Nostra Family. He was, and still is, the Boss who gives people like Buccieri and Torella the "contracts" for killing people like the late, heavy William Jackson.

The cardinal principle of the Fix is immutable—i.e., be with winners. Politically, this is conducive to bipartisanship. "Do like we do in Chicago," counseled Sam Giancana when he was reviewing his secret investments in the Stardust Casino in Las Vegas in 1961. "Give to both parties."

Naturally, when the delicate matter of investments of this sort is at issue, the man whose knowhow is most prized is Meyer Lansky. Though not a Cosa Nostra member (he is Jewish), he is the Mob's chief financial counselor. As such, he was the architect of "the skim," the system whereby tax-free cash is siphoned off the top of casino profits in Nevada.

Nevada has been "open" territory for Cosa Nostra racketeers ever since legalized gambling made Las Vegas synonymous with high rolling. The Mobs from Cleveland, Chicago, Miami and New York all had representatives looking after their hidden interests and therefore had something of a stake in Nevada politics.

Small wonder, then, that Giancana saw fit to give people advice. Nor is it at all remarkable that the Fremont Casino in Las Vegas found it necessary to obtain the personal approval of Lansky for its \$19,500 budget for political "contributions" in 1963: \$5,000 for a justice of the Nevada supreme court; \$200 to a justice of the peace; \$300 to a county commissioner; \$500 to a state assemblyman, and \$500 to a candidate for lieutenant governor. That was local. Another \$1,000 was anted up for a national political figure—and \$12,000 for his opponent.

The payoff, of course, was influence in Las Vegas, Carson City and Washington—not just for Ed Levinson, operator of the Fremont, but also for Lansky. (At the time, Levinson had another very useful connection in Washington. Both he and Benjamin Sigelbaum, the bagman who transported the "skim" money to Lansky in Miami Beach, were partners of Bobby Baker in the Serv-U vending machine enterprise. Baker, it will be recalled, was then the Senate majority secretary, as well as a chief dispenser of funds for the Senate Democratic campaign committee and confidant and protégé of the then Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson.)

The philosophy behind all this was perhaps most succinctly explained by Major Riddle, operator of the opulent Dunes Casino of Las Vegas. When the owners yelped about a \$20,000 contribution to a man very high in then-Governor Grant Sawyer's office, Riddle gave an explanation, which an informant has passed along: "The guy does what-

ever we want. Any one of the things he does for us would bring in \$20,000." And besides, Riddle added, the contribution in question was an economy when compared with the \$200,000 the Desert Inn had anted up for another influential politician.

Riddle told the informant later about the nuances of political giving and taking. The case in point was the gambling license for Irving Devine, a local racketeer. Devine was prepared to make a hefty "political contribution" of \$50,000 to the Nevada governor's campaign for re-election, Riddle said, in return for his license.

"That's the only way our guy would do it," said Riddle. "You know, in a campaign, he needs funds. Any other time, it's something else again."

Unfortunately for Devine, a federal report disclosing his ties with skimming racketeers began to circulate around Nevada shortly afterward. Any talk of a gambling license for Devine became a dead issue.

PROCONSUL OF THE BOSTON GANG WAR

The Fix is by no means limited to wide-open Nevada and the political backrooms of Chicago. It also flourishes in New England, with a ruthlessness that is a point of personal pride to the resident of Cosa Nostra proconsul, Raymond Patriarca.

At 59, Patriarca has two distinctions in Cosa Nostra. When it comes to manipulating the makers and enforcers of the law, he has few peers. His tightly disciplined 150-member gang operates a dazzling array of rackets and legitimate businesses over Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and Maine.

He is also known as the only Cosa Nostra Boss to operate for more than three years within range of an FBI microphone. The Cosa Nostra Commission have held several discussions to decide how this mountainous blunder should be dealt with. Bosses have been killed for less. The bug itself, planted by the FBI in Patriarca's office in Providence, R.I., was bad enough. But Patriarca compounded the original security breach by letting some of the taped transcripts get into the federal court record. In this, his arrogance played a major role.

It all involved the income tax fraud trial of one of his capos, Louis Taglianetti. When Taglianetti was found guilty, Patriarca made his big mistake—by ordering an appeal of the conviction. This ultimately forced the introduction of the bugged tape transcripts in the record. The way Cosa Nostra sees it, far better Taglianetti should have served his seven months in the first place.

Among the disclosures in the FBI records: Patriarca is the referee of the celebrated gang war that has plagued Boston for more than three years. He presides over the shabby scene with such authority that nobody is killed without his permission. At least a dozen of the 40-odd victims were slain on his direct orders. The bug picked up conversations among Patriarca and his capos concerning the slayings; the assassins themselves were named. At one point, when his own declaration of an armistice was not being observed, Patriarca proclaimed angrily that he was about to "declare martial law."

All types of crime in his bailiwick, not just the organized kind, are cleared by Patriarca—among them bank robberies, hijackings, arson, jewel thefts and kidnappings.

Such information, needless to say, was priceless intelligence for law officials. It was also a temporary lease on life for gangsters William Marfeo and John Biele, who had fallen out of favor with Cosa Nostra. The bug revealed Patriarca's various plots to kill the pair over a period of months, and on each occasion, FBI agents managed to tip them off—as well as the police. A ban on bugging in 1965 forced disconnection of the microphone in Patriarca's office. Within a year, Marfeo was slain in Providence; Biele was murdered in Miami last March.

As a Mob Boss, Raymond Patriarca sits as something of a judge himself, sometimes

over the affairs of politicians. On one such instance, in 1963, a top official of the Rhode Island state government, much in Patriarca's debt, had been defeated for re-election. One of his backers, a Warwick, R.I. businessman, had contributed \$17,000 to the unsuccessful campaign and wanted his money back, claiming it had been a loan. Not so, said the politician—it was an outright gift.

Patriarca himself held court on the matter behind the vending machines in his Coin-O-Matic office in Providence. Unsurprisingly, he ruled for the defendant. The \$17,000 was a gift. Judge Patriarca advised the businessman to forget it. He did.

Patriarca is far wrier with his own political contributions. His political payoffs are held in a bank account that has come to be known as "Raymond's Escrow Fund." It is released to deserving political servants only after they have delivered for Raymond Patriarca.

A good example of this device was a battle in 1963 in the Massachusetts legislature over proposed extension of the racing season at the Berkshire Downs race track, at Hancock, Mass. At the time, Patriarca and the late Thomas Lucchese were among the hoodlums holding secret interests in the track. More racing days were needed at the track to keep it from going bankrupt. Patriarca spread the word that there would be an added purse of \$25,000 in Raymond's Escrow Fund for dispersal—if the track got a lengthened season.

There was a stormy floor fight in the legislature. Patriarca's forces lost, but the \$25,000 remained in Raymond's Escrow Fund.

But in routine matters, Patriarca's Fix, in spite of his tendency to talk too much about it, has worked smoothly. To cite an example: on Friday afternoon, July 27, 1962 a high-ranking state police officer flashed a yellow alert to Jerry Angiulo, Patriarca's Underboss in Boston, that there was going to be a raid the next day on gambling joints at Revere Beach. When the raiders arrived, Patriarca's five joints were demurely closed. The police raided only the independent gamblers—who had been foolish enough to refuse to cut Angiulo and the Mob in on their operations. On the following Tuesday, Angiulo's five casinos reopened at new addresses and quickly lapped up the business of the gamblers who had been shut down in the raid. Three years later, in June 1965, with the Fix working smoothly as ever, the whole sequence of jiggers-shutdown-raid-reopening was reenacted at Revere.

If the Commission doesn't decide to eliminate him, Patriarca eventually could be tripped up by his own heavy-handed greed. Right now the chief witness against him in a conspiracy case awaiting trial is Joseph Barboza, a 35-year-old triggerman whom Patriarca had assigned in June 1965 to kill Marfeo (one of the occasions when Marfeo was tipped off). Later Barboza was imprisoned on an unrelated charge. His gangster friends immediately set about collecting funds to pay for an appeal. Two of them were waylaid—by Patriarca's men—and shot dead. The killers walked off with the \$80,000 they had collected. Barboza, stranded behind bars and enraged at the doublecross, became a government witness. Patriarca may live to regret it.

The Fix, like any other form of commerce, is peculiarly susceptible to the winds of inflation. Nowhere was this more apparent than in New Jersey, home of Vito Genovese and other thieving murderers and politicians.

In February 1963 three men sat down in a ramshackle club called "The Barn," on Route 22 in Mountainside, N.J., to discuss the rising cost of fixing police officials. Two of them were the gabby old friends who discussed Richie Bolardo's beckoning incinerator: Angelo DeCarlo and Tony Russo, the Genovese family's betting boss in Monmouth County. (Russo's sobriquet in the Mob is "Little Pussy." His brother John—"Big

Pussy"—did a stretch for murder.) Also at the table was an informant for a law enforcement agency, and the minutes of that meeting, kept secret until now, have been a key factor in the recent amassing of intelligence by federal officials on New Jersey Mob activities.

The specific complaint of the two gangsters was the forthright grabbiness of a top-level officer in the New Jersey State Police. Russo said the police official was collecting \$250 a month for ignoring bookies around Monmouth Park race track, plus \$1,000 a month in gambling payoffs in Long Branch and another \$1,000 from Asbury Park. As if this weren't enough, Joe Zicarelli, a Bonanno capo who bosses bookie and lottery action in Hudson County, was paying, according to Russo and DeCarlo, an additional \$5,000 a month. And now, to top it off, Russo complained, this guy had the gall to demand double payoffs for each month of the summer season, when resorts like Asbury Park and Long Branch boom and so does gambling. The irony of it all, DeCarlo added bitterly, was that he, Russo and Zicarelli had only themselves to blame. They had personally picked their greedy policeman and arranged for a well-connected Hudson County politico to promote him to his high place on the force. DeCarlo promised to talk soon to the same politician about the state policeman's unseemly greed.

Whatever was said at that meeting, the result was negative, for the police officer continued to extort heavy payoffs from DeCarlo, Russo and Zicarelli until his retirement, two years later. Expensive though he was, he was worth too much to the Mob to warrant getting rid of him. He represented what is called in Cosa Nostra a "solid setup"—the ultimate protection, a direct hand-to-pocket Fix with a top law enforcement official in a policymaking position.

