

ment of the Senate until Monday, October 16, 1967.

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before I move to adjourn, would the Chair kindly state the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 2171, a bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Presiding Officer.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 16, 1967, at 12 noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12, 1967:

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

John Walter Hechinger, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

Walter E. Fauntroy, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

The following-named persons to be members of the District of Columbia Council for the terms indicated:

##### TERMS EXPIRING FEBRUARY 1, 1968

Margaret A. Haywood, of the District of Columbia.

J. C. Turner, of the District of Columbia. Joseph P. Yeldell, of the District of Columbia.

##### TERMS EXPIRING FEBRUARY 1, 1969

John A. Nevius, of the District of Columbia.

##### TERMS EXPIRING FEBRUARY 1, 1970

Stanley J. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.

William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia.

Polly Shackleton, of the District of Columbia.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12, 1967:

##### SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

##### U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Lawrence A. Whipple, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Juan B. Fernandez-Badillo, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

Damon J. Keith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

##### U.S. ATTORNEYS

William A. Meadows, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

Calvin K. Hamilton, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri for the term of 4 years.

Yoshimi Hayashi, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years.

##### U.S. MARSHAL

Guy W. Hixon, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Manuel Norat, a Great Hair Stylist

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, last week in Cincinnati, Ohio, the Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, AFL-CIO, held the 1967 all-American barber spectacular and first annual U.S.A. championships in men's hairstyling. I was very pleased to learn that an Alaska man, Manuel Norat of Anchorage, won fourth place in the open free style international competition. In this competition Mr. Norat competed with barbers from around the world. He is the first from Alaska to achieve such an honor. The 49th State is fortunate to have such fine representation. We are indeed proud of his achievement. The winner of the championship was Mr. Daniel Ruidant of Belgium.

Mr. Norat will be making a further contribution to Alaska and to men's hairstyling. He has been designated as a superior hairstylist qualified to conduct advanced training classes for barbers. This November he will begin the first classes of this kind in Alaska. Conducted by the Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, AFL-CIO, this training will upgrade the skills of the profession in Alaska.

Not only is Manuel Norat a great hair stylist; he is a distinguished Alaskan and American, and a very fine gentleman.

I congratulate Manuel Norat on these

accomplishments. They are a fine contribution to his State.

### Mrs. D. W. Bond, of Jackson, Tenn.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding longtime farm leaders of my district passed away last Friday.

Mrs. D. W. Bond, of Jackson, has led a life of dedication to her community and to her State and to the farming people everywhere. She was 86 years old when she died, yet she has been active in the Madison County Farm Bureau until quite recently.

Mrs. Bond was a charter member of the Madison County Farm Bureau, and has been its secretary and a director since its beginning. She had been on the board of the Tennessee Farm Bureau ever since it was founded.

In 1924, she was chairman of the Women's Department of Tennessee, and promoted farm women throughout the State. She served as director on the Tennessee Rural Health Improvement Association, the Southern Region of American Farm Bureau Women, Tennessee Mental Health Association, Tennessee Library Committee, and various committees and boards in west Tennessee and the State.

"Progressive Farmer" magazine named her the "Woman of the Year" in 1945, and she has been recognized throughout the South and the Nation by awards,

certificates of achievement, and recognition and other honors.

She was one of the early organizers of the National Cotton Council, and a charter member of the Mid-South Cotton Growers Association.

The people of Jackson, and the State of Tennessee are deeply saddened at the passing of one of our most outstanding women leaders, one who devoted her life to rural improvement.

### The Great Accomplishments of Ray Charles

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned that during the summer, the city of Los Angeles formally adopted a resolution declaring Ray Charles Day in Los Angeles. In view of the inspirational way in which he has overcome handicaps, I am delighted that he was given this recognition. His great success in the world of entertainment is well known, but it is less well known that despite his own blindness, he has found time to participate in various charitable endeavors.

Ray Charles is chairman of the Sickle Cell Anemia Foundation, raising funds for research for this thus far incurable blood disease, and has assisted the Christmas Seal Foundation, Radio Free Europe, Children's Asthma Research, United Way, the Heart Association and

Armed Forces Radio Service, and has given concerts to our servicemen.

Born to poverty and blind since the age of seven, Ray Charles has conquered handicaps which would have floored any person except the most indomitable. He has used his natural talents and has honed them to a sharp perfection.

He has many imitators, but none can match the individuality of his style. Frank Sinatra has aptly referred to him as "the giant of our profession."

The pain of his early life and the hardships he has overcome are part of the Ray Charles sound. The term "soul singing" seems to have been coined for him.

He now lives on the west coast with a lovely wife and three fine sons who he cannot see physically. However, Ray Charles has a sixth sense which is like an inner eye with which he can see more deeply than many of us who lack his sensitivity. I join with many of my colleagues in wishing him many more years of satisfaction and solid accomplishment.

**"Horizons in Science and Technology":  
Address by Senator Howard H. Baker,  
Jr., at Georgetown University**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. ALBERT GORE**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] before the Middle East Institute's annual meeting at Georgetown University, Friday, September 29, 1967. The subject of the address is "Horizons in Science and Technology."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**HORIZONS IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

(By SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., before Middle East Institute, at Georgetown University, September 29, 1967)

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you today a problem which is of vital concern to all of us here, bringing peace to the troubled Middle East.

The situation in the Middle East presents a unique opportunity and challenge to peace-loving men throughout the world. Rarely in history, I suppose, has such great effort been given by so many men and nations to find a peaceful solution to a conflict between nations as has been expended over the Middle East. In the United Nations and in the governments of a dozen countries around the world there have been efforts to find a satisfactory solution to the problems and attritions which plague Israel and the Arab countries. Unfortunately no solution has yet been found.

Solving our problems by peaceful means will suffer a severe setback if we fail in the Middle East. Thus, the opportunity and challenge to use every means at our disposal to find a workable solution to these problems are tremendous.

I firmly believe that if the people of the

Middle East can be provided an opportunity to share in the prosperity of the more broadly developed world, the stresses and strains which have produced three costly wars in recent years will be greatly reduced.

Those of us in Congress are not unmindful of this awesome responsibility or of the conditions which have created the conflict. I have long been convinced that the key to the dispute lies in the chronic shortage of fresh water and arable land. Water, Work and Food are three elements desperately needed if we are to erase the territorial and refugee problems.

Recognizing the need for water, work and food, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission under President Truman and chairman of the AEC under President Eisenhower, developed a plan to use nuclear energy to produce large quantities of fresh water by desalting sea water.

When the plan was first presented, there was some question whether it was technically feasible. But today, it is clearly within the realm of our nuclear technology not only to do this but to do it in a fully economic and competitive manner.

General Eisenhower, who cooperated fully with Admiral Strauss in the development of this plan is actively working to see it pushed to fruition. In order to speed the process somewhat, I have introduced a resolution which would make it the sense of the Senate to endorse the proposal and to urge the President to make it American policy to see it implemented.

I am pleased to report that 52 senators of both parties and all ideological persuasions have joined me as cosponsors of the resolution. I am further pleased to note that Vice President Humphrey in a recent speech referred to the Eisenhower-Strauss plan as an attractive alternative.

The plan, which Admiral Strauss has recently revised and updated in line with the most advanced developments in the nuclear field, envisions the construction first, of a 6600 megawatt thermal desalting reactor which would produce 450 million gallons of fresh water per day at a cost of about \$200 million. Two other plants, one of equal size, the other somewhat smaller, would also be constructed. It is planned that they would be self-financing. I will discuss the method of financing in a moment.

This quantity of fresh water, more than the combined flow of the major tributaries of the Jordan River, would immediately provide an abundance of water for irrigation and industry. Of equal importance, however, is the fact that the construction of the desalting plant and of the water and power distribution systems will immediately provide jobs for many of the untrained and unskilled refugees in the area. After completion of the plant, the enormous expansion of available arable land will provide a tremendous demand for agricultural workers.

Thus, construction of the plants would provide enough work for the unskilled and unemployed refugees, enough water to irrigate the land which in turn would provide continuing work and food for the people of the area.

This, then, would remove much of the source of irritation among the peoples of the area in their disputes over the available water from the Jordan and its tributaries and the arable land.

Earlier I mentioned that the Eisenhower Plan provided an unusual if not a unique method of financing. I believe that you are all familiar with the fiscal problems facing this Congress. As a result the Foreign Aid program requested by the Administration has been cut in the House and Senate by \$647 million and \$837 million, respectively. It does not take unusual political insight to recognize that new foreign aid commitments, no matter how attractive nor of what signif-

icance, will have rough sledding in the Congress. General Eisenhower and Admiral Strauss have proposed that the financing of the Middle East project be funded through an international corporation modeled after our own Comsat. (I have proposed that the corporation be named MEND for Middle East Nuclear Desalting Corporation, but like most other aspects of the proposal, only the results are important, not the details.) Admiral Strauss, with his vast experience in international finance is convinced that the world banking community will enthusiastically support this project. For the United States to make an investment in this project seems far more likely than to expect an outright grant when we are faced with the continuing costs of the Vietnam War and our domestic problems. It is interesting, however, to note that even the total cost of this project, which is estimated to be no more than \$1 billion, is well under the estimated cost of \$2 billion which the five-day war in the Middle East this past spring is estimated to have cost, or the fact that our foreign aid to the countries involved has totaled nearly \$3 billion over the past 20 years.