The power of the Fix in certain areas of New Jersey is just about total. In Long Branch, for example, a town of 26,000 on the Jersey shore, Russo told the informant that the Mob had taken charge. Russo bragged they had fixed elections and maneuvered the ouster of a city manager. "What we got in Long Branch is everything," said Russo. "Police we got. Councilmen we got, too. We're gonna make millions."

Russo said that another capo, Ruggiero Bolardo, no less, keeper of the crematorium near Livingston, was wanting to muscle into the Long Branch bonanza with some road-construction contracting. DeCarlo figured Bolardo was out of bounds on this—he and his son Anthony already had all they deserved with "all the electric work in Newark." (Anthony Bolardo lists his occupation as "public relations man" for an electrical contracting firm in Newark.)

Several federal agencies have confirmed and supplemented the information on the Russo-DeCarlo talk. One investigation stemming from it disclosed that DeCarlo, Zicarelli and Ruggiero Bolardo had combined to maneuver the friend of another gangster into office as police superintendent of a large New Jersey city. The Mob-selected police chief used to work as a doorman at crap games run by gangster John Lardiere.

Actually "Bayonne Joe" Zicarelli's outwardly modest position as head of a bookie and lottery syndicate in Hudson County does him considerable injustice. True, in New Jersey, his interlocking tie-ups with scores of Hudson County officials are so expensive that some gangsters consider him a "connection-crazy" wastrel. But Zicarelli has an international sideline so extensive that he's practically a one-man state department for the Mob. He has holdings in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, and throughout the hemisphere is known as the man to see for guns and munitions when a government is to be overthrown or a rebellion is to be put down. For example, through the years he shipped arms to Dominican leaders, selling

with fine and profitable impartiality to Trujillo and the men who overthrew him. (In next week's issue more will appear on Zicarelli's business interests.)

Even Zicarelli's domestic connections extend well beyond the confines of Hudson County, into the chambers of the U.S. Congress itself. Indeed, he is on the best of terms with the widely respected Democratic representative from Hudson County, Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher. Gallagher is one of the bulwarks of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and was seriously mentioned before the 1964 Democratic convention as a possible running mate for Lyndon Johnson. Bayonne Joe and his congressman seem to have a lot to talk over, judging from the frequency of their get-togethers. These usually take place a long way from Washington or Bayonne—where Gallagher lives and Zicarelli runs the rackets. Sometimes the setting is a picturesque wayside inn off the Saw Mill River Parkway, north of New York, and the occasion is an unhurried and chummy Sunday brunch.

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

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

Mr. KUPFERMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has spoken of the problem of crime and has emphasized the failure to use electronic devices for surveillance in connection with the problem of crime. I just want to ask the gentleman if he does not recall the day we were sworn in at this session of the 90th Congress, that night we heard the President speak on his legislative program, and the one point that I recall specifically he made in this connection was that he, himself, said that he would ask the Congress to outlaw all methods of electronic surveillance. I just wonder whether the criticism is placed properly on the Attorney General.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York properly notes that the ultimate responsibility lies with the President in regard to the use of electronic devices. I am simply objecting to the fact that the Attorney General requires personal sanction for their use by trained agents. Indeed, I doubt the capacity of the Attorney General to use such modern devices.

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

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION WINNING CRIME WAR DESPITE REPUBLICAN ROADBLOCKS

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days some Republican Members of the House and the other body have launched a series of attacks against the Johnson administration, claiming that the President and the Justice Department are not doing enough to combat crime in this country.

It is unfortunate that these Members of Congress have chosen to delve in political thumb twiddling in an area that is so vitally important to our Nation.

It would appear from the unfounded remarks of some Republicans that crime in this country is running rampant. However, the opposite is the case. The administration of President Lyndon Johnson, despite numerous Republican attempts to cripple his efforts to solve the crime problem, has raised crime fighting levels in this country to an alltime high. The only factor which prevents the Johnson administration from doing an even greater job is the traditional four legislative horsemen of the Republican Party—cut, gut, weaken, and stall.

There can be only one reason for the unfounded Republican attacks on the President's crime program. That is, very simply, that President Johnson is getting the job done and the Republicans want to cloud his efforts in a smokescreen of vocal air pollution.

At the same time, the Republicans are criticizing President Johnson's efforts, they are resisting every attempt by the President to strengthen our crime fighting procedures. This point was brought home yesterday by Deputy Attorney General Warren Christopher, in a statement issued in response to the Republican attack on the President's crime program. In part, Mr. Christopher said:

The Administration's Firearms Bill is a tough attack on the present laxity which puts firearms into the hands of criminals. Why are the Republicans opposing this bill? More than six thousand persons were slain by guns last year, which should be enough to enable sensible people to get the message that something has to be done.

President Johnson's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act would enable the Federal Government to help up-grade local law enforcement by direct grants to cities.

But what have the Republicans done to this? With nineteenth century logic, they are cutting the bill's heart. They are trying to rewrite it to prevent the Federal Government from making direct grants which would enable local police departments to expand and modernize.

Based on these Republican tactics, it can only be assumed that GOP stands for "Great Obstructionist Party," the party of the logjammers.

But I want to make it crystal clear, once again, that despite all of the Republican efforts to sidetrack and ambush the President's crime program, the administration is making record progress.

As Deputy Attorney General Christopher pointed out yesterday:

Convictions of FBI-investigated organized crime and gambling figures reached a record high in 1967, up 39 percent from the previous year.

Figures for the most recent fiscal year available show the highest number of criminal trials in more than a decade.

Figures for the most recent fiscal year available show the highest number of procedures before grand juries in more than a decade.

At the present, there are more than 20 grand juries investigating organized crime matters.

In view of these impressive figures I do not think any reasonable, well-informed, individual would question the President's activity in the battle against crime.

I do not want to charge the Republicans with fostering crime, but their re-

fusal to go along with basic social programs, such as the rat control bill has, at least indirectly, added to the unrest in urban areas which has led to criminal activity.

If the Republicans wish to join the winning side, the side headed by President Lyndon Johnson in the war on crime, they should carefully consider their votes on the legislation before this Congress.

I want to assure the American people that the remarks made in recent days by Republican Members of Congress concerning the President's crime program are not factually correct, nor even prudently sound. The Republican attack clearly shows that President Johnson is getting the job done. The Republicans clearly realize this and are attempting to cover the fact with a flood of unfounded statements.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD VERSUS UNSWERVING GOP OPPOSITION

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is the target for scandalous vituperation and unfair criticism, perhaps unprecedented in the history of American politics.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that most of those criticizing the President have long been opposed to a government responsive to the people's needs. Not surprisingly, these political attacks are aimed at a President who personifies the philosophy of the Democratic Party—the party of the people.

We know what motivates the President's critics. The Republicans have not changed their minds or their ideas for more than 30 years. They remain as opposed to progress as was their great political hero, Calvin Coolidge.

We Democrats can only imagine how the achievements of the Johnson administration must stick in their craw.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that Presidents get praised when things go well and get blamed when they go badly. As Lyndon Johnson once said: "That's what Presidents are for."

But I am dismayed by the statements of some leading Republicans who seem determined to blame President Johnson for the city rioting this summer.

This is like blaming the Democratic Party for the rising divorce rate or for a record death toll on our highways.

The problems of the cities, and the ghettos within, have been with us for many generations. Yet, we also know that it was in the 1950's when a great wave of Negro migration—from South to North—began pouring into our already overcrowded ghetto areas.

And the record shows that during these 8 years, the Republican administration in power sent to Congress only one message on the cities.

This is the party now trying to blame Lyndon Johnson for the tragedies of this summer.

They are trying to blame a President who initiated unprecedented legislation to help the urban poor—the President who began the war on poverty, rent supplements, model cities, medicare, urban mass transportation, and created the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

And with each of these programs, the overwhelming majority of Republicans voted in their traditional fashion—against.

There is no easy solution to the problem of the cities. It seems clear that we shall be grappling with the complexities of city living for many years to come.

But the record will show that the Democratic Party has responded to this problem with imagination, concern, and dedication.

We have made a promising start. But it is only a beginning. And for the Republicans to attempt to blame the administration for urban violence and unrest is the height of political irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the President has some 14 proposals dealing with urban aid still pending before Congress. We can test the sincerity of the Republican's alleged concern about our cities by their votes and on these pending measures.

Let those who are so willing to blame the President for what has occurred this summer step forward to be counted for programs designed to alleviate social unrest and despair—the two ingredients that triggered the violence.

It is relatively easy to get publicity by attacking the President. And this is especially true about Vietnam.

Yet, as a number of editorial writers—including William Randolph Hearst, Jr.—have pointed out recently, there has not been one single alternative to administration policies proposed by the Republicans.

We have all read tens of thousands of words on Vietnam in the papers. But not one of the President's critics—not one—has managed to come up with an alternative that is better than the policies now in effect in Vietnam.

President Johnson will not be pushed into extreme positions on Vietnam. He will not withdraw—and he will not dangerously escalate the war.

Vietnam is difficult and frustrating for us all. But this administration has followed the wise and responsible course of resisting aggression while making every possible effort to get Hanoi to the conference table.

Our goal in Vietnam remains unchanged. It is to settle this struggle peacefully and honorably. And it is a goal the overwhelming majority of Americans fully support.

But our people know that President Johnson cannot negotiate with himself. And they know that the onus for peace now rests squarely on the rulers in Hanoi.

And so, I would say to those who have been hearing so much from the President's critics: The value of criticism is the constructive alternatives offered.

To date, the value of the Republican

alternatives being proposed matches their dismal voting record in Congress.

The 1960's have been challenging and difficult years for the United States and the entire community of nations.

Let us not lose our perspective.

Washington did not create the bitterness and unrest in slum ghettos. This is a problem created in each city where trouble occurred.

Washington can—and has—provided the leadership and resources to meet this problem responsibly. But to truly solve it will take the total effort of every community and all of our citizens.

The Republican effort to blame President Johnson for all that is wrong in our society and in the world must be judged by one yardstick: Which President and which party has been responsive to problems of our people and our society?

This yardstick has always been the measure of the Democratic Party's success at the polls. And it is this yardstick that will once again produce victory for Lyndon Johnson and the Democrats in 1968.

Meanwhile, our Republican colleagues will continue to view with alarm each and every action of this administration.

And as they grind out their charges and criticisms, we Democrats in Congress will continue to support the important legislative programs of this administration. We are building a solid record of accomplishment—a record unique in American history.

In our diversity, we Democrats sometimes disagree—and we sometimes seem to be pulling in several different directions at the same time.

But out of that diversity we draw our strength. For we are the party of the people. And we are more responsible to the will of the people—and more responsive to the needs of the people—than any other political party in history.

We can stand tall in 1968 by standing shoulder to shoulder with President Johnson and supporting the record he will carry to the American people.

OUR VOCAL WAR CRITICS: WHERE IS THEIR INSTANT HORROR OVER VIETCONG ATROCITIES?

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to make a plea to some of my fellow citizens who question this Nation's basic morality in its conduct of the war in Vietnam.

A plea to those who shout "Murderer" at our President, our Secretary of State, and our Secretary of Defense.

A plea to those who take out full-page newspaper ads, demanding that we "Stop the Bombing" and "Negotiate Now."

A plea to those who picket in front of the White House under the mistaken

assumption that they are the only true peace-lovers in the world.

My plea is this: For once—just once—address your wrath to the Vietcong who today are carrying out a systematic bloodbath throughout South Vietnam. Express your horror to Hanoi which is directing this systematic campaign of murder and brutality.

I do not use the word "systematic" lightly, an Associated Press story on August 27, the Washington Star reports that captured Communist documents show that the Vietcong are under explicit orders to step up terrorism in an effort to wreck the approaching national elections.

Once again—as in the Constituent Assembly elections last September—they are resorting to terrorist tactics because they know that a working democracy is their gravest enemy.

I hope that the critics of President Johnson have been following those sordid events. I hope they understand what is happening to innocent women and children.

Civilian hospitals are being shelled.

Election workers are being shot on sight.

Government officials are being assassinated.

Civilians are being kidnaped and their working cards confiscated.

Polling places are being blown to bits.

Other polling places are being booby-trapped.

Civilian buses are being raked with small arms fire.

The tragic results of these brutal tactics cry out from the daily newspapers.

The Washington Star states that last week, 167 civilians were killed, 252 wounded, and 126 were kidnaped.

This week's toll will be even higher.

On August 27 alone, the New York Times reports:

Vietcong guerrillas—in a series of coordinated terrorist attacks from the northern provinces to the Mekong Delta—killed and wounded at least 355 people . . . most of them Vietnamese civilians.

Mr. Speaker, where are the voices of protest against these atrocities?

Where are the full-page ads?

Where are the picketers?

Where are the people who like to shout at our President? Are they marching in the streets chanting, "Hey, hey, Ho Chi Minh. How many civilians have you done in?"

I stop short of accusing them of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. Blindness goes far enough—and it has the same end result.

These are the people who can muster instant horror over a U.S. bomb which has been accidentally dropped on a Vietnamese village.

I do not fault them for this. We all feel horror—though some more vocally than others.

But where is their instant horror over the deliberate murder of mothers and babies?

This has nothing to do with anyone's position on the Vietnam war, Mr. Speaker. It has nothing to do with doves or hawks.

It has to do simply with basic hu-

manity. And basic humanity does not have room for a double standard.

PLACEMENT CENTER SURVEY OF PARKS JOB CORPS CENTER

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have in my congressional district, a Job Corps center which has in a comprehensive approach tackled some of the hardest problems of our society—renewing the lives of young men and women who have suffered the setbacks in education, health, job potential that comes of growing up in our central city ghettos.

I am also very pleased that this particular center, from all testimony, appears to be one of the most successful programs of its kind. The Parks Job Center in Pleasanton, Calif., is operated by Litton Industries, and has been training and educating young men since April 1965.

The Job Corps is fulfilling an important need too in placing the young men exposed to the training and environment of these centers. Parks' placement record is an especially fine one—2,526 young men, approximately 30 percent of the men who were graduated from or left the Parks Job Corps Center in the last 2 years, have been placed in gainful positions.

The former Parks Job Corpsmen who are now employed are earning an average hourly wage of \$1.78. Sample, follow-up checks show a 71.9 percent job retention rate. Further, in the same sampling, 78.9 percent of those placed have been promoted since being hired.

The latter record is particularly impressive when viewed against the background of the boys involved. Of the total Parks population, nearly one-third have had previous criminal records, 91.5 percent were dropouts from elementary and high schools and 48 percent came from broken homes. The Parks corpsmen are from poverty areas of all 50 States. An analysis of the Parks placement record points up one significant fact: Vocational training in itself it is not enough. Reshaping of attitudes and reorientation to a responsible productive life is equally if not more important in the Job Corps rehabilitation program. More than half of the corpsmen employed by private industry were placed in positions not related to their Job Corps training.

The breakdown of the placements generated by the Parks Job Corps Center shows 905 young men were placed in positions related to their Job Corps training at an average hourly wage of \$1.93 and 980 in positions not related to their training at an hourly wage of \$1.64.

Placements in training positions have been as follows: 248 men in electronics at \$2.16 an hour; 207 in automotive skills at \$1.80 an hour; 149 in maintenance at

\$1.91 an hour; 67 in office machine repair at \$1.87 an hour; 135 in general skills—which includes office occupations—at \$1.83 an hour and 99 in the culinary arts at \$1.79 an hour.

For young men who have obtained positions in fields not related to their training, the figures are as follows: 225 men from electronics training have obtained positions at an average \$1.64 an hour; 232 from automotive at \$1.70 an hour; 79 from maintenance at \$1.68; 79 from office machine repair at \$1.70; 121 from general skills at \$1.70; and 51 from culinary arts at \$1.70.

A total of 641 men have gone on in either education or into the military services.

When we shift from statistics to realize that each figure represents a young man who sees, probably for the first time, some light and hope on the road ahead, we recognize the vital role of the Job Corps. It is a story of hard work and devotion to the prospect of leading a productive and self-satisfying life. These centers ought to be continued—for only with some time are the operating problems being ironed out and results becoming visible. This program ought not be cut off in its infancy.

SEPTEMBER 2-9, NATIONAL DRUM CORPS WEEK

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the week of September 2-9 has been designated this year as National Drum Corps Week in honor of the thousands of young people and their adult leaders who devote long hours to preparation for musical competition and participation in public events.

It is difficult to measure their contribution to the pageantry and patriotism of our parades and holidays. Even more difficult to measure is the character-building influence that this activity exerts on its members. In this year of 1967, a year when intelligent young Americans are sacrificing their minds to the never-never land of drugs, a year of youthful snipers and youthful protesters and youthful rioters—in this year of 1967, we especially appreciate an organization of young people involved in wholesome activity leading to musical enjoyment and community service. I should like to commend the drum and bugle corps of America and to thank them.

EARLY SOCIAL SECURITY CHECKS FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday hundreds of thousands of senior citizens throughout America will receive their social security checks on the second of the month rather than on the fifth.

This may seem a small thing to many of us. But, to our older citizens, it is a matter of great importance whether their social security checks come early or late. So many of them live on tiny pittances—the average social security payment is only some \$80 a month—that a few days delay in receipt of their checks means real hardship and privation.

Previously social security checks were always marked for delivery on the third of each month, and this sometimes meant a delay of 1 or 2 days when the third fell on a Sunday or a holiday. This weekend the third falls on Sunday and the fourth is the Labor Day holiday. Thus under the previous system the September checks would not have reached social security beneficiaries until Tuesday, September 5.

This matter was brought to my attention last year and I sought to obtain a change in the delivery date of these checks. I was advised that this could not be done because the checks were dated the third and early delivery would produce ill will for merchants and bankers if these checks were presented prematurely for cashing. I then requested that the Social Security Administration consult with the Treasury Department to see if it would not be possible for these checks to be dated earlier, as well as delivered earlier when a holiday would cause late delivery.

I am gratified that the Social Security Administration and the Department of the Treasury found that this was possible. As a result, the September checks will be delivered before the Labor Day holiday, rather than after, and many hundreds of thousands of our citizens will benefit.

I insert in the RECORD the pertinent material relating to my correspondence with the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration. I believe my colleagues will be interested in seeing that it is sometimes possible to insist upon humanitarian consideration in great bureaucratic operations and obtain that consideration for our people. This material is as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 22, 1966.—Congressman Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) has appealed to Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball to allow Social Security beneficiaries to get their checks early rather than late when the delivery date falls on a weekend or holiday.

The Florida Congressman pointed out that postmasters throughout the country are instructed to deliver Social Security checks "on the third day of the month."

"This can cause great hardship," he said, "when holidays and weekends cause the checks to be delayed for a number of days after the third of the month."

He pointed out that the recent 4th of July holiday, which fell on a Monday, caused many Social Security checks—due on Sunday, the 3rd—to be delayed until Tuesday, the 5th of July.

In his letter to Commissioner Ball, Pepper noted that 85 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries have no other regular retire-

ment income and that a delay in their Social Security check of even a day or two can mean hardship and privation.

AUGUST 30, 1966.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: This is in further response to your letter of July 20 about the mailing of monthly social security checks. I appreciate your comments regarding my speech on "Policy Issues in Social Security." There are certainly many important improvements that should be made in the social security program.

We appreciate the problem that even one or two day's delay in a beneficiary's receipt of his monthly social security check can cause him. While our studies over the years have so far produced no checks-mailing arrangement that would seem better overall than the present one, we are continuing to examine various ideas and modifications.

The reason our checks bear a payment date of the 3d of the month is that we are assigned that date under a staggered check issuance arrangement in effect among various Federal agencies which send out monthly checks. The purpose, of course, is to avoid some of the problems that post offices, the Treasury Department, banks and other institutions would have if all monthly Federal checks were mailed or made payable on the same day each month.