Finally, I would like to discuss an aspect of the Eisenhower Plan which has not attracted sufficient attention yet, but which I feel probably offers the most hope for achieving peace in the Middle East. As we all know, we have reached a communications stalemate in solving the crisis. The Arabs won't talk to the Israelis and the Israelis won't talk to the Arabs. Other governments have tried without apparent success to bring the warring parties together. International organizations have met with a similar and notable lack of success in bridging the gap. We are thus faced with a total vacuum in the all important effort to resolve a most unhappy situation. The establishment of an international corporation such as MEND, which has as its very core the objective of solving the problems of the Middle East, will provide a forum at which both sides may reach a common understanding for their own national interests, unencumbered by previous biases and influences. I do believe that the very nature of this corporation can and should be used as a vehicle to accomplish what individual national interests cannot today accomplish. Creation of such an entity would provide a non-national third party with which both the Arabs and Israelis could talk.

Another thing that excites me about the Eisenhower-Strauss proposal is the fact that this would be a major breakthrough in the use of the constructive power of nuclear energy to make peace rather than using its destructive power to prosecute war.

**Post Office Should Issue Stamp Marking  
50th Anniversary of Independence for  
Three Baltic States**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to work toward the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp to mark the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

This proposal was originally made by the Independence for Baltic States Committee of Washington and Baltimore.

This committee has informed me that approximately 283 of my colleagues in the House and 54 Members of the U.S. Senate are supporting the issuance of this stamp. This widespread support in the Congress clearly demonstrates the great deal of interest this proposal has generated.

It has come to my attention that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee of the Post Office Department will meet on Friday, October 13, 1967, to discuss its 1968 stamp program. I would strongly urge members of this committee to give favorable consideration to the issuance of a commemorative stamp in 1968 marking the 50th anniversary of independence for the three Baltic States.

### The Morality of Our Commitments in Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current debate in both Chambers of Congress about the Vietnam war, I would like to enclose in the RECORD at this point a recent speech I made on the subject.

I was invited by my church, the First Methodist Church in Adamsville, Tenn., to deliver the Layman's Day address on Sunday, October 8. For my topic, I chose "The Morality of Our Commitments to Vietnam."

The theme I have tried to emphasize in this speech is that when we debate our commitments in Vietnam, we somehow have lost the perspective of the full picture. Too often we ignore history, and more often do we ignore the long-range future.

The remarks I made at my hometown church are as follows:

#### THE MORALITY OF OUR COMMITMENTS IN VIETNAM

It is an honor for me to speak before this congregation on Layman's Day. I am humbled at the opportunity.

The theme of my message concerns a subject of major importance for all Christians. It is—"The Morality of Our Commitments to Vietnam".

Our country was settled by religious people. Our Declaration of Independence invoked Divine Providence to guide our people through the perilous days of the Revolution. In fact, down through our entire history, our Christian heritage has been as deeply rooted as the very democratic system of government it spawned.

This heritage poses a paradox for our government. Because of this deep Christian framework, the actions of our government are always scrutinized by citizens on the basis of whether activities are morally right or wrong.

In Russia a recent public opinion poll published by TASS indicated only 20 percent of the people have any belief in God. In a state-run society like they have, it is no wonder the people are passive and do not inquire into the motives of their government's policies.

This passiveness of the Communist people in regard to their own government leaves their leaders free to pursue aggressive policies almost free from dissent from the inside. Yet, here in our country, the morality of our government's actions are often challenged openly—in the streets, in the pulpits, and in the free press.

I have given you a contrast to show you that it is difficult for a democratic society to run its government. And when it feels obligated to pursue policies it feels in the nation's best interests, it must sometimes—indeed often times—provoke much dissent at home. Dissent is both helpful, and necessary, in a country which was born out of dissent.

In Vietnam today, this country has more than half a million young men fighting a war. It has provoked much dissent here at home and abroad. Many have charged that we are morally wrong, that our actions go against the conscience of our heritage.

The simple fact is that because of morality in our decision-making processes, we have been less imperialistic than most of the world expects us to be. We are in many ways the Rome of the 20th century—the mightiest nation in our era and in the history of civilization. With just one-sixth of the world's population, we have more than one-half its wealth.

We could have conquered half the world in the past few decades—and probably could today if we wanted to. Yet our policy-making processes are so orientated toward doing the moral thing in respect to the rest of the world that we have been restrained from an aggressive path.

One very influential Senator has written a best seller entitled "The Arrogance of Power". He feels the United States is very imperialistic because of our power. He is wrong. When we exploded the first atom bomb 18 years ago, we used it to end a war, not to start one. And we have not used it since. It is our morality, our conscience which prohibits its use. We alone had the atomic power to conquer any nation we wanted to in the closing days of the World War II. We could have annihilated all our then existing enemies, and those we believed our future enemies. But our morality restrained us.

The real aggressor in Vietnam and the World today is not the United States of America. The real aggressors are Russia and Communist China. The arrogance of power is an apt description of Communism—not western democracy.

Without any Christian heritage to guide them in their dealings with other peoples, these atheist countries have not been reluctant in plundering, killing and conquering. For those of you who might not remember—and for those politicians who claim they have been brainwashed—let me cite some examples:

1. The Russians have built an iron curtain around numerous weak Eastern European countries, too feeble to defend themselves after the ravages of World War II. Let us inquire into the morality of the conquest of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia.

2. In Asia, the Russians imposed their will on Mongolia, while the Chinese atheists were and are today committing genocide against the very religious people of Tibet.

3. It is not the United States that has insurrectionists and terrorists in Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia. It is not our government that has trained and armed terrorists in 23 countries of the world.

4. It is not the United States that is fighting India's troops in Sikkim this past week.

These are but a few glimpses into what atheistic Communism—masquerading as peace lovers—are doing in the world today. Communist governments look upon their

people as units to produce for the state—not individuals. It is no wonder that dissent in communist countries is met swiftly by imprisonment or death. It is no wonder—without a conscience to guide them—millions of people behind the Iron Curtain died in the Stalin purges, and presently the Chinese Cultural Revolution?

Aggression is nothing new to the Communist. Our reaction is not new to them either. We met their challenge in Korea. We repulsed their aggression with force. Today, the same totalitarian philosophy which has made slaves of their own people is trying to do the same thing to the poor and backward people of tiny South Vietnam.

The strategy is typical. While outwardly they seek to appear as wanting peace with the rest of the world, they secretly ignite the fires of war. If the co-existence they talk of is the same co-existence they have shown in their actions in the Dominican Republic, in Cuba and the Vietnams of the world today—then it is a fraud. When we respond with our power, they immediately shed crocodile tears in the forums of the world to cast the role of aggressor on us.

They have succeeded, unfortunately, in convincing much of the world—and even some of our own brightest minds—that we are at fault in Vietnam.

The Communists are no fools. They are masters of deceit and treachery. There is nothing they would not do to see our prestige and power defeated. Lest we not forget that Stalin even allied himself with Hitler in 1939 when he thought it would help Russia. Then he begged us to help him after Hitler turned against him.

They know our power. But, they also know our policy-making processes. They know that the morality in the decisions we make would not permit us to attack them first. They know too that they could not risk a direct nuclear confrontation with us. And since they know that Communism is a dogma that cannot flourish until the last vestiges of free enterprise is gone, they seek to weaken us, to destroy us, by bogging us down in limited wars which drain our economy and our manpower.

The Communist-inspired "wars of liberation" are the strategic weapon against the United States in a day when nuclear warfare would otherwise mean defeat. Here in these far-off brush wars rests their only hope in beating America. The land that is the stage of these wars is destroyed. This means nothing to the Communists. It is the chance to weaken us that is their goal and only concern.

In Vietnam, we are fighting Russia and China by proxy, just as we did in Korea 15 years ago.

The bullets that kill our young men are not made in Vietnam. North Vietnam is so disorganized and ravaged by our bombings that munitions cannot be produced in the quantity their troops need. The bullets and bombs which have snuffed out the lives of almost 15 thousand Americans—the bullets that have killed thousands of Vietnamese soldiers, and thousands of helpless women and children in the villages—they were made in Russia and China, and their puppets.

The same lies we hear out of Russia today are the same lies that we have heard for the past 50 years—and under their smoke-screen have passed half the world's population.

It angers me for people to say that it is immoral for America to stand with the Vietnamese in defense of their country. It angers me because Vietnam is in reality a frontier for the entire world against a bigger, more powerful enemy than the ragged Viet Cong peasants could ever be.

The morality of our commitments in Vietnam goes beyond the fact that we are duty-bound to honor our treaty with the South Vietnamese. It goes beyond a commitment

to defend a mere piece of Asian real estate. The morality is that we have to stand up to Godless Communism in Asia, or else we will have to fight them on our own shores someday.

As Christians, we all have a stake in Vietnam. We also have a duty to the young Americans we have sent into battle there. But we also have a duty to those men who gave their lives in Korea, in the two World Wars, and in the battles for self-preservation we fought in the last century. For if we fail now, haven't we in effect turned the victories of past wars into defeats? Have those who have died before us merely bought some extra time for our country?

The spilling of blood, the snuffing out of an individual's earthly existence—these are alien to our faith. But when the very faith is being put on the firing—when it faces an enemy who would prohibit our faith in God—then we must resort to the powers we have to stand before that tyranny.