Delivery of checks in advance of their payment date creates problems of its own. On a few occasions when our checks were inadvertently released by a post office on the 2d of the month, banks and other business houses pointed out that they were caused real difficulties. Beneficiaries presented the checks, marked payable as of the 3d of the month, on the 2d and put the business houses in the position of either honoring a post-dated check or of declining to do so and losing goodwill and patronage.

It is certainly understandable that a beneficiary may think we could solve the problem simply by looking ahead and making checks payable on the 1st or 2d of the month when the 3d falls on a weekend or holiday. This is of course not impossible but it would tend to offset the advantages of the check-staggering arrangement I described. Also, it would not seem to provide real advantage to beneficiaries as it would mean a wait of more than a month for the next check—and thus often do no more than shift the beneficiary's budget problem ahead by a month.

As I am sure you recognize, the mailing of checks each month for our more than 20 million cash beneficiaries requires careful handling and constant appraisal. This is the more so because we know the checks so often are relied upon for necessities. We have given a great deal of time and study to the process and shall continue to examine it and seek refinements. Thank you for bringing your constituent's ideas to our attention and for your own comments.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner of Social Security.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1966.

HON. ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner, Social Security Administration,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR COMMISSIONER BALL: You were very good in your letter of August 30 to comment on my suggestion that post offices be allowed to deliver Social Security checks prior to the third of the month when the third falls on a Sunday or holiday.

I understand that the various Federal agencies are assigned certain payment dates in order to stagger the issuance and delivery of monthly checks sent out by the Federal Government. I can appreciate also the problems which would arise if checks dated for

payment on the third were presented to banks and merchants before that time.

Would it not be possible, however, for Social Security checks be made payable from the first of the month, even though scheduled for regular delivery on the third. If this could be done, the local post offices could be authorized to deliver the checks early, as I have suggested, when the regular delivery date would fall on Sunday or a holiday, and the problem of premature presentation of the checks would not arise.

I would thank you if you would explore this possibility with the Department of the Treasury and let me hear from you further.

With kindest personal regards, and
Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 23, 1967.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: In recent months you and other Members of Congress have written us about delivery of social security checks in months in which the regular due date (the 3rd of the month) falls on a weekend or holiday. As we reported, the payment date of the 3rd of the month for social security benefit checks was assigned under a staggered check issuance arrangement in effect among various Federal agencies that issue monthly checks. This arrangement was designed to avoid some of the problems that would be created for the post office, the Treasury, banks, etc., if all these checks were mailed or made payable on the same date.

I am sure you will be glad to know that arrangements have now been made for earlier issuances of social security checks for months in which the 3rd falls on Sunday or a non-delivery legal holiday. In these months the checks will be dated as of the 2nd of the month (or the 1st, if necessary), and will be released to the post offices one or two days ahead of regular schedule. The first month for which this will apply is September 1967 and we expect to make use of the new arrangement at that time.

The other Members of Congress who inquired about this matter are being similarly advised.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner of Social Security.

APRIL 5, 1967.

HON. ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner of Social Security, Social Security Building, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: You know I was delighted to receive your letter of March 23 advising me of the plans that had been made to advance the payment date of social security benefit checks when the normal payment date falls on Sunday or on a legal holiday.

This will mean much to many millions of beneficiaries of the Social Security Administration's vital programs and in their behalf I wish to commend you for taking the trouble to investigate this problem and resolve it in this manner.

Warmest personal regards, and
Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

TRUTH IN THE MARKETPLACE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 28, my colleague from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and I, who are members of the House Subcommittee on Consumers Affairs, conducted an informal hearing in New York City on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and related truth-in-lending bills, which are pending before our subcommittee. We heard a number of excellent statements on the merits of H.R. 11601, as well as moving personal stories of those who have been deceived and defrauded by misleading and incomprehensible consumer credit transactions. I plan to put some of the most helpful statements in the RECORD in order to further inform my colleagues on the need for this legislation.

Yesterday, the New York Times declared its support for major provisions of H.R. 11601, introduced by the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee's most able chairman, the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN, as against S. 5 which recently passed the Senate. The Times correctly pointed out that the Senate bill's gravest inadequacy is its failure to cover all revolving charge accounts, and that the Sullivan bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, remedies that defect. I insert the editorial herewith:

TRUTH IN THE MARKETPLACE

The truth-in-lending bill already passed by the Senate needs strengthening in the House if it is to provide adequate protection for ordinary families. As Senator Robert F. Kennedy, City Council President O'Connor and other witnesses told the House Consumer Affairs subcommittee here yesterday, those in the low-income brackets are the principal victims of high-interest rates charged for personal loans and installment purchases. These consumers are often unaware of how much they are actually paying for so-called easy credit.

The bill, in the form approved by the Senate, would require sellers and lenders to state the true interest in terms both of annual rates—as distinguished from monthly or quarterly rates—and of actual dollars. The sale of automobiles and other large items such as furniture and refrigerators would be included, as well as personal loans and second mortgages on real estate.

The big defect in the bill is the failure to cover revolving charge accounts. Department stores persuaded the Senate Banking Committee that it would be burdensome and misleading to state the credit charge on these accounts, usually 1.5 per cent a month, at the annual rate of 18 per cent.

Representative Leonor K. Sullivan, Missouri Democrat, who is chairman of the subcommittee, is urging restoration of this provision in the bill. Since revolving charge accounts are the fastest-growing form of consumer credit, it is important that families become fully aware of the cost of handling such purchases.

A Federal ban on the garnishment of wages would also protect unwary buyers. This device for collecting money is principally used by high-pressure, easy-credit outfits which prey upon the gullibility of low-income consumers. It has no more place in the modern business scene than a debtor's prison.

SCREVEN COUNTY RECEIVES UNWARRANTED CRITICISM

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine editorial which appeared in one of my hometown papers, the Screven County News, on Thursday, August 24, in which my longtime friend, Mr. Stegins, so ably points out the fact that understanding of exactly what is taking place and methods of working out in the best way possible whatever problems may be existing in this country are sadly lacking and urgently needed.

Obviously, it is necessary in situations of this kind to take into account the source of such undeserved criticism and the editorial referred to follows:

SCREVEN COUNTY RECEIVES UNWARRANTED CRITICISM

Despite the fact that Schools of Screven county have been integrated for the past two years, and that the relations between the white people and the colored residents of the county are and have always been cordial and harmonious, Supt. George T. Jarrard was the recipient of a letter this week from John Doar, Assist. Attorney General, advising him of complaints he had received from Screven county Negro parents complaining that their children had been deprived of equal protection of the laws on account of their race in the operation of the public school of this county.

The fact is, Negro children have been attending Screven County High School for the past two years, and have the same privileges accorded white children—they eat at public places in Sylvania, and enjoy all of the other advantages afforded any child in Screven county. In fact the people of the city and county have gone to extremes in their efforts to comply with the Civil Rights Legislation, and apparently had the full cooperation of the Negro population as well.

On the face of the cordial relations always existing between the two races in the county, it is difficult for our public officials to comprehend the dissatisfaction of anyone of our local colored families with regards to their being deprived of equal rights under the Civil Rights law or any other law.

As in the recent registration of Negro voters in Screven county by Federal officials, it would appear that the unwarranted criticism to which the Asst. Attorney General refers, was conceived in the mind of outside interlopers, or perhaps, an individual of the Hap Brown type, who unfortunately has been transplanted in the county. The author of these fraudulent accusations, is probably known to many of our people, and will be repudiated by not only our white citizens, but the people of his own race.

HELPING DEMOCRACY WORK IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I must candidly admit that I do not understand the comments and attitude of certain people and news media in the United

States in the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

From my perspective as a citizen, and as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I thought that the very fact of open elections in South Vietnam already demonstrated the ethical and political difference between a struggling-to-be-free south, and a dictatorial, monolithic Communist north.

It was my impression that the press had looked into the history of the development of these coming elections, and had found the United States backing them, encouraging them, and advising the South Vietnamese for the last year and a half.

It was my impression that the free world press had already reported fully that there had been pretty fair and open elections in the villages where some 14,000 local officials have already been selected.

It was my impression that South Vietnam had adopted a Constitution, and the north had not.

It was my impression that the current campaign resembled an open American-type election where, in the memorable words of Mr. Dooley, "each man was as good as the next, and maybe a damned sight better."

It was my impression that President Johnson and the U.S. mission had done everything short of manning the voting booths to assure open, fair, and free results.

It was my impression that Secretary McNamara, Vice President HUMPHREY, General Taylor, Mr. Clifford, Ambassador Bunker, had all personally conveyed President Johnson's stress on free elections directly to every high Vietnamese official, and had done so, in most cases, long before the cries of "fraud" began to fill the daily newspapers.

President Johnson and his advisers have made free elections a principal theme of almost every conversation with the Vietnamese for the past year and a half.

President Johnson publicly and privately stressed the need for free and fair elections at the historic Honolulu Conference, and that need was written into the Honolulu declaration.

President Johnson offered American technical experts to help the Vietnamese draft a constitution and electoral laws.

President Johnson again encouraged development of democratic institutions in Vietnamese during the Manila Conference in late 1966.

President Johnson has affirmed and reaffirmed his deep interest in the growth of democracy in South Vietnam through such personal emissaries as Secretary McNamara, Vice President HUMPHREY, Ambassador Goldberg, Ambassadors Bunker and Lodge, and others.

President Johnson stressed the importance of avoiding divisions in the country and the critical need for free, fair, and honest political developments, at the Guam Conference in March 1967.

And just a few days ago, an invited delegation of American election observers flew to Vietnam to represent the American presence there.

I simply do not understand, nor can I accept, the unwarranted attacks being made on President Johnson for not do-

ing enough to insure democratic elections in South Vietnam.

South Vietnam has come a long way toward freedom, self-determination and democracy since it emerged from 200 years of colonial rule, and it has done it with our help.

South Vietnam exists today because Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson would not permit 15 million free people to be swallowed up by an aggressive neighbor to the north.

South Vietnam is now experimenting with democracy. It is relatively new to them. Their culture is different from ours. Their value systems might be different from ours. Let us not judge them solely by our own standards. Let us not pin the label "made in America" on them.

Let us, as President Johnson has charged us to do, help them to help themselves. That is democracy.