I am not pleased with all aspects of the Vietnam war.

I am not happy to see Americans maimed and crippled and sent home in boxes to weeping parents. I am not happy to see our resources, our great wealth, being diverted from use in our own communities because of its need 13,000 miles away.

But we are doing the only moral thing we can do. We cannot abandon helpless people to the savagery of these aggressors. We cannot tire of our commitments and cause the collapse of all Southeast Asia. We cannot lay down our arms and run in the face of an enemy. We no longer live in an isolated world.

The real brainwashing today is the brainwashing of good-intentioned people into thinking we are not morally right. History depends on our steadfastness. It would indeed be our failure to our Christian heritage if we told the world today that the strongest defender of Christianity no longer believes in the right of peoples everywhere to self-determination and freedom.

The defense of freedom is a heavy burden for this generation to shoulder. But if we appease when we should stand firm, we only shift that burden to our children. This would be immoral.

**Nebraska's Achievements in Education, Competition, and Patriotism**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Nebraska has had occasion to feel great pride in the accomplishments of three of its citizens who have been brought to national attention during recent months. Two of its young people have been a particular source of pride.

Jennifer Reinke, age 14, of Deshler, Nebr., won the 40th Annual National Spelling Bee in June of this year. Before competing in the national contest here in Washington, Jennifer met and defeated competitors on the county, district, and State levels.

We are equally proud of Kenneth Cline, age 13, of Lincoln, Nebr. On August 19 of this year Ken won the National Soap Box Derby contest. In

addition to winning the race itself, Ken also won the best design trophy. He says that he spent over 1,400 hours building his car. It has a 15-coat handrubbed lacquer finish, rabbit fur upholstery, adjustable suspension system and a dual-cable adjustable angle brake. Ken is going to be a designer and racer of sports cars someday.

Young people such as Jennifer and Ken are the key to the future progress of our Nation.

The first district can also point with great pride to William E. Galbraith of Beemer, Nebr., who was recently elected American Legion Commander. Commander Galbraith's filling of this post follows a career of service within the Legion organization itself and in his own community. In 1965 he received the School Bell Award from the Nebraska State Education Association for outstanding contributions as a layman to the cause of education, and the Schoolmasters Award for similar service.

He has been both schoolteacher and farmer and is now managing his own livestock feeder business in addition to participating in the direction of the First Fidelity Insurance Co., of Nebraska, and the Community Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Nebraska's pride in these three citizens is well founded. The standards of excellence in achievement they have established, both teenagers and adult, reflect a willingness to serve and to work. Standards such as these have produced American individuality and excellence in the past. This country needs more of this kind of performance.

**Resource Conservation and Development Projects**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, in several areas of this Nation of abundant natural resources, the economic opportunities of the citizens do not match the potential provided by land and water. There are not enough jobs; farm income is low; industry and marketing facilities are inadequate. To bring these areas and their people into the mainstream of American economic progress requires special efforts and good coordination of those efforts.

An outgrowth of the soil and water conservation movement is providing this spark in 41 areas of about 2 million acres each—resource conservation and development projects, authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. These projects draw on the experiences of these decades of conservation which have shown that where land is used and treated properly, where water is managed carefully, benefits go beyond the individual property to broader economic improvement in entire communities.

In these projects all segments of the community—rural, suburban, and urban—work together to solve local problems and improve resource use. Programs of Government agencies already at work increase their efforts, and leadership is provided by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. All together, it is a highly effective team, whose efforts can already be measured on the land and in the pocketbook.

In the 20 multicounty areas authorized for USDA operations assistance by July 1, 1,894 specific measures had been activated by that date; 473 of these have already been completed and 520 others are being installed.

The project measures cover a wide range of activities to conserve, develop, and improve the natural resources, provide more employment, improve public facilities, and better community life in the project areas. For example, 387 measures concern development of recreation facilities, to help meet our growing needs for outdoor recreation and at the same time provide a source of added income. Nearly 200 have to do with multiple-purpose water developments to provide water for farm, city, and industrial uses; water for wildlife and recreation; and protection against flooding. Eighty-three measures are designed to increase processing and marketing facilities that will make use of local farm crops and woodlands.

After all measures are installed, and developments completed, more than 47,000 man-years of continuing annual employment are expected to be provided.

Five additional projects have moved into the operations stage since July 1. In the remaining 16 projects, local leaders have been at work, taking stock of the natural resources of their areas and planning together for development and wise use of those resources.

The R.C. & D. project approach is quickly proving its merit as a way of molding local resources and local initiative to make communities better places to live and work. It puts life and action into the rural areas development concept.

**A Proposal To Bring the Remains of Christopher Columbus to Washington, D.C., for Permanent Burial**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this Columbus Day, 455 years after the discovery of America, I wish to join my colleagues in commemorating the courage and daring of this great Italian explorer.

He faced opposition, fear, superstition, and an uncharted sea to discover a new world of opportunity for all men who searched for a better life.

Christopher Columbus is buried today

in the Cathedral of Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic. Because his vast discovery brought the world to the North American Continent, I am today proposing that our Government enter into preliminary discussions with the Government of the Dominican Republic for the purpose of exploring the possibility of transferring the remains of Christopher Columbus to a permanent resting place in Washington, D.C., so that a suitable monument to his vision and genius may be built and shared by all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the cosponsors of legislation to make Columbus Day a legal holiday in the United States, as well. This legislation is overdue. We, who owe so much to this outstanding Italian explorer and the men who braved the unknown Atlantic to follow him, should at the earliest opportunity make every effort to announce to the world our debt to his genius.

A permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus would be a beacon for all who envision a better, richer world. Washington, D.C., the capital of the free world is the logical place for such a monument.

Columbus is part of each of us. A monument dedicated to his greatness will reflect in some small measure our depth of appreciation and gratitude.

He deserves to take his place among the heroes who have brought the full benefits of the North and South American Continents to men of all races, creeds, and nationalities around the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope our Government will seriously consider undertaking these discussions at the earliest opportunity.

### Columbus Day Celebration

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Columbus Day has come to mean more than the honoring of this visionary's lofty achievement in discovering America. It has become an occasion to mark the courage and fortitude of subsequent immigrants.

Minority groups representing millions of immigrants have come to identify with him, for his undaunted spirit was the same as that of their forebears who came to this country in search of new vistas. Whether their ancestors came to this country willingly or of necessity, the virtues that enabled Columbus to succeed still hold promise of rewards.

Our able colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, has long been a champion of those who came to our shores as strangers and contributed immeasurably to our country's greatness; of those who through their toil and loyalty and devotion to America and their families have

demonstrated as no "demonstration project" could, the wealth of opportunity this Nation offers; of those who transferred to their children their sense of responsibility and their ideals of good citizenship.

At a Columbus Day celebration in Detroit, Mich., on October 8, the gentleman from New Jersey eloquently expressed his deep devotion and understanding of these loyal Americans.

On this Columbus Day, I submit Mr. RODINO's remarks for the RECORD:

#### COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATION

(Remarks of the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Detroit, Mich., October 8, 1967)

I am delighted to be here with you in the Motor City to join in the annual celebration of one of the great, unexcelled moments in all recorded history—the opening of an entire new world to civilization.

From earliest boyhood, this has been a favorite holiday of mine, and with the passing years I have lost none of my youthful enthusiasm for it. I hope I never grow too old, too hardened, too blasé to enjoy and relish this festive event when we render fitting tribute to the one-time weaver from Genoa, whose vision, skill and courage made possible that great moment of discovery.

The celebration of Columbus Day traditionally serves a twofold purpose. It is an occasion for festive social gatherings, and a time for solemn contemplation. Fun and frolic have their place. So, of course, does serious thought.

And, tonight's happy occasion is one of the few bright spots in an otherwise gray and somber year.

It has been a long, distressing season of depressing events, what with the rash of rioting in our cities, the outbreak of war and tenuous truce in the middle east, and the unsilent guns and elusive peace in Viet Nam.

Clearly, the situation could be better.

And yet, for all the noisy, raucous demonstrations and counter-demonstrations; for all the violent hate-America rallies; for all the carping and criticism, I have yet to discover a better nation in all the world.

Despite its flaws and failings, the United States remains the most democratic, the most prosperous, the most forward-looking, the most humane nation on the face of the earth.

Imperfect though it may be, ours is a more perfect union than any who would belittle us have been able to create.

I do not say these things to wave a flag, although I am still old fashioned enough to believe that patriotism is not old hat.

I say these things, these complimentary things about America, because we somehow lose sight of them in the heat and fury of momentary discontent.

Not for a single instant do I doubt that the United States will endure, for this nation of ours is unique.

And, a great part of its unique quality is inextricably bound up with the boldness and daring of Christopher Columbus.

I often wonder what it must have been like, setting out to penetrate the mystery of the dark Atlantic in those three tiny ships, so pitifully frail and ill suited to the awesome challenge that lay ahead.

What faith and courage it must have taken to dare unlock the secrets of that vast, uncharted ocean—at the mercy of navigation instruments so crude and winds so capricious.

Few believed that Columbus could succeed. The wise branded him a fool, and fools thought him crazy.

To the doubters and detractors, the undaunted Columbus had a simple one-word answer:

"Adelante."

In Spanish, it means: ahead! Forward! Onward!

To himself, in his native Italian, Cristoforo Colombo must have thought:

"Vanti, Sempre Avanti!" Onward—ever onward!