In all honesty and sincerity, I believe the present election campaign in South Vietnam reflects honor and dignity on the United States for what it has done.

In this moment when a democracy is trying to be born—with our help and encouragement—let us not prejudice the results with charges of fraud and fake.

Let us share with our President the inner satisfaction of knowing that we have done our best; that democracy flowers in a free climate; and that democracy demands that the Vietnamese decide their elections in their own way.

I support the President. I congratulate him for having included the distinguished Governor of my State on his team of American observers.

And I am confident that in the days ahead we are going to be proud of South Vietnam and the United States for their joint venture in making democracy work.

RECOGNITION OF WALT DISNEY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, some 2 weeks ago the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported and the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 93. The resolution provides for the issuance of medals in remembrance of Walt Disney. A gold medal will be given to Mr. Disney's widow, and bronze medals will be made available to the California Institute of the Arts.

Although only a small token, the medals represent the appreciation and respect of a grateful Nation to a citizen who made a most significant and positive contribution to humanity.

Walt Disney, during his life, and at the time of his death received extensive acclaim, both from the industry in which he played such an eminent role, and from the public. There is no need now to repeat all that has been said in the past, or the many great words which will be spoken of him in the future.

The people of his Nation, as are the people of the world, richer because of

his days of accomplishment. To strike a medal in his name is a simply yet significant national tribute to a man whose humanity was bounded only by his imagination, which, as the world well knows, had no limit.

I am confident that the House Banking and Currency Committee will act upon the resolution I am introducing today in the same favorable manner as its counterpart in the Senate.

H.J. RES. 812

Resolution to provide for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the late Walt Disney and for the issuance of bronze medals to the California Institute of the Arts in recognition of the distinguished public service and the outstanding contributions of Walt Disney to the United States and to the world.

Whereas Walt Disney's life personified the American dream and his rags-to-riches story demonstrated that the United States of America remains the land of opportunity; and

Whereas Walt Disney, "the most significant figure in graphic arts since Leonardo," pioneered motion picture cartoons, produced spectacular feature films, and created fascinating nature studies bringing joy and pleasure to children of all ages; and

Whereas Walt Disney developed one of the wonders of the modern world, Disneyland, a fabulous park where happiness reigns and where one can relive the Nation's past as well as step into the future; and

Whereas Walt Disney was a great humanitarian, a "teacher of human compassion and kindness," a master entrepreneur, a great conservationist; and

Whereas Walt Disney's masterful touch contributed so significantly to the success of exhibits of the United States, including those at the New York and Brussels World's Fairs; and

Whereas Walt Disney, always an outstanding patriot, during World War II devoted 95 per centum of the production of his studios to the armed services; and

Whereas Walt Disney's vision and work with the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs did so much to create international friendship and mutual understanding with our neighbors in Latin America; and

Whereas Walt Disney received an unprecedented number of Academy Awards, citations, and honors from governments the world over, industry, civic groups, and universities, which when listed total nearly a thousand; and

Whereas Walt Disney's greatest gifts to mankind were laughter, his steadfast faith in future generations, and his belief that good will ultimately triumph over evil; and

Whereas Walt Disney's interest in young America is evidenced by his founding of the California Institute of the Arts, a college-level school of the creative and performing arts, which he regarded as his most important contribution to posterity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the distinguished public service and outstanding contributions to the United States and to the world, the President of the United States is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States and in the name of the Congress to the widow of the late Walt Disney a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by Walt Disney Productions with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 to carry out the purposes of this section.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall strike and furnish to the California

Institute of the Arts not more than one hundred thousand duplicate copies of such medal in bronze. The medals shall be considered as national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

(b) The medals provided for in this section shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the California Institute of the Arts in quantities of not less than two thousand. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

PRESIDENT AND KAISER COMMITTEE PRAISED FOR NEW LOW-COST HOUSING PROPOSAL

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and the Kaiser Committee on Housing are to be congratulated for recommending a new approach to public housing through Operation Turnkey.

Under the Turnkey project, private enterprise and public policy will be harnessed in an attempt to meet the heavy demand for adequate low- and middle-class housing. A private investor will be able to purchase a site, develop plans for a housing development, negotiate a purchase contract with the local housing authority, and manage the project under terms which provide a reasonable profit. Much of the responsibility is thus shifted from public to private hands.

One of the basic causes of urban discontent is the dearth of adequate, clean, low-cost housing.

President Johnson, through the Turnkey approach, has taken a giant stride forward by encouraging private developers to enter the low- and middle-class housing market.

I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit News which talks in glowing terms of the possibilities offered by the President's new pilot project for low-cost housing:

A GOOD PUBLIC HOUSING PROPOSAL

President Johnson's order establishing a pilot project designed to bring private business into the low-income public housing field is encouraging. It reflects a determination to get moving now—not after yet another in-depth study—to solve one of the most basic causes of urban discontent.

The order will step up work on the "turnkey" approach to public housing. Designed to reduce the time needed to plan and build a housing project, it enables a private investor to buy the land, build the housing and manage it under terms which provide a reasonable profit.

It is hoped that by having the local public housing authorities contract with private business in this manner, the profit motive can be harnessed with public policy to cut the red tape which has so delayed low income housing projects in the past.

There will be risks involved, and housing

authorities will have to be on guard against unreasonable profit levels being built in to their fixed fee contracts. But there are always such risks and the pilot project ordered by the President will give ample opportunity to examine the consequences.

Until recently, low income housing was not a serious problem in Detroit, but the pool of housing which existed here for years is now dry. City Housing Commissioner Robert D. Knox says we should be building at least 1,000 units a year "for the foreseeable future."

Existing programs, some of them well conceived but starved for funds, have not kept up with the pace of decay. Perhaps the "turnkey" idea will give private capital the incentive it needs to move into this long-neglected market.

WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply conscious of the frustrations arising from the complex and unresolved war in Vietnam.

Hard decisions lie before us, and we are best served if hard, unadorned facts are presented to us on the realities of the situation.

Last Friday, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara made a clear, hard, unadorned statement before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on our conduct of the air war in North Vietnam. It was a highly informative and highly significant statement, worthy of every Member's attention.

Not only are the objectives, achievements, and limitations of our air attacks clearly set forth, but the flaws in the proposals of all-out bombing advocates became self-evident.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the statement follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA BEFORE THE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, AUGUST 25, 1967

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen: I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you our conduct of the air war in North Vietnam. It is a matter of the greatest importance that the Congress and the people of the United States have a current and accurate picture of what the air campaign can and cannot accomplish. To address this issue, I should like to discuss these topics:

1. The objectives and achievements of the air war.
2. The target recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in relation to the objectives, and the extent to which the Chiefs' recommendations are being followed.
3. The proposals of those who argue that the bombing should be expanded, either on the theory that bombing can break the will of the North Vietnamese, thereby forcing them to the conference table, or that bombing can prevent the flow of military supplies into or through North Vietnam, thereby destroying its capability for continued aggression in the South.

I. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE AIR CAMPAIGN

In the light of the many recent public statements and speculations about the pur-

poses and effects of our air attacks, it seems appropriate to preface this review with a restatement of the objectives that the bombing of North Vietnamese targets was intended to serve. As I have stated many times:

Our primary objective was to reduce the flow and/or to increase the cost of the continued infiltration of men and supplies from North to South Vietnam.

It was also anticipated that these air operations would raise the morale of the South Vietnamese people who, at the time the bombing started, were under severe military pressure.

Finally, we hoped to make clear to the North Vietnamese leadership that so long as they continued their aggression against the South they would have to pay a price in the North.

The bombing of North Vietnam has always been considered a supplement to and not a substitute for an effective counter-insurgency campaign in South Vietnam.

These were our objectives when our bombing program was initiated in February of 1965. They remain our objectives today. They were and are entirely consistent with our limited purposes in Southeast Asia. We are not fighting for territorial conquests or to destroy existing governments. We are fighting there only to assure the people of South Vietnam the freedom to choose their own political and economic institutions. Our bombing campaign has been aimed at selected targets of military significance, primarily the routes of infiltration. It has been carefully tailored to accomplish its basic objectives and thus to achieve the limited purposes toward which all our activities in Vietnam are directed.

Weighed against its stated objectives, the bombing campaign has been successful. It was initiated at a time when the South Vietnamese were in fear of a military defeat. There can be no question that the bombing raised and sustained the morale of the South Vietnamese. It should be equally clear to the North Vietnamese that they have paid and will continue to pay a high price for their continued aggression. We have also made the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam increasingly difficult and costly.

Complete interdiction of these supplies has never been considered possible by our military leaders. I believe that this point has been made to you by General Wheeler, General McConnell, Admiral Sharp and General Momyer.

Our experience in Korea demonstrated the unlikelihood that air strikes or other means could choke off the minimum amounts needed to support enemy forces. The nature of the combat in Vietnam, without established battle lines and with sporadic and relatively small-scale enemy action, lessens the requirement for a steady stream of logistical support and reduces the volume of logistical support needed. Moreover, it should be noted that the geography of the infiltration routes is less favorable to interdiction than was the case in Korea. There the entire neck of the peninsula was subject to naval bombardment from either side and to air strikes across its width. The routes into South Vietnam are far more complex and protected and involve the use of territories of adjoining countries. Under these highly unfavorable circumstances, I think that our military forces have done a superb job in making continued infiltration more difficult and expensive.

Any discussion of the bombing of North Vietnam must first address the nature of the target. North Vietnam is a land of 18.5 million people. By no standards could it be considered an industrialized country. It is predominantly agricultural. Prior to initiation of the bombing, its significant industrial facilities could be counted on your fingers. It had no steel-making capacity and in 1965 its

monthly industrial production of pig iron was only 5,000 metric tons, less than 1/50 of 1% of US output. It had no real war-making industrial base and hence none which could be destroyed by bombing.

North Vietnam's ability to continue its aggression against the South thus depends upon imports of war-supporting material and their transshipment to the South. Unfortunately for the chances of effective interdiction, this simple agricultural economy has a highly diversified transportation system consisting of rails and roads and waterways. The North Vietnamese use barges and sampans, trucks and foot-power, and even bicycles capable of carrying 500-pound loads to move goods over this network. The capacity of this system is large—the volume of traffic it is now required to carry, in relation to its capacity, is small.