Adelante. Avanti. Onward! No matter what the language, that one word captures the spirit and echoes the everlasting significance of the legacy of this great man.

The indestructible faith, the penetrating vision, the unalterable determination of Christopher Columbus had conquered myth and mystery. The terrifying riddle of the Atlantic had been solved. The veil had been lifted. The wise who had doubted and the fools who had scoffed had been proved wrong.

With raw courage and iron will, Columbus had pressed onward, ever onward, to carry the Old World to the New World, here to begin a stirring new chapter in the story of mankind . . . for the towering achievement of Columbus did not end with discovery and exploration.

On his subsequent voyages (there were four in all), Columbus made the first attempt to colonize the lands he had discovered. In so doing, he became the father of immigration and the founder of the great melting pot that was to become America.

And so they came, year after year, the tired and the poor, the downtrodden and the oppressed, the lovers of liberty and the seekers of freedom from the Old World to the new.

They came with faith and hope in heart in search of dignity, equality and opportunity.

They brought their religion and their culture, their arts and their crafts, their skills and their ambitions—and with bare and bleeding hands they pushed the frontiers of freedom forward and they helped to make America great.

They became doctors and lawyers, businessmen and bankers, artists and musicians, teachers and professors, workers and executives.

In time of war, they proudly proved their patriotism (even as they are doing now), fighting and dying for the adopted nation they loved, that the light of liberty not be snuffed out by turbulent tyranny.

As with Columbus before them, the way to the new world was long and trying, but still they came—your fathers and mine—braving the hazards and the perils on their arduous, difficult trek from the countryside and mountainside, from city and hamlet, across the wide ocean to the land of promised opportunity.

Yes, they came, the young and the old, with a rich warmth in their souls and a determination to succeed. With their hands and their sweat, they built the great cities of America, its roads and highways, its railroads and skyscrapers. And for good measure they threw in all their love and loyalty and devotion, and they became intertwined in the fabric of their adopted land and they enriched the tapestry of America's heritage.

They labored unselfishly that we who followed them would inherit the priceless gifts and treasured traditions of a free and prosperous nation.

This, my friends, is the stuff on which our forebears were made. The spirit to get things done; the will to achieve; the determination to accomplish—this is the legacy of the immigrant to his adopted land; to the land he gave so much of himself, though he often received so little in return.

Let me emphasize this. The American of Italian heritage seeks neither favor nor reward because he is of Italian descent.

But he should not, and must not, be denied fair and just treatment because his name ends in a vowel.

His abilities should not be ignored because he is of Italian origin. He should not be bypassed for promotion or advancement be-

cause his ancestry is Italian. His climb up the ladder of success should not be impeded by prejudice.

The American of Italian heritage should not have to be twice or three times as good as a rival in order to gain recognition; and yet we must admit that too often this is true, all too true.

Such treatment, to be sure, undermines our fundamental concepts of decency, respect for human dignity, and fair play. It makes the Bill of Rights an unpaid i.o.u., and the Declaration of Independence an uncollectable promissory note.

The practitioners of this kind of indefensible behavior ignore the powerful contributions of the Italian-rooted American community.

They choose to see only the sensational headlines that link Italian-sounding names to crime.

Because it suits their purpose, they forget that all nationalities have their bad actors, their rotten apples, their disowned and their discredited.

What a heavy cross to ask law-abiding, law-respecting Americans of Italian descent to bear!

A tiny minority, an infinitesimal fraction of evil-doers is being used to sully the reputation of a proud and wonderful ancestry. Now guilt by association is insidious—but guilt by reason of national origin, often generations removed, is worse.

We cannot, we dare not, ignore this.

As a Member of Congress, if you will pardon the personal reference, I fought for 17 years to eradicate the anti-Italian bias that was built into our Federal Immigration Act.

The quota system, based on national origin, has, with your help and the help of many enlightened people, at last been scrapped, and we no longer have to live with the smug implication that the people of one country are better and more welcome in the United States than the people of other countries.

Good fruit, they say, needs more time to ripen. If so, the democratizing of our immigration laws must certainly be a prize melon!

But the important point is that victory was achieved, the wrong was recognized and corrected—through the democratic process, under law and order, and within the framework of our established Government.

I think this is pertinent to the problem we presently face among groups demanding immediate results and instant miracles. The justness of a cause does not always turn the wheels of progress as quickly as we would like, even in an age of supersonic travel and speed-of-light communication. Perseverance, determination and patience are those Columbian qualities so necessary and essential to the ultimate victory over bigotry and racism.

This casts light upon another marathon campaign I have been waging to right a wrong of long standing—to establish Columbus Day as a national holiday.

Congratulations are certainly in order for your fine work here in Michigan in observing Columbus Day as a State holiday. But a State holiday and a national holiday are never the same. Even though 37 other States now mark this important date in history, none of these observances can give to Columbus Day the measure of respect and importance it justly deserves.

The Nation owes a heavy debt of gratitude to the Americans of Italian descent, who almost singlehandedly have kept alive the tradition of a Columbus Day observance, and who have championed its growth and prominence as a holiday of consequence and meaning.

It is not, however, and it should not be, a holiday solely for Americans of Italian heritage. It should and must be a holiday for all Americans who are justly proud of their common heritage; a common heritage that

began in the early dawn of October 12, 1492, when that stalwart Genoese bent his knee to the earth of the new world and prayerfully thanked God for the divine guidance that carried him and his crew safely across the Atlantic.

Last Wednesday it was my privilege to deliver the opening speech at a public hearing called by the House Judiciary Subcommittee to help decide whether Columbus Day should be a national holiday.

I said then that I could think of no reason why it should not.

And I emphasized that whether Columbus was actually the first, or second, or even the third voyager to reach these shores is purely academic and totally irrelevant. It subtracts nothing from the intrepid admiral's daring and determination. It detracts nothing from the everlasting significance of his unique and towering achievement.

I outlined for the Judiciary Subcommittee my dream of a Columbus Day observance as a multipurpose national holiday.

It would recognize Christopher Columbus, his heroic voyage and his historic discovery.

It would be a day on which all Americans could reaffirm their faith in the future and express their willingness to face with confidence the imponderables of unknown tomorrows, in the spirit of Columbus.

Further, Columbus Day would be a perfect occasion for the Nation to pause each year to pay homage to the cause and challenge of discovery, invention and exploration. It would be a fitting time to review our progress in the search for technological advances to improve our way of life; to evaluate our gains in the patient quest for cures to diseases that kill and cripple; to apprise the wondrous probes into the vast void of outer space, and the still unknown secrets of the ocean depths.

Finally, Columbus Day would be a day to honor immigrants of all nationalities and to acknowledge their contributions to the building of a strong, just and prosperous United States of America.

President Kennedy correctly called us "a nation of immigrants", and the Congress already has acted to establish Ellis Island as a permanent reminder of our indebtedness to those who came from foreign soil and who gave their brain and their brawn—and not infrequently, their lives—that their adopted land could grow and flourish.

Just as George Washington is called the "Father of our country", so Christopher Columbus deservedly should be remembered as the "Father of immigration", for it was he, and no other, who made the first attempts at colonization in the new world.

In honoring our immigrants on Columbus Day we will do more than show our gratitude for their countless contributions to a better, safer America.

We will be simultaneously striking a powerful blow against discrimination and the intolerable prejudice of those who insist upon judging a man by where he comes from, or where his parents or their parents came from, without regard for individual ability, integrity, loyalty or any other distinguishing and commendable characteristics.

The observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday will, I am certain, prove to be an effective instrument to blunt the vestiges of discrimination, prejudice and bigotry, and it will complement and enhance our calendar of national holidays.

I am happy to report to you this evening that we are making headway. I know that we made a favorable impression upon the Judiciary Committee, for the witnesses who followed me were many in number and imposing, even as they were eloquent and articulate.

And I would not be surprised if this Columbus Day celebration turns out to be historic, although for a reason you might not have expected. This may mark the last Columbus Day as a State holiday.

I sincerely hope that by next year Columbus Day will be observed by all Americans, from coast to coast, as a national holiday. Columbus Day deserves this honor and prestige.

It will truly be a holiday for all Americans. But I have no doubt that Americans of Italian heritage will honor it with just a little extra show of love and just a little additional feeling of reverence, respect and heartfelt warmth.

Thank you.

## A Salute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski and the Polish People

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with the Members here in paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the occasion of the anniversary of his death.

His role in resisting the forces oppressing his beloved Poland has been celebrated by the historians of every freedom-loving nation. Every American schoolboy has been taught the debt of gratitude that our own country owes to the contributions and courage of this great patriot. As we revere his memory, we honor through him that love of liberty and that dauntless spirit, stemming from his Polish heritage, which sent him forth to fight for freedom in the New World.

Through the centuries Poland has had its great leaders—men of extraordinary capabilities, character, and courage. Yet all of the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

At the beginning of modern times all of western Christendom owed a debt of gratitude to Poland when King John Sobieski drove the Turks back from Vienna in 1683 in one of the most decisive victories in history. Had the gallant Sobieski failed, all Europe would have been subjected to a yoke of slavery and Christian culture would have been destroyed.