Precise figures on the amount of infiltrated material required to support the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces in the South are not known. However, intelligence estimates suggest that the quantity of externally supplied material, other than food, required to support the VC/NVA forces in South Vietnam at about their current level of combat activity is very, very small. The reported figure is significantly under 100 tons per day—a quantity that could be transported by only a few trucks. This is the small flow of material which we are attempting to prevent from entering South Vietnam through a pipeline which has an outlet capacity far greater than that.

Those targets along the lines of communication which can be found are attacked. From January through July, we averaged about 13,000 sorties per month over the infiltration routes and base areas. About 75 percent of these sorties were directed against line of communication (LOCs) and goods moving over them. Air strikes are reported to have destroyed over 4,100 vehicles, 7,400 water-craft and 1,400 pieces of RR rolling stock. In addition, we have struck approximately 1,900 fixed targets in North Vietnam, including 57 bridges, 50 major rail yards, troop barracks, petroleum storage tanks and power plants.

NVN has been forced to divert an estimated 300,000 full-time and at least an equal number of part-time workers and troops, to the repair, dispersal, and defense of the lines of communication and other targets which have been damaged. This diversion of some 500,000 people in a society already strained to maintain a marginal subsistence is a severe penalty.

There can be no question that the bombing campaign has and is hurting North Vietnam's war-making capability. Accordingly, they are using every propaganda means to stop the bombing. Although there are some signs that war weariness is growing, these indications are accompanied by firm expressions of resolve. There is no basis to believe that any bombing campaign, short of one which had population as its target, would by itself force Ho Chi Minh's regime into submission.

I want to repeat, however, that from the military standpoint, bombing of NVN supports our combat operations in SVN. It renders more difficult and costly the efforts of the DRV to supply both their own and VC forces on the other side of the demilitarized zone. As General Wheeler has testified, we have under constant review the advisability of adding new military targets in the North and of conducting re-strikes against rail facilities, highways, bridges, military and other war-supporting targets that have previously come under our air attack. There is continuing study of ways in which our air and naval bombardment of NVN can be made more effective in disrupting and interdicting North Vietnamese attempts to support aggression against their southern neighbors.

There also is continuing study of the optimum mix of sorties, both geographically and

in types of targets. Consideration is given to every possibility of greater effectiveness through shifts in emphasis. These studies are designed to maximize the cost that our air campaign inflicts on NVN's infiltration of men and supplies while at the same time reducing to the minimum the price that we must pay in the lives of American pilots.

These efforts to refine and improve our application of air power will, I am confident, continue as long as the necessity for bombing remains. It must, however, be recognized that no improvements and refinements can be expected to accomplish much more than to continue to put a high price tag on NVN's continued aggression.

II. THE TARGET RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

To illustrate this point, I might note that the Operating Target list, currently used by the Joint Chiefs as a basis for the planning of attacks on fixed targets, contains a total of 427 targets. Of this number, the JCS do not now recommend 68 for air attack. Of the remaining 359 targets, strikes have been authorized against 302, 85% of the total. There are only 57 targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff against which strikes have not yet been authorized. Whatever the merits of striking these 57 targets may be, I believe it is clear that strikes against them will not materially shorten the war. As a matter of fact, seven of the 57 targets are recognized by the Chiefs as of little value to the North Vietnamese war effort. For example, one is a tire plant reported to have a productive capacity of but 30 tires per day. Nine of the 57 targets are petroleum facilities which in total equal less than 6% of North Vietnam's remaining storage capacity. The present importance of such targets as these has not been shown to warrant risking the loss of American lives.

Of the remaining 41 targets, 25 are classified as lesser targets in populated, heavily defended areas; 4 as more significant targets in such areas; 3 are ports; 4 are airfields (in total the remaining MIGs based in North Vietnam approximate 20); and 5 are in the Chinese Buffer Zone. In the case of a few of these targets, the risk of direct confrontation with the Communist Chinese or the Soviet Union has thus far been deemed to outweigh the military desirability of air strikes. Others will be considered for "authorization" at a later date.

The conclusive answer to any charge that we are inhibiting the use of our air power against targets of military significance lies in the facts. As I have noted, strikes have been authorized against 85% (302 of 359) of the targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs. And the total number of fixed targets struck in North Vietnam stands now at about 1900. As further targets are authorized and additional targets are found to be of military importance, this number will increase. But the decisions to authorize new targets cannot be expected to gain different objectives than those toward which our air campaign has always been directed.

III. THE PROPOSALS OF THE CRITICS

Those who criticize our present bombing policy do so, in my opinion, because they believe that air attack against the North can be utilized to achieve quite different objectives. These critics appear to argue that our air power can win the war in the South either by breaking the will of the North or by cutting off the war-supporting supplies needed in the South. In essence, this approach would seek to use the air attack against the North not as a supplement to, but as a substitute for the arduous ground war that we and our allies are waging in the South.

It would obviously be possible for us to change our present selective bombing campaign. We could abandon the target-by-target analysis which balances the military importance of the target against its probable

cost in American lives and the risk it presents of expanding the conflict to involve new combatants. Instead, our air and naval forces might be employed against North Vietnam in an all-out attempt to break their will and thus compel them to cease their support of military efforts against the Government of South Vietnam. A somewhat less drastic revision of our air campaign might be undertaken in an effort to restrict the import of war-supporting materials so substantially as to prevent the North Vietnamese leaders from supporting their present level of military effort in South Vietnam. Any such effort would obviously require action to close the three significant North Vietnamese ports of Cam Pha, Hon Gai and, most important, Haiphong.

In order to reach a reasoned conclusion on the key question of whether to abandon our present limited bombing objectives and adopt a policy intended to achieve either of these new objectives, the chances of success must be weighed against the inevitably higher risks such revision would entail. To bring this question into perspective for the Committee, I would like to deal first with the likelihood that either of these objectives could be realized through a reorientation of our air attack against NVN.

IIIA. BREAKING THE WILL OF THE NORTH

As to breaking their will, I have seen no evidence in any of the many intelligence reports that would lead me to believe that a less selective bombing campaign would change the resolve of NVN's leaders or deprive them of the support of the North Vietnamese people. As previously pointed out, the economy of NVN is agrarian and simple. Its people are accustomed to few of the modern comforts and conveniences that most of us in the Western World take for granted. They are not dependent on the continued functioning of great cities for their welfare. They can be fed at something approaching the standard to which they are accustomed without reliance on truck or rail transportation or on food processing facilities. Our air attack has rendered inoperative about 85% of the country's central electric generating capacity, but it is important to note that the PEPCO Plant in Alexandria, Virginia generates five times the power produced by all of NVN's power plants before the bombing. It appears that sufficient electricity for war-related activities and for essential services can be provided by the some 2000 diesel-driven generating sets which are in operation.

Perhaps most important of all, the people of NVN are accustomed to discipline and are no strangers to deprivation and to death. Available information indicates that, despite some war weariness, they remain willing to endure hardship and they continue to respond to the direction of the Hanoi regime. There is little reason to believe that any level of conventional air or naval action, short of sustained and systematic bombing of the population centers, will deprive the North Vietnamese of their willingness to continue to support their Government's efforts to upset and take over the Government of SVN.

There is also nothing in the past reaction of the North Vietnamese leaders that would provide any confidence that they can't be bombed for the comfort and even the lives of the people they control does not seem to be sufficiently high to lead them to bargain for settlement in order to stop a heightened level of attack.

The course of conflict on the ground in the South, rather than the scale of air attack in the North appears to be the determining factor in NVN's willingness to continue.

Accordingly, as General Wheeler has pointed out, the air campaign in the North and our military efforts in the South are not

separate wars and certainly they should not be regarded as alternatives.

IIIB—AN EXPANDED CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE SUPPLY ROUTES WITHIN NORTH VIETNAM

It could be argued that a greatly expanded and virtually unrestricted bombing effort might substantially reduce the movement of forces and supplies through North Vietnam into SVN, even though NVN resolve remains unshaken. Recent prisoner interrogations suggest that 10-20% of the personnel dispatched to the South by the rulers of NVN never reach the battle area—about 2% are casualties caused by air attacks. A much higher percentage of the supplies sent South to support the DRV fighting forces are destroyed in transit by our armed reconnaissance and heavy bombing attacks. Conceivably an all-out air and naval bombardment might somewhat further increase the forces and supplies destroyed. But the capacity of the lines of communication and of the outside sources of supply so far exceed the minimal flow necessary to support the present level of North Vietnamese military effort in SVN that the enemy operations in the South cannot, on the basis of any reports I have seen, be stopped by air bombardment—short, that is, of the virtual annihilation of North Vietnam and its people. As General Wheeler has observed, no one has proposed such indiscriminate bombing of populated areas.

IIIC—THE CLOSING OF SEA AND LAND IMPORTATION ROUTES

This leaves, then, as a possible new objective of our air campaign, the closing of the sea and land importation routes in an attempt to prevent entry into NVN of the supplies needed to support the combat in the South. There can be no question that bombing the ports and mining the harbors, particularly at Haiphong, would interfere seriously with NVN's imports of war-supporting materials. But far less than the present volume of imports would provide the essentials for continued North Vietnamese military operations against SVN. As I have mentioned, it is estimated that the total tonnage required is less than 100 tons per day of non-food supplies. This is dwarfed by North Vietnam's actual imports of about 5800 tons per day. And its import capacity is much greater. The ports together with the roads and railroads from China have an estimated capacity of about 14,000 tons a day.

The great bulk of North Vietnamese imports now enters through Haiphong—perhaps as much as 4700 out of the 5800 tons per day. This includes most of the war-supporting material, such as trucks, generators and construction equipment but this category of supply represents only a small percentage of total sea imports. And little if any of the imported military equipment (which is estimated by intelligence sources to total 550 tons per day) comes by sea. Moreover, this present heavy reliance on Haiphong reflects convenience rather than necessity. Haiphong represents the easiest and cheapest means of import. If it and the other ports were to be closed, and on the unrealistic assumption that closing the ports would eliminate all sea-borne imports, North Vietnam would still be able to import over 8400 tons a day by rail, road and waterway. And even if, through air strikes, its roads, rail and Red River waterway capacity could all be reduced by 50 per cent, North Vietnam could maintain roughly 70 per cent of its current imports. Since the daily importation of military and war-supporting material totals far less than this, it seems obvious that cutting off sea-borne imports would not prevent North Vietnam from continuing its present level of military operations in the South.