Poland's contributions to the success of the Allies during World War II, and the fight of her people to preserve western civilization once again as they did in the battle of Vienna in the 15th century, make it mandatory that all true Americans support the demands for justice for Poland in the United Nations.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. Poland's contributions to the military success of the United Nations in the drive to final victory and peace, and her sacrifice in the cause of humanity, merit every consideration. We must keep the sacred pledges that were made to

Poland, not only because of the debt of gratitude which the other nations of the world owe to Poland, but because of the necessity of obtaining the wholehearted cooperation of all the smaller nations who look to us for justice.

To Americans of Polish ancestry, who have contributed so much to the development of the United States, I urge you to continue your efforts to restore Poland to its prewar glory. The buoyant idealism and splendid patriotism, together with the deep Christian concept of the right, which have characterized the Polish spirit in the past, have done much for our own country and should certainly do much for Poland.

Civilization is based upon a reign of peace and justice, and for this reason America has been ennobled by the spiritual contributions of her citizens of Polish descent. By being true to their culture and their creed, Americans of Polish ancestry cannot help being true to their country. Their love of Poland and desire to make it free will only enhance their love of America. All of us might well be proud if we could contribute as much as Pulaski did to progress in the United States and peace in the world.

### Proposed Adirondack Mountains National Park

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN**  
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent proposal for the establishment of a national park in the Adirondack Mountains of New York has occasioned considerable concern and comment from the people of the area. An excellent editorial entitled "Time for Action!" in the Tupper Lake Free Press sets forth the threat that this proposal holds for the economy of the village of Tupper Lake. It was this same community that was sorely threatened in 1965 by the Federal Government's closing of its Sunmount Veterans Hospital. Again, this community sees itself threatened by yet another possible Federal action. This editorial, together with my response to it contained in a letter to the editor of the Tupper Lake Free Press, sets for the concern of the community and my own position on this proposal:

[From the Tupper Lake Free Press, Sept. 14, 1967]

#### TIME FOR ACTION!

The more we read about the plans for the proposed Adirondack Mountains National Park and the persuasive line being followed to "sell" the idea to the public, the more concerned we become that this is not just a far-out and impossible dream which will sputter out after the novelty wears off. . . .

Whether we like it or not—it can happen here, and it begins to appear that it WILL happen, unless opposition on a grand scale materializes. . . . The wishes of the people who call the Adirondacks home, and who make their living here, will apparently go unconsidered. The proponents of the national

park idea contend that it is essential to preserve the wilderness character and "natural wonders" of the region; that at the present rate of land acquisition, under forest preserve status it "would take 125 years to acquire another one million acres" within the Adirondack park blue line, in which time, because of the rocketing climb in population pressure and "greater demands for economic exploitation of the private lands", such lands would be made unsuitable for either forest preserve or national park uses.

A question-and-answer document released recently by the national park promoters dismisses New York State's present Adirondack State Park as "little more than a public relations tag" and charges that "the park does not exist. . . . It is a myth" . . . This should come as something of a surprise to those interests which have bucked the rigid "forever wild" provisions pertaining to the state-owned Adirondack timberlands, and which have been in effect for three-quarters of a century. . . .

The plan provides that the legislation to authorize establishment of the national park would also provide for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate zoning standards, formulated in cooperation with the towns, to guide town zoning within the authorized national park boundaries and at park entrances. . . . Incorporated towns outside, but adjacent to the boundaries of the authorized park would be "encouraged to improve their zoning ordinances" so as "to prevent developments incompatible with the purposes of the national park" . . . "Within the specified village and resort exclusions or enclaves, the Secretary of the Interior's authority to acquire land by condemnation would be suspended "unless zoning failed to comply with the approved standards, or unless a property owner failed to comply with town zoning consistent with the approved standards, or unless necessary to provide public access to lakes, streams or other important park features".

The procedure is spelled out quite definitely. Private homes within the proposed park "built prior to a date specified in the legislation" would be permitted to remain, with "essential surrounding land, usually not exceeding three acres" . . . Existing commercial ventures not consistent with park purposes (including subdivision of land for sale and commercial timber production) could be acquired by the Federal Government for park purposes by condemnation, if necessary. . . . Undeveloped land would be acquired for park purposes as rapidly as possible, by transfer, purchase, exchange, donation or condemnation. . . . "Purchases are negotiated on the basis of competent appraisals of fair market value by qualified, impartial real estate appraisers familiar with property in the area" . . . The plan generously adds that "reserved use and occupancy by the owner for life, or for a term of years, can be allowed if purchase on this basis will meet the needs of the Service and are justified in cost. . . . in general, eminent domain proceedings are utilized only as a last resort, when all other reasonable efforts or negotiation have failed" . . . In brief, you'll sell, whether you wish to or not, and at a price regarded as "fair" by government-paid appraisers, —whether or not it's "fair" by your standards. . . .

All hunting and trapping would be banned within the park. . . . To ease the blow to towns which would lose heavily in state taxes paid on lands within the town limits "a limited series of payments in lieu of taxes" would be arranged "until increased income from the park establishment and operation would make the local communities economically viable" . . .

That's the picture. . . . Possibly for some areas the proposed Adirondack Mountains National Park would make no great difference economically. For Tupper Lake, insofar

as we can see, it would be a disaster. This community is situated just outside the proposed park boundary, and would enjoy none of the recreation development possibilities of the villages in the "resort enclaves". —Lake Placid, Saranac and Old Forge. . . . On the contrary, with the forced sale of the big park lands, by condemnation procedure or otherwise, —Whitney Park, Litchfield Park and others which for many years have assured a continuing supply of raw materials for the forest products industry, —Tupper Lake would face the bleak prospects of closed mills, vanished payrolls and a sleighride downhill to the status of another Derrick.

We're still not convinced that the Adirondack National Park will become a reality, provided enough opposition to the project develops. . . . A couple of years ago this community faced up to another potential disaster when Uncle Sam decided to close Sunmount VA Hospital. The fight which Tupper made at that time didn't save the hospital as a Veterans Administration Facility, but it DID spark the change-over to state operation, preventing the loss of the biggest single employer in the area and giving Tupper an institution which promises to grow and develop with the passing years.

The same community-wide action is essential now. . . . We strongly urge our readers to write Congressman Robert C. McEwen, Governor Rockefeller, State Senator Ronald Stafford and Assemblyman Glenn Harris, registering opposition to the proposal and calling on them to use every means at their disposal to prevent its becoming a reality. . . . If you don't feel like composing a letter of protest, and you agree with the sentiments in this editorial, —clip it out and mail it to them, along with a brief note to the effect that it sums up the way most of us here feel about this important question. . . .

Economically, this region has little going for it other than lumbering and the resort trade. . . . With lumbering and forest products manufacture killed by national park restrictions, Tupper's future would be pretty much all behind it. . . .

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1967.

Mr. LOUIS J. SIMMONS,  
Editor, Tupper Lake Free Press,  
Tupper Lake, N.Y.

DEAR LOU: I noted with interest, appreciation and agreement every word contained in your outstandingly excellent editorial entitled "Time for Action!"

It has always seemed to me, as a native Northern New Yorker and one who has spent over half of his adult life in legislative bodies, that too many plans and suggestions for what to do with the Adirondacks come from everywhere but the Adirondacks. The Park Avenue friends of the forest are ever ready to suggest what would be best for the Adirondacks. Usually, as an after thought, they have some form of addendum to point out that it would also be a great boon to the people living in the Adirondacks.

I am sure that I represent the feelings of many of my North Country constituents when I react with less than enthusiasm to the proposal for the Adirondack Mountains National Park.

Every facet of this proposal does violence to the interests of the area and its people, and, yes, I would say both its year-round resident population and visitors as well. The National Park proposal does not mean increased recreational use—it means less. A plan that would ban all hunting and trapping is to me inconceivable of having any sound conservation or economic value. To allow a deer herd to become so numerous that starvation would be the only harvester, is so unenlightened as to be appalling.

Your editorial made many excellent points, including the matter of payments in lieu of taxes. I am sure that with many of your

other readers, I share a skepticism about the "increased income" that would come from this proposed park.

Our North Country has long felt the adverse economic effect of an already too restrictive policy on the use of our forest lands. It is my view that the proposed park would be a further and gigantic step in the wrong direction.

In conclusion, I am pleased to report that a number of your readers accepted your suggestion that they write to their Congressman. Without exception, those letters expressed strong disapproval of the proposed national park. These letters, and the excellent editorial that prompted them, were appreciated by the writer of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. McEWEN.

### Columbus Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute today to Christopher Columbus and all our good Italo-American citizens and friends on Columbus Day. I am happy to be a sponsor of H.R. 5057, which I introduced on February 8, 1967, a bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day.

Columbus Day, as now celebrated by 35 States, including my own Pennsylvania, falls on October 12. This day stands as a memorial and honor to Christopher Columbus. This great Italian discovered and brought to Europe's attention the vast American Continent. Columbus' voyage was severely difficult and only the enthusiasm of this powerful leader kept the expedition on its course.

Four hundred and seventy-five years ago today was an important day for Americans when Columbus actually discovered America. In this age of exciting space explorations, we should pause to recall and pay tribute to Columbus, because his journey stands as a monument of human courage, bravery and enthusiasm. He was a powerful leader who kept his expedition of three ships and handpicked crew of 90 on its course, in spite of extreme hardships, and unfavorable winds. Although Columbus had made numerous voyages to the Mediterranean, Iceland, and the African coast, and studied under the most advanced geographers and navigators of the day, his determination in seeking a western route to Asia led to his landing on our shores on October 12, 1492.

More recent years have seen an increasing appreciation of this great Italian navigator. In 1892, 400 years after the discovery of this continent, President Benjamin Harrison recommended to the American people that October 12 be a general holiday. President Harrison called for Americans, as much as possible, to "cease from toil" and devote themselves to such exercises as may best express honor to the discoverer and their

appreciation of the great achievements of the four completed centuries of American life.

Keeping in mind the spirit of President Harrison's appeal, and also as a tribute to the many outstanding Italo-American citizens of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pa., including Justice Michael A. Musmanno, Judge Ruggero J. Aldisert, Judge William F. Cercone, Charles G. Notari, Frank J. Zappala, and my good friends in the Italian Sons and Daughters of America and the Sons of Columbus, I am glad to join in paying tribute to Christopher Columbus on October 12, and strongly urge that Columbus Day be made a national holiday.

### Thaddeus Kosciuszko: 150th Anniversary of His Death—October 15, 1967

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1817, Thaddeus Kosciuszko died. This Sunday marks the 150th anniversary of his death. With him died an era of individual devotion to principle that was without equal in history.

Kosciuszko was the heart and soul of that era. His entire life was spent battling for an ideal. His goal was freedom—freedom for men and women who had never known freedom; freedom for those who had labored under tyranny and oppression all the days of their lives.

When he came to this country from Europe to help in our Revolutionary War, he was well acquainted with the selfish tyrannies of kings. So he offered his life to total strangers who believed as he did—that men had the right to decide for themselves what their destiny would be.

His courage in battle led men to risk their lives as readily as he risked his. His zest and enthusiasm renewed them when they tired and were discouraged and despaired of defeating the hordes of redcoats that swarmed at every hand.

There seemed to be nothing Kosciuszko could or would not do for the fledgling American government, from designing fortifications for West Point and Fort Delaware, to leading charges in clash after clash with enemy forces.

Eventually, Cornwallis was defeated and the peace was signed. The United States of America was a free and independent new nation. Praise and riches were lavished on Kosciuszko, but he was troubled by the grave news from across the sea in Poland. He could not rest, but sailed at once to lend a hand to help his doomed nation in any way he could. Yet even he could not withstand the massed armies of Russia and his revolt was smashed and he was captured and thrown into a Russian prison.

But they could not crush his spirit or his mind.

Eventually, when he was set free, he

sought out his friends in the United States once more. Congress, recognizing his great contribution to our victory over the British, presented him with grants of land and an independent income. On every hand were well wishers, friends, and admirers.

But, as dark clouds gathered over Europe, this man who had never chosen a soft life, resolved to return to the frontlines in the war against tyranny. Before departing, he turned over his fortune and holdings in America to his friend Thomas Jefferson, with the stipulation that they be used to establish a school for Negroes and to buy and free Negro slaves. Slavery was the great blemish on American democracy. Kosciuszko—who hated all forms of oppression and human suffering—by his example taught America a lesson in conscience that could not be ignored.

President Jefferson carried out his wishes to the letter and set his own slaves free upon his death.

February 12, 1809, was Kosciuszko's 63d birthday. On that day, far across Europe and the Atlantic Ocean, a child was born who was to proclaim Kosciuszko's lesson in freedom to all his countrymen and to the world. Abraham Lincoln was equal to the challenge.

Kosciuszko lived in an age of violence; of shifting borders and shifting loyalties; of fear and oppression, hunger and deprivation. And war. Early in life, he decided to devote his talents and his allotted time on earth to changing the old, old order.

Love of liberty radiated from him as light from a torch. He inspired men to look beyond themselves; to reach a little higher than they thought themselves capable; to see life as a continuing gift from God to be used carefully, wisely and with respect for all men.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko inspired a generation. Always, always by his example he urged men to improve, to better themselves, to stand for something, and not to fear dying if it meant others might live freely and with dignity.

Now this Nation he crossed a continent and an ocean to help is confronted with a global struggle that is not confined to national borders and territories. Today, the entire world is at stake and all who live in it must become involved in survival or face the consequences of their indifference.

Our national involvement in Vietnam is a blunt statement to all the nations with whom we share this tiny planet that the United States stands for something. Our word is good.

There is not a man among us, whether in the White House, in the Congress, or in the towns and cities across the country who likes what we are doing in Vietnam. None of us wants to be there.

But the history of too many great nations has been a history of appeasement, capitulation, and eventual defeat.

Our technological progress is great and growing. But it is also conservatively estimated that Red China will have a deliverable hydrogen weapon capable of hitting any target, anywhere on earth, in less than 5 years.

I ask you, What good would it do at

this stage of development in the terrible weapons of war to say America will defend her own borders and no others? In a nuclear age there are no borders. Only targets.

Our globe, which holds so many hungry, oppressed millions, must be America's concern. We have the conscience, and the power, to do something to help.

If we can convince Red China and the Communist governments in Hanoi and Moscow we will not sacrifice Asia—as Poland was sacrificed, and Czechoslovakia, and nation after nation in every corner of the world throughout history—we may buy enough time to persuade these hysterical warlords with their horrifying ability to destroy the world that there can be no victor in a global holocaust.

They have whipped themselves into frenzied dreams of conquest, somehow believing that conquering a hungry, overcrowded world will remove them from the responsibility of solving their own gigantic domestic problems.

We must convince them a war with us would be impossible of victory. And we must persuade them to talk of peace instead of war.

We have not much time. We in America could use these next few years frantically living the good life at home while the shadow of death slips over the world as one by one the small, defenseless nations are absorbed and crushed by communism.

But what about responsibility and the American dream of liberty and self-determination for all men? As long as our pledge stands for something and our commitments are made in honor, we are living up to the good words we have preached to the world in easier, more peaceful times.

Just as Kosciuszko was on the side of right, regardless of the odds, so must we—each and every one of us—be on that side, too.

Adlai Stevenson might have had Kosciuszko and all of us in mind before his death when he wrote:

What counts now is not just what we are against, but what we are for. Who leads us is less important than what leads us—what convictions, what courage, what faith—win or lose. A man doesn't save a century or a civilization, but a militant group wedded to a principle, can.

### Proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

**Mr. KASTENMEIER.** Mr. Speaker, our technologically oriented society has focused attention on our patent system and that system is today under active study in a number of areas. President Johnson has proposed enactment of a patent reform bill to modernize the U.S. patent system, and this measure is before the Patent Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. On another

front, the U.S. Patent Office is engaged in international cooperative endeavors with other countries. A draft Patent Cooperation Treaty has recently been brought forth by the United International Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property. These significant developments are described in detail in a recent address by Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge before the Patents Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers and I insert the speech by Secretary Trowbridge in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE PATENTS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 8, 1967

It is my very real pleasure to be here with you today to discuss the improvement of our patent system—a system in which we as administrators and you as users have a common interest.

Efforts of improvement can be classified as long-range undertakings whose benefits will accrue for decades to come, just as the original Constitutional provision for patent protection has served us for 180 years.

Most of our time in this fast-moving world is taken up with short range objectives. Obviously both are important—laying the foundation for progress in the years ahead by the improvement of over-all systems, and making short-run adjustments that meet the immediate needs of the day.

President Johnson's Patent Reform Bill illustrates this Administration's concern with long-range improvements in our economic system.

In transmitting the measure to Congress last February, the President noted that the patent system has "helped American business to translate the 'fire of genius' into the products and processes that have enriched the lives of all of us."

But he also pointed out that "institutions must change to meet the demands of our times," and I think it is clear that modernization is long overdue.

If the patent system is to continue to serve us well it must be strengthened and streamlined to cope with the challenges of the decades ahead. It must keep pace with both expanded trade and new technology. Even more, it must create a better climate for expanded entry of American businessmen into international markets. And it must provide for prompt disclosure and use of new technology in this country. This will benefit not only American business but also the American consumer.

The NAM, under the leadership of your Committee Chairman, Frederic O. Hess, has been among those most active in defining the problems facing the patent system and in relating them to business interests.

One problem that illustrates the need for reform is the unnecessary and burdensome duplication of effort in protecting inventions internationally. This duplication bears heavily on the patent offices of the world and on businessmen engaged in world commerce. It creates an artificial barrier to world trade.

An average of three patent applications is filed internationally on each invention patented. This means that of the estimated 650,000 patent applications filed worldwide each year, two-thirds are duplicates or multiple filings of other applications. Each is processed individually in each country. Moreover, companies and individuals must plow through a complex maze of divergent laws and customs which have grown up over the years, involving even the size of paper which must be used or the number of typewritten lines per page.

In this country, dissemination of technological advances is often delayed by the

very system designed to accelerate disclosure. U.S. patent applications are now kept secret until a patent is issued, and this can take up to five years or more.

Because of built-in delays, businessmen, unaware of a competitor's work, may invest substantial sums reinventing something already patented by a competitor. I find it hard to believe that knowledgeable American concerns actually search published foreign patents and applications to find out what other American companies are trying to patent right here in this country.

As you know, this Administration has moved on a number of fronts to update the patent system and gear it for more rapid and effective service to business and the public.

You are all familiar, of course, with the recommendations of the President's Commission and with the Patent Reform proposals he sent Congress in February to implement the Commission's work. This bill would bring about the first major revision of the patent system in more than a century. It is designed, as the President said:

"(1) To raise the quality and reliability of U.S. patents.