Elimination of Haiphong and the two other ports as a source of supply would not, in fact, eliminate sea-borne imports. Our POL experience is illuminating. Our air strikes on

petroleum facilities did destroy the in-shore POL off-loading facilities in Haiphong. However, the North Vietnamese have demonstrated a capability to adjust their methods, and they now off-load POL drums into lighters and barges and bring the drums ashore at night. There is no evidence of a POL shortage and stocks on hand equal an estimated 120 days consumption.

The North Vietnam seacoast runs for 400 miles. Many locations are suitable for over-the-beach operations. The mining of Haiphong or the total destruction of the Haiphong Port facilities would not prevent off-shore unloading of foreign shipping. Effective interdiction of this lighterage, even if the inevitable damage to foreign shipping were to be accepted, would only lead to total reliance on land importation through Communist China. The common border between the two countries is about 500 air miles long.

Accordingly, bombing the ports and mining the harbors would not be an effective means of stopping the infiltration of supplies into SVN.

A selective, carefully targeted bombing campaign, such as we are presently conducting, can be directed toward reasonable and realizable goals. This discriminating use of air power can and does render the infiltration of men and supplies more difficult and more costly. At the same time, it demonstrates to both South and North Vietnam our resolve to see that aggression does not succeed. A less discriminating bombing campaign against NVN would, in my opinion, do no more. We have no reason to believe that it would break the will of the North Vietnamese people or sway the purpose of their leaders. If it does not lead to such a change of mind, bombing the North at any level of intensity would not meet our objective. We would still have to prove by ground operations in the South that Hanoi's aggression could not succeed. Nor would a decision to close Haiphong, Hon Gai and Cam Pha, by whatever means, prevent the movement in and through NVN of the essentials to continue their present level of military activity in SVN.

On the other side of the equation, our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to restate my view that the present objectives of our bombing in the North were soundly conceived and are being effectively pursued. They are consistent with our over-all purposes in Vietnam and with our efforts to confine the conflict. We are constantly exploring ways of improving our efforts to insulate South Vietnam from outside attack and support. Further refinements in our air campaign may help. I am convinced, however, that the final decision in this conflict will not come until we and our allies prove to North Vietnam she cannot win in the South. The tragic and long drawnout character of that conflict in the South makes very tempting the prospect of replacing it with some new kind of air campaign against the North. But however tempting, such an alternative seems to me completely illusory. To pursue this objective would not only be futile but would involve risks to our personnel and to our nation that I am unable to recommend.

RIGHT ON RATS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1967, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] made an excellent statement on the now celebrated rat eradication bill, entitled "Profile of a False Issue." The thrust of the statement is that there are presently three eradication programs in being, and the addition of a fourth is not appropriate when the better course would suggest consolidation of all programs for more effective administration.

The essentially political nature of this campaign to make the rat the symbol of the ills of our cities was early recognized by Daniel P. Moynihan who wrote in the Washington Post on August 4, 1967:

Talk about the rat bill is meaningless. The bill was nothing.

A not dissimilar view was expressed less forcefully in the New York Times weekly review on the same date.

Now, I am pleased to see that the truth about the rat bill is beginning to spread throughout the Nation's press. On August 11, the lead editorial in the *Corning, N.Y., Leader* said:

ARE RATS THE ISSUE

President Johnson has deplored it!
Gov. Rockefeller is shocked by it!
A group of citizens demonstrated in Congress this week because of it!
The "it" is control of rats.

The Administration had asked Congress to pass a rat eradication bill and provide \$20 million a year to the Housing and Urban Development Department for two years. The House of Representatives committee considering the measure refused to act on such a bill.

Today Congress is being criticized as inhuman, deaf to a serious problem, penny-pinching in favor of rat-biting.

Rep. Charles Goodell of this Congressional District, offered some interesting comments on the matter last Tuesday. Little attention was given to his comments—or facts presented—by the national press. Much attention is given to the press-agency of the President, Gov. Rockefeller and the demonstrators.

Congressman Goodell considers the problem of rat control as very serious. He also pointed out that there are at least three federal programs for urban rat eradication on the books and for which funds have been appropriated. They are:

1. The Department of Interior with funds available for technical assistance for rat extermination in the urban areas. Interior says all applications for funds are being met.

2. The Community Action portion of the Poverty Law provided the Office of Economic Opportunity with approximately \$323 million last year in unearmarked money that can be used for, among other things, rat eradication. Congress is now considering a proposal to increase this by nearly \$100 million.

3. Under Health, Education, and Welfare, Congress authorized \$125 million in 1966 to be given states for a variety of public health programs, including rat extermination. States and communities are applying for such funds.

Mr. Goodell properly asks why, with three laws already on the books, put a fourth federal agency in the act? "Instead," he says, "let's eliminate rat money from two agencies and allow the third to handle the whole matter." The results would be quite obvious. More funds could be available for rat eradication because only one agency would be in-

involved in administration rather than three. And it doesn't take much intelligence to realize how much would be saved in administrative costs—always a high item in any governmental operation.

The congressman maintains that those who berate Congress because of its refusal to add another federal agency to the problem, with its increased red tape and administrative costs, are raising a totally false and specious issue.

Mr. Goodell summed up the matter quite well when he said:

"With at least three existing Federal programs for urban rat eradication, is the real solution to add a fourth? That's one of the troubles with Great Society solutions. You see a problem that is not being solved by existing programs so you put a label on a new bill and give it the big public relations treatment. When the new law does not solve the problem, we have simply succeeded in compounding the frustrations of those who thought they had found a Great Society solution."

Then, on August 25, 1967, the Post Journal of Jamestown, N.Y., Mr. GOODELL's hometown, wrote the following, again as a lead editorial:

GOODELL LISTS THREE EXISTING AGENCIES FOR ERADICATION: DUPLICATION IN RAT FIGHT

Most people hate rats. And when the President proposed a rate extermination program with \$20 million a year for two years to be allotted to the project, it hit a responsive chord. The refusal of the House of Representatives to go along with the program stirred a lot of resentment and for some reason the Republicans, although in the minority, were handed a lot of the blame for the refusal.

Along with many people this newspaper wondered a little why the House would not join in a plan to get rid of rats when they seemed to be menacing the slum areas, which have been in the limelight of late. And then the facts about the President's proposal came to the front in a speech of protest about these complaints made on the floor of the House by our own Representative Charles E. Goodell.

Mr. Goodell listed three federal laws now on the books which are designed to provide money for rat eradication, and apparently none is being used to the full limit. In addition our Congressman said that he was confident that other provisions could be found in the federal machinery to assist in the extermination of rats. And now the President proposed a fourth major rat project with its expensive administration and duplication of effort.

It seems to this newspaper that Mr. Goodell is on sound ground when he suggests that the President should have come forward with a plan to consolidate the various programs in a single plan, combining the three existing funds into one. By such a proposal the cost of administration of three of the programs (including the new plan) would be eliminated and the wasteful expense could be applied to the killing of rats. As Mr. Goodell told the House, "Every time we set up an additional program, we leak off that much more money in red tape and unnecessary administrative waste."

The rejection of the newest rat program was no failure to meet responsibility to the slum areas. Rather it was an insistence on sound methods to meet the challenge and to avoid wasteful duplication of effort. The fight against rats that do great harm and threaten the safety of people living in slum type areas is vitally important and should be pressed with the greatest energy and efficiency. But it is pure nonsense, as Mr. Goodell told the House, to charge the representatives with a failure to their responsibilities by their rejection of the creation of a fourth agency to carry on the battle.

The three programs to which Mr. Goodell referred in his address provide a total of

\$448,025,000 from which urban rat eradication programs could draw along with other projects. Recently Governor Rockefeller opened a state program for the eradication of rats in New York. Other states could well make provision to participate where needed. These state funds along with the federal funds now available should be able to meet the cost of any workable plans.

The Johnson Great Society method of naming new projects and duplicating efforts and wasting funds falls far short of meeting the needs of the American people today. If existing programs are falling short of solutions, the Great Society method of creating new and additional agencies is no solution. The Congress should find ways to consolidate programs in a single agency that will work.

And finally, only Monday, Marquis Childs, the distinguished nationally syndicated columnist, said as follows:

The famous rat bill, which got only 21 Republican votes in the House is another case in point. As Goodell noted, a liberal Democrat, Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, pointed out that the \$40 million measure was a gimmick to put another agency with a high administrative overhead into the rat-exterminating business when the Public Health Service already is coordinating a series of antirrat programs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Marquis Childs' characterization of this Great Society measure is indeed apt. It was clearly a gimmick, and a studied effort was made to capitalize on the misery of less affluent Americans by injecting this false issue to inflame and aggravate the conditions which prevailed immediately following Detroit.

For us there is a lesson here to be learned on both sides of the aisle.

When faced with gimmickry, just state the facts.

IMPORTS COULD SOUND SHOE INDUSTRY'S DEATH KNEEL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, we now have the shoe import statistics for the first 6 months of 1967, and I regret that the shocking rise they took was in line with the most dire predictions.

Even before announcement of the drastic tariff concessions granted in the recently concluded GATT negotiations at Geneva, Leather and Shoes magazine published a solemn article by its Washington editor, Lloyd M. Hampton, captioned: "Picture Threatening: Imports Could Sound Shoe Industry's Death Knell." This warning declared:

The rapidly accelerating import picture has beyond doubt reached such serious proportions as to now pose a grave threat to the very existence of a number of U.S. industries, including the footwear and leather goods manufacturing sectors.

Now we are told by the national affairs committee of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association that the import of footwear increased 32 percent to a total of 93,804,000 pairs during the first half of 1967. The hike for leather

type footwear alone was 35 percent or a total of 67,142,000 pairs—excluding slippers, athletic, and work shoes.