"(2) To reduce the time and expense of obtaining and protecting a patent.

"(3) To speed public disclosure of scientific and technological information."

The President added that these changes would also bring our own system into closer harmony with those of other nations.

Better international cooperation will lead naturally to better protection of intellectual property. And this, of course, is the rationale behind our new bilateral information and search exchange agreements with Germany, Switzerland, France, Japan, Austria and other countries. All of these pilot studies have not been completed. But so far we have learned some valuable lessons from them, notably that the quickest way to end expensive, inefficient, massive duplication is through a multi-nation system within the framework of existing international cooperative arrangements.

Accordingly, the U.S. Delegation asked the Paris Union last fall to have the United International Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property undertake an urgent study of the duplication problem. As you know, the result was the proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty which is being considered by your Committee here today.

I do not propose to discuss in any length the President's Patent Reform Bill, except to emphasize my support for its provisions and their underlying objectives. We want the most effective and efficient patent system to serve this country in the future. Enactment of the Reform Bill, I am convinced, will achieve the goals laid down by the President and will bring our patent system more fully in line with its Constitutional objectives.

Nor do I propose to discuss in any detail the Patent Cooperation Treaty. We are encouraged by BIRPI's effort and initiative and anxious to see further development and refinement of its work.

But I would like to outline what I think are the broad objectives of a modern, efficient patent system and to relate them to our national and international goals.

Simply stated, the patent system should provide effective incentives for the greatest possible development and use of new technology in this country and in international markets.

To the extent that it is able to achieve this goal—

It will enhance our standard of living, which increasingly is founded upon a sophisticated technological base.

It will facilitate the transfer of new technology across national borders to spur economic progress in all parts of the globe.

And finally, it will permit us to compete more effectively in international markets

where new technology is at the very cutting edge of competition.

We are in a period of both continuing expansion and keener competition in world trade. U.S. exports climbed to record levels last year, and are now running at an annual rate of \$31.2 billion. Obviously there is the closest relationship between our export expansion and our technological progress. For example, we can now replace reduced exports in low-technology products with increased exports in high-technology products.

Just as technological changes bear heavily on efforts to expand exports, so does the success of U.S. firms in penetrating high-technology foreign markets depend largely on their ability to obtain foreign patents to protect inventions and innovations. This interrelation will increase, of course, as our mix of export products becomes more sophisticated. Clearly, the trend is toward greater reliance on patent safeguards. The export prospects for the future continue to be bright for highly technical products in which foreign patent protection could be a deciding factor in successful competition in foreign markets.

The world market to which U.S. business looks for customers has widened to include many countries which were ignored or not even in existence twenty years ago. These are the so-called less developed countries—less developed in an industrial sense, but in many cases with abundant natural resources. It is generally recognized that they must be brought into the international patent system to help speed their economic development, and their potential as trading partners. BIRPI has been conducting a vigorous program in this regard and we in this country heartily endorse it. One difficulty is that few of the developing countries have either the personnel or the government machinery for the complexities of a patent system. BIRPI has instituted training arrangements in which our Patent Office is cooperating. Useful seminars already have been held in Asia, Africa and Latin America. BIRPI has also supervised the drafting of a legal model for a national patent system.

In talking about international cooperation, a distinction is sometimes drawn between our national or domestic interests and our international objectives. I can't see any difference between the two. For the patent system to be truly effective, it must serve both to foster progress at home and to stimulate our international commerce.

Both the Patent Reform Bill and the proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty envisage far-reaching changes in old and established customs and practices. For this reason, if for no other, they invite controversy and opposition. To the extent that this is constructive and in the national interest, we welcome it. To the extent that it is self-serving and designed to create roadblocks, we deplore it. Whoever would oppose these measures because he is against change, *per se*, or for other purely subjective reasons, has a real obligation to review his position in light of the national interest—not to say that of his business or his profession. It is less than responsible to pretend that either the U.S. patent system or the international legal structures protecting inventions, as they exist today, cannot be improved upon.

Reasonable men may differ over details; I cannot believe there is any question that basic reforms are needed—and soon. The world quickly leaves behind those who cannot adapt to the fact and the form of change.

We are now in the process of studying the BIRPI draft. Your meeting and discussions here today, and those of other interested parties, will help us. We should not forget that this is a draft, the first of many which will be prepared even before formal international negotiations are begun.

At a meeting of the Committee of Experts, scheduled for October in Geneva to consider

the draft Treaty, the views of twenty-three interested governments on the Treaty will be fully explored. To provide broad gauge representation at this meeting, private industrial and bar groups from this and other countries have been invited to participate. Following the October meeting, there will be ample opportunity for further consideration of a revised draft Treaty.

We favor harmonization of national patent laws, and we look to the ultimate goal of a true universal or multinational patent. The proposed Treaty is a major step toward this goal. Because of its importance, we should make it as attractive as possible. For example, it may be that to attract the widest possible international support, this initial step should require as little change as possible in the national laws of the member countries. It should require a minimum of administrative cost and effort. If proposals to improve the Treaty in these and other areas will increase support for it, we are prepared to vigorously sponsor such proposals.

All of these moves in the patent field, both in the international and domestic spheres, should illustrate our resolve that technological progress not become ensnared in technical red tape.

How ironic it would be for man's inventive genius to be stymied by our failure to devise ways to put the fruits of his genius to work!

We are characterized as an "innovative" society—which essentially means that we can turn the ideas of man into effective and productive tools. It is clearly in our joint interest, as administrators and as users of the patent system, to see to it that such a description of our economic system is continually proven to be accurate.

### Congressman Ottinger Attacks Jet Noise

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased when my colleagues from other congressional districts speak out on the menace of jet noise. The more voices raised in protest, the greater the recognition of the problem and the sooner we will achieve our objectives.

True, jet noise started out as a local problem. It originally only affected those around the first airfields geared to service jet planes. Now as the number of smaller jet aircraft in operation increases and the number of airfields servicing jets increases across the Nation, we have recognized jet noise as a national problem.

Just a few weeks ago, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, a frequent and outspoken critic against jet noise, attacked jet noise and called it one of the most serious environmental problems facing the Nation today. In referring to "noise pollution" from National Airport, he further indicated that the Federal Government will soon launch a war on jet noise.

Certainly jet noise has been branded as a critical problem on the local, national, and international levels and deserves the attention of Federal responsibility.

Last week the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAMUEL FRIEDEL, advised me that hearings would be scheduled next month on pending aircraft noise abatement bills. Legislation to revoke flight certificates of airlines which fail to comply with noise standards—introduced in the House by the distinguished chairman of the House Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, and by more than 20 other Members of the House—will be considered.

Focusing his attention on our Nation's Capital—Washington, D.C.—our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable RICHARD L. OTTINGER, has vividly pointed out the noise and pollution factors involved in this question. Congressman OTTINGER's remarks before the Palisades Citizens Association of Washington, D.C., on October 3, 1967, highlight the jet noise problem and the relationship between the people affected by jet noise and the Government agencies with jurisdiction in the field of aviation.

I urge my colleagues to read the full text of Mr. OTTINGER's address and the Washington Post editorial of October 3, 1967, which I place in the RECORD at this point under unanimous consent:

PEOPLE, NOISE, AND THE CAB

(A speech by the Honorable RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Member of Congress, to the Palisades Citizens Association, October 3, 1967)

It's no exaggeration to say that I've experienced the problem of aircraft pollution from virtually every angle. I've dealt with it as a regular twice a week commuter between La Guardia and National. When I'm in Washington I'm on the receiving end of a phenomenal number of complaints from constituents about the assault that air traffic is making upon their lives in the form of air pollution, noise and air traffic safety. And when I'm home I have the pleasure of living right under what I am convinced is the most heavily travelled jet approach to La Guardia. So when I say that I'm glad to be here with you tonight, you will appreciate that my heart is really in this battle.

I find it a strange irony that the environmental pollution which threatens our health and sanity, if not our very survival, is a direct result of the very technological achievements that are responsible for the unparalleled physical well-being of our nation.

During the great depression, the late Will Rogers observed that we were on the way to having the distinction of being the only nation in history to ride to the poor house in a limousine. Well, our technology advanced so fast that we've kept raising our sights. Now we seem to be aiming at extinction in a supersonic jet.

Seriously, however, there is impressive evidence that unless we change our ways, we may well strangle in the waste and refuse that is now the greatest single product of our affluent society.

The Senate Public Works Committee has reported that by the end of this century, slightly more than one generation away, the demand for water in this country will exceed our known resources of clean water by some 300 million gallons each year.

In less than ten years, New York City will have exhausted every known resource for disposing the residue from incinerated trash—if the volume of refuse doesn't increase and

it is increasing steadily. My own district of Westchester faces this same crisis within the next seven years and metropolitan areas all over the country are on a similar timetable.

A distinguished meteorologist, Dr. Morris Nieburger of the University of California, has warned that if we continue at our present rate "the world's atmosphere will grow more and more polluted until, a century from now it will be too poisonous to allow human life to survive and civilization will pass away."

These are the main conflicts that we must find a way to resolve, but they are by no means the only ones.

There are other, subtler forms of pollution that can have equally devastating effects upon the health and welfare of our society such as noise and urban sprawl.

I personally have no question that we can develop the mechanisms for resolving these conflicts and thus preserve a livable environment. But the sober fact is that we had better get cracking because we haven't made any real progress yet.