This means that the total footwear imports were 24.5 percent of domestic production from January through June of 1967, compared to 17 percent for the same period a year ago. The first 6 months' domestic production this year was estimated at 383,500,000 pairs—300,327,000 pairs of leather types and 83,173,000 pairs of rubber footwear.

The Leather and Shoes magazine article I have quoted went on to conclude that the best hope for saving the American shoe, leather, and other industries is the enactment by Congress of the Orderly Marketing Act, of which I am pleased to be a sponsor and which has the strong endorsement of both shoe and leather manufacturers and labor unions.

Like the hat and textile industries—

Editor Hamilton wrote in that article—immediate relief for the footwear sector must be forthcoming before ruinous foreign competition completes the job of wiping it out entirely.

With the Kennedy round agreements letting down the bars for still further imports, and in the wake of the dramatic rise in imports thus far this year, the Haverhill, Mass., Gazette has also issued a renewed appeal for the orderly marketing legislation.

The import situation seemed serious in previous years—

Observes the Gazette—

but this year is surpassing anything envisioned earlier and indications are it can get much worse without Congressional action.

In the hope that they will inspire greater congressional support for the earliest possible action to prevent the dissolution of our shoe and other industries, with the consequent loss of jobs, I shall here quote the texts of both of the commentaries to which I have referred. They follow:

[From Leather and Shoes magazine]

PICTURE THREATENING: IMPORTS COULD SOUND SHOE INDUSTRY'S DEATH KNEEL

(By Lloyd M. Hampton, Washington editor)

The rapidly accelerating import picture has beyond doubt reached such serious proportions as to now pose a grave threat to the very existence of a number of U.S. industries, including the footwear and leather goods manufacturing sectors.

Besides clobbering our domestic marketing position, skyrocketing imports have resulted in laying at our doorstep an array of other domestic economic miseries. We have also imported unemployment and poverty; general industry insecurity; a further dimming of consumer demand; and the very real possibility of killing outright the footwear manufacturing segment.

In the face of what is happening, there remains little if any validity to the argument that tariff schedules, antidumping laws and other traditional trade flow controls have proven effective in curbing shipments of footwear to this country. The statistics speak for themselves. The figures are alarming. The U.S. shoe producer today is having hurled at him a brand of unfair competition unparalleled in American history.

Footwear is pouring ashore here at the expense of our people. Goods allowed to enter the nation in such unequalled, inundating quantity have had the effect of undermining their wages and employment.

In the area of reciprocal trade, it is an acknowledged fact in and out of Government that "no such thing" exists where footwear is concerned. U.S. shoe duties are the lowest of any trading nation in the world, while tariffs levied by foreign countries on American-manufactured footwear range from two to four times our level. For instance, U.S. tariffs on foreign shoe products range from five to 20 percent, with the average around 12 percent—a considerably less margin than overseas rates levied against our products.

By sharp contrast, the net duty-plus-tax barriers imposed by a number of other nations on U.S. shoes show the following: Canada, 52 percent; Japan, 20–50 percent; Italy, 27–29 percent . . . figures that can hardly be described as unfair to the foreign producer.

The shoe industry is not alone in this frightening import situation. Many other trade groups are threatened by the problem also. A trade monster that emerged and came full blown since 1945, the import battle has arrived at a point critical to the survival of American industry and jobs throughout our economy. Like the hat and textile industries, immediate relief for the footwear sector must be forthcoming before ruinous foreign competition completes the job of wiping it out entirely.

Fortunately for the shoe, leather and several other industries, there are an increasing number of lawmakers who are deeply concerned about the import problem. Among those Congressmen who have thus far moved to provide legislative relief for the industry there must be singled out House Members William H. Bates, (R.), and James A. Burke, (D.), both of Massachusetts. Long-time import foes, the two recently introduced Orderly Marketing bills via their companion measures, H.R. 87 (Bates) and H.R. 88 (Burke). Decidedly a step in the right direction, both proposals have been passed along to the House Ways and Means Committee. The Committee, chaired by Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., includes Rep. Burke.

With time fast running out, the strongest possible effort should be made by the House to expedite action on the Orderly Marketing and Tariff Schedules bills. Once passed, the pair of bills should help alleviate the import threat. By the same token, Sen. Edmund Muskie's proposed Orderly Marketing Act of 1967 (S. 1446) should be given the same degree of positive support by the Upper House (where it has been) introduced by the Maine legislator.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette,
Aug. 25, 1967]

LIMIT SHOE IMPORTS

Shoe workers, in Haverhill and throughout the country, need all the support they can get in their fight to keep the American market from being flooded any further with foreign-made shoes, being dumped here by countries interested only in getting American dollars.

The union representing the workers in this city, the United Shoe Workers of America, AFL-CIO, is doing an especially good job in its efforts to protect the jobs of its members. Its national leaders in Washington have been working hard to stem the flow of cheaply made imports.

There is no question, either, about the efforts of our men in Congress to hold back the tide. Cong. William H. Bates is co-sponsor with Cong. James Burke of this state and Sen. Edmund Muskie of Maine of a bill known as the Orderly Marketing Act, now before both houses of Congress.

The bills would authorize the setting of quotas on importations of goods produced with cheap labor when it is found they are damaging domestic producers.

This would strengthen American defense against "dumping," the practice of offering goods at lower prices in the United States

than prices charged in other established markets. There are many complaints that the Treasury Department, charged with investigations in these matters, is so lax the Tariff Commission cannot act until widespread damage is caused to American industry and workers.

The shoe industry needs legislation like that of Bates, Burke and Muskie to give it protection from completely unscrupulous tactics against which American manufacturers cannot possibly compete.

On an otherwise equal basis, American shoe manufacturers can turn out a better product faster and more economically than their foreign counterparts, but they have no defense against the low-priced labor and government-subsidized prices of the countries which choose to "dump" their goods here.

It is obvious from the work of members of Congress from strong shoe-producing states, that the shoe industry is one of the most vulnerable when it comes to dumping.

Since our men in Washington are so clearly aware of what is happening, and are working so hard to do something about it, they deserve help.

We urge that shoe workers and others whose livelihoods are affected by the shoe industry conduct a campaign to enlist support for the union officials and the members of Congress who are already working on their behalf.

Write to other Congressmen and Senators and ask them to support the Orderly Marketing Act. Urge them to make the Tariff Commission increasingly aware of the completely unfair competition being waged against an important American industry.

Because the recent Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations did not provide any significant protection for the shoe industry, this limitation by quota is needed before countries like Italy, Japan and others with similar ideas crowd American-made shoes right out of the stores.

The import situation seemed serious in previous years, but this year is surpassing anything envisioned earlier and indications are it can get much worse without Congressional action. The union officials and the Congressmen need support in their efforts to get that action.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. ASPINALL, from August 31, 1967, to October 16, 1967, on account of official business in his congressional district.

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. SMITH of Oklahoma, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 1 hour, on August 31; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE), for 15 minutes, on August 31; 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:

Mr. BLANTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUDE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. PATTEN.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 974. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the city of Glendale, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1477. An act to amend section 301 of title III of the act of Aug. 14, 1946, relating to the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a National Advisory Committee, to provide for annual meetings of such committee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1568. An act to amend the sixth paragraph of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, relating to restrictions on eligibility for loans by Federal Land Banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the late Walt Disney and for the issuance of bronze medals to the California Institute of the Arts in recognition of the distinguished public service and the outstanding contributions of Walt Disney to the United States and to the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1633. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1960, relating to the Potomac interceptor sewer, to increase the amount of the Federal contribution to the cost of that sewer.

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 were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 547. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location to replace the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 29, 1967, present to the President, for his ap-

proval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 804. An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 31, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5605. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10835. A bill to establish the National Park Foundation; with amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11847. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 12705. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, by creating single-officer general and special courts-martial, providing for law officers on special courts-martial, affording accused persons an opportunity to be represented in certain special court-martial proceedings by counsel having the qualifications of defense counsel detailed for general courts-martial, providing for certain pretrial proceedings and other procedural changes, authorizing the Judge Advocate General to grant relief in certain court-martial cases, extending the time within which an accused may petition for a new trial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12706. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12707. A bill authorizing construction of certain navigation channel improvements on the Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black in Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12708. A bill to amend the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 to provide that the Members of Congress who represent the counties of Maryland and Virginia adjacent to the District of Columbia shall be ex officio members of the National Capital Planning

Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12709. A bill to designate the bridge authorized by the act of October 4, 1966, as the Light Horse Harry Lee Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 12710. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance to any country which is 6 months or more in arrears with respect to payment of its assessed share of United Nations expenses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 12711. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12712. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase (from \$1,500 to \$3,000) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12713. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12714. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12715. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the temporary rate of duty for color television picture tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 12718. A bill to amend section 403 of title 23, United States Code, to authorize research on certain specified problems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12719. 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. PETTIS:

H.R. 12720. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 12721. A bill relating to the prohibition of riots and incitement to riot in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12722. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 12723. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 12724. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend city delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the late Walt Disney and for the issuance of bronze medals to the California Institute of the Arts in recognition of the distinguished public service and the outstanding contributions of Walt Disney to the United States and to the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12725. A bill for the relief of Walid Y. Kirma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12726. A bill for the relief of Nashaiat Y. Kirma and his wife, Suad M. Kirma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12727. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Salunga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12728. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Caprara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12729. A bill for the relief of Sabato Ruberto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12730. A bill for the relief of Giovanni DiMaggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12731. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Castellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12732. A bill for the relief of Erlinda Inducil Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12733. A bill for the relief of Catherine Veronica Conlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 12734. A bill for the relief of Calogero Gianbrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1967

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 29, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, amid the tensions of these terrific days, we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty.

In these days with destiny, grant that those who here speak to the Nation, and for the Republic, may be true to their high calling as servants of the common good.

We come in deep anxiety concerning the world the next generation will inherit from our hands.

Facing decisions with destiny, unite our hearts and minds, we beseech Thee, in a mighty purpose that our Nation's strength, material and spiritual, be dedicated to throw open the gates of more abundant life for all mankind.