This is a national problem and the logical place to look for leadership is the Federal agencies that have played such an important role in spurring technological development. Agencies such as the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, NASA, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Reclamation all have important responsibilities affecting the resources of the nation.

Now I am aware that I am going to be stepping on some toes here when I say this, but the sad fact is that these Federal agencies, created in the days when the paramount need was to develop technological potential to the fullest, have failed signally to recognize the present challenge or adjust to meet it.

John Kenneth Galbraith has an explanation. He once wrote that agencies "like the people who comprise them, have a marked life cycle. In youth, they are vigorous, aggressive, evangelistic and even intolerant. Later they mellow, and in old age—after a matter of ten or fifteen years—they become, with some exceptions, either the arm of the industry they are regulating or senile."

By this harsh but realistic time table you might expect the agencies I have named to have achieved a truly archaeological antiquity, even in their revised and modified editions, and I am afraid that in the main your expectation would be justified.

That is why I believe that your particular battle is so very important for the nation as a whole, even though it may seem at times to be a local and rather parochial concern. It is becoming clear that only through the action of concerned citizens can agencies of the Federal government be made to recognize that the "public" in "public convenience and necessity" means everybody, not just the airlines, the power companies, the travelers, truckers and other interest groups. And that convenience and necessity include as a primary consideration the preservation of a livable environment as well as a well-developed one.

The now-famous Storm King Mountain Case with which I am personally quite familiar offers not only a clear parallel to your case with the CAB, but also concrete proof of the value of citizen action in the battle to preserve a livable environment.

In Storm King, a group of independent citizens battled for four years to force the FPC to weigh environmental hazards in determining whether a gigantic hydro-electric project proposed for Storm King Mountain on the threshold of the nation's greatest metropolitan complex served the true public convenience and necessity.

Just as the CAB has chosen to interpret the "public" in "public convenience and necessity" as the airlines and the airlines' view

of the traveling public, so the FPC interpreted public as meaning the utilities and the utilities' view of the consumer.

Just as the CAB has endeavored to pass the responsibility for environmental impact onto local authorities and the Department of Transportation, so did the FPC attempt to leave these issues to the Department of the Interior and local agencies, preferring to act as umpire rather than assume affirmative responsibility.

Just as the CAB has refused intervention on the grounds that the public interests affected by noise and air pollution are too remote and generalized, so the FPC refused intervention on the grounds that the citizens had no economic interest in the quality of the environment that was being affected.

The CAB would do well to review the stinging rebuke administered to the FPC by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals when its precedent-setting decision revoked the license issued by the FPC in the Storm King Case.

In effect, the Court said that in this complex world every citizen has an interest in preserving a livable environment and that interest must be recognized and respected by Federal agencies. It said that insofar as the consequences of an action taken or approved by a Federal agency can have an adverse impact upon the general environment, the agency has a responsibility to evaluate and weigh that impact fully in arriving at its decision. Most encouraging of all, the court added an eleventh commandment to the administrative book: Thou shalt not act as "an umpire blandly calling balls and strikes," but shall exercise an affirmative responsibility for seeking out and protecting this broader public interest.

Because of the fight that these private citizens put up, the FPC will probably never again feel safe in accepting a utility company's best guess as to what effect a proposed project may have on air pollution, fish, water pollution and other related resources. In fact, no agency of the Federal government can now safely feel indifferent to the impact of its decision on the quality of our environment, especially when they know that other groups of private citizens care.

It is important to stress that, like the Storm King Case, this is not just a local problem. You will find that people all over the country are just as annoyed, just as hounded and just as frustrated as you are by environmental intrusions and by the indifference of Federal agencies.

Eleanor Clark French in New York has been leading a battle to protect Manhattan's already cacophonous environment from a further nerve-shattering assault in the form of helicopter service to the Pan Am building.

She has pointed out with great reason that the dubious convenience of having a dozen or so businessmen deposited on Pan Am's roof is more than offset by the damage done by the noise and by the continuing danger that the craft may well miss and land in Grand Central Station someday.

A group in Santa Barbara, California, has had an ordinance passed forbidding low-flying jets from abusing their airspace. A distinguished group in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is doing valiant battle against the incredible sonic boom intrusions that are certain to come from the supersonic jet and in Westchester, New York a group has been formed to combat the mounting noise problem experienced from the growing volume of jet aircraft landing at La Guardia and Kennedy airports.

These people deserve your attention. They share a common cause. Part of the key to victory in the Storm King case was the effort that went into locating concerned citizens all over the country and getting them involved in the battle.

With so many private citizens involved in these issues, why doesn't Congress take direct action?

In regard to your problem with aircraft noise, I have introduced legislation that would direct NASA to undertake a full-scale (I almost said "crash") program of research to develop the techniques that are needed to eliminate aircraft noise of all types. I have also introduced legislation that would authorize the Federal Aviation Agency to compel carriers to install noise abatement devices and to change flight patterns to minimize public disturbance.

Only last week the Commerce Committee of which I am a member took the first tentative step to deal with air pollution from jet aircraft when they adopted my amendment to the Clean Air Act which directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to get into this area. These are sound proposals and will undoubtedly help.

We have to face the fact, however, that short of creating a wholly new agency with authority to act on environmental issues, we have no alternative but to work with those existing organizations which have, so far, failed, and, worse, shown little or no interest in succeeding. This Federal myopia undoubtedly stems from the fact that they were originally chartered to spur development without much serious consideration for the impact it might have on our environment. It isn't easy to legislate leopards into changing their spots.

If these agencies recognized the challenge and were prepared to accept it, then extensive new legislation would probably not be necessary. Certainly the recent court decisions, especially the High Mountain Sheep and the Storm King Cases, seem to indicate that the existing authority is adequate, if they will only act upon it. However, if these existing agencies won't see the challenge, new legislation to make them do so would be difficult to get enacted and even more difficult to get them to implement effectively.

For the future, I am proposing legislation to set up an independent agency reporting only to Congress and charged with the responsibility for representing the public interest in Federal agency deliberations on matters affecting environment and natural resources. If this concept is adopted, then groups such as yours and the Storm King fighters will no longer have to bear the full burden of such action. You will have a resource of talent and information to which to repair for help; a resource free of the restrictions and complexities imposed upon executive agencies, free from the conflict between development and preservation, and charged only with representing the public interest. But all of these proposals will take time, time we can ill afford.

The problem is sufficiently pressing to cause the National Audubon Society to consider setting up an "Environmental Defense Fund"; this is an idea which I wholeheartedly endorse. In the meantime, the fact remains that in the real and endangered world in which we live, effective action to preserve a livable environment will come only from the efforts of determined, concerned and independent groups of citizens such as you. It will come from citizens fighting over local intrusions into their own environment and each victory will have what the great philanthropist Stephen Currier called "Social reverberations" that will in the end make the difference for survival.

#### CAB AND THE NOISE MENACE

Should citizens whose lives are made miserable by the noise and fallout from airplanes above their homes be allowed to intervene when the Civil Aeronautics Board is considering new air operations? The CAB says no, but the Department of Transportation and civic groups who are fighting the nerve-shattering din from National Airport

take vigorous exception to that ruling. In our view, the CAB has failed in its obligation to act in the public interest in this matter.

Congressman Ottinger has pointedly reminded the CAB of the spanking that the Federal Power Commission got from the Second Circuit Court of Appeals when it similarly rebuffed a group of independent citizens seeking to protect the public interest against the construction of a hydroelectric project at Storm King Mountain. The CAB may be inviting a similar rebuke. It denied the right of citizens to intervene in the case before it in the interests of maintaining a tolerable urban environment on the ground that the complainants' interests "are not so substantial as to require or warrant intervention by them."

But in the Storm King case the Court of Appeals said that a showing of "economic

injury" was not necessary to intervention "where the plaintiffs have shown a direct personal interest." The Court sharply reminded the FPC of its claim to be representative of the public interest. It then went on to say:

This role does not permit it to act as an umpire blandly calling balls and strikes for adversaries; the right of the public must receive active and affirmative protection at the hands of the Commission.

The Transportation Department has taken a similar view, "that a consideration of the environmental impact of common carrier operations is a relevant and important factor to be weighed in determining whether in a particular proceeding the public convenience and necessity require authorization of the proposed service."

Instead of actively and affirmatively protecting the public interest here, the CAB has

attempted to wash its hands of the noise and fallout menace. Instead of looking at the issue on its merits, it has simply closed its eyes and ears. In these circumstances there is no alternative to pressing the case before the courts and before Congress until relief is forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, legislation is needed to place the airlines on notice that the Federal Government is serious about noise abatement. The courts have held jet noise to be a national problem and a national responsibility.

If a quiet engine were available tomorrow, there is no way the Federal Government could require its use by the airlines. That authority must be placed on the books now.

## SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the fresh mercies of yet another day we come with hearts grateful for Thy grace, praying that, by a strength not our own, our individual record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best.

Thou knowest that these testing times are finding out our every weakness and calling for our utmost endeavor against the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance.

We come claiming the promise that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings of eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

Girded by Thy might, give us the courage to fly, the urgency to run, and the patience to walk.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 12, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 11, 1967:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blakenships; and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

On October 12, 1967:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing

quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees

be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the transaction of routine morning business, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 590 and 621.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMDR. ALBERT G. BERRY, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "of" strike out "pay