Col. Gaylord Edward Shepard, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Clarence Binder Shimer, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. D. A. Thompson, [redacted], Armor.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Clarence Schnipke, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Mark Ambrose, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.
Col. Thomas Bonner, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.
Col. William LaFayette Ward, Jr., [redacted], Artillery.
Col. LaVern Erick Weber, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Charles Vawter Wheeler, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Erbon Wilbur Wise, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).
Lt. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).
Lt. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).
Lt. Gen. August Schomburg, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).
Lt. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).
Lt. Gen. William Frew Train, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).
Lt. Gen. Richard Davis Meyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, [redacted], U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Brig. Gen. Robert Bruce Shira, [redacted], Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3040, 3442 and 3447.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).
Maj. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).
Maj. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).
Maj. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).
Maj. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named Medical Corps officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Philip Wallace Mallory, [redacted], U.S. Army.

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. Kenneth Dew Orr, [redacted], U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Harold G. Bowen, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

William C. Abhau	Woodrow W. McCrory
Walter V. Combs, Jr.	Philip A. Beshany
Earl R. Crawford	Robert W. McNitt
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.	Raymond F. Du Bois
Thomas S. King, Jr.	Ralph Weymouth
Ed R. King	Evan P. Aurand
John J. Lynch	Vincent P. de Poix
David B. Bell	Thomas J. Walker III
Donald M. White	Eugene P. Wilkinson
Roger W. Mehle	Frederic A. Bardshar
Frederick H. Schneider, Jr.	Lawrence R. Geis
Ralph W. Cousins	C. Edwin Bell, Jr.
Donald "G" Baer	Frank C. Jones
Richard G. Colbert	Paul A. Holmberg
Walter L. Curtis, Jr.	Donald M. Showers
John E. Dacey	Harry C. Mason
	Jamie Adair

Medical Corps

Frank T. Norris
John S. Cowan
Harry S. Etter

Supply Corps

Kenneth R. Wheeler
George E. Moore II

Civil Engineer Corps

Robert R. Wooding

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Robert B. Bell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Douglas J. Peacher
Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Jack M. Pollin, to be professor of mathematics, U.S. Military Academy, and ending Jack A. Ziemke, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 17, 1967.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Jack G. Airlie, Jr., to be ensign, and ending Patrick J. Hephner, to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 21, 1967.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Blair P. Conway, to be second lieutenant, and ending Robert D. Rogers, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 21, 1967.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Robert L. Baker, to be captain in the Navy, and ending Alan C. DeCrane, to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 3, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

A faithful man shall abound with blessings.—Proverbs 28: 20.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we rejoice in the glory of a new day and in the beginning of another week. During this time when the foundations of the world seem to be shaken and the bite of bitterness would blight the best of men, we would use this hallowed moment of prayer to be assured of Thy presence and to tap the spiritual resources we need as we face the pressing duties of these hours.

May we feel Thy spirit leading us as we make our decisions, may we possess Thy power which holds us steady amid the constant pressures of daily life, and may our trust in Thee deliver us from those tensions which would tear us to pieces, and from those worries which would wear us out. All through this day may we think our best, do our best, and be our best, and thus be worthy of our calling to this high office.

Hasten the day when justice and love shall rule the hearts of men and reign

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

in the lives of all people. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090).

S. 443. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122).

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 3399) entitled "An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission."

COMMENDATION OF STATEMENT MADE BY CYRUS VANCE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the public can well applaud the statement made by the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the 90th annual convention of the Diocese of West Virginia at Martinsburg, W. Va., on May 6. He spoke with forceful logic which again spelled out the reasons for America's commitments in South Vietnam. He contrasted the clear and unmistakable difference between the efforts of the United States to help the South Vietnamese to establish a sound and stable government with the brutality and wanton terrorism used as deliberate tools by the Communists in an effort to enforce their will.

There are a number of passages which are of particular significance in his well-prepared statement. For instance, he declared:

Knowing these things—knowing the true face of the war, on both sides—I find it difficult to understand the convoluted logic which leads some to condemn this nation for "immorality" and to defend terrorism as a heroic struggle for "independence."

In reply to the argument that the United States has no vital interest in Southeast Asia, Secretary Vance said:

The national interest of the United States is international . . . our role of leadership is inescapable.

This does not mean that we must become the policeman of the world.

He said:

It does mean that we must stand behind the commitments we have made if we hope to preserve peace rather than permit raw and naked power to govern.

In his conclusion, Mr. Vance declared:

I would say to the young divinity students then: I share your abhorrence of war, but the sacrifice of principle and the loss of freedom are worse than the loss of life. Both principle and freedom are at stake in Vietnam, and so I believe that we are engaged in a just battle.

I believe, too, that the national interest of a great nation is involved wherever principle, freedom and the peace and stability of the world are imperiled. Thus, for these very reasons, I think we should be in Vietnam and we should stay there until the aggression ends.

RETIREMENT OF CARROLL KENWORTHY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that on Tuesday, Carroll Kenworthy will retire after 26 years as head of the foreign department at United Press International.

After early experience on the Hartford, Conn., Courant; the Tokyo, Japan, Advertiser, and the Wall Street Journal, Kenworthy began his UPI career while the organization was still the United Press, in 1930.

For a decade he covered the diplomatic beat, the foreign committees of Congress and other international news centers, and wrote about such great continuing stories of that era as the great depression, the Philippines independence campaign, the Roosevelt New Deal, the rise of Hitler, and the mounting war tensions in Europe and Asia.

Soon after being named head of the foreign department in August 1941, he scored a remarkable triumph with a story exactly 1 week before Pearl Harbor, which said talks between Secretary Hull and the special Japanese envoy, Saburo Kurusu, "are near collapse" and "it is believed Japan may strike."

His story was cited by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson at the joint congressional committee which after World War II investigated the lack of preparedness at Pearl Harbor.

His newspaper colleagues and many great and near-great news sources in Washington will miss his cool judgment and reliability. I wish him well on his retirement.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND HIGHER EDUCATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of academic freedom and higher education was seriously set back last week when former Governor of Alabama, George C. Wallace, was forced to leave a speaking platform at Dartmouth College as the result of mob action.

Both the president and dean of Dartmouth have condemned this attempt to silence Governor Wallace, which was led, according to press reports, by a faculty member from another nearby New England college.

However, apologies aside, the fact remains that the raucous and undemocratic mob action of members of an audience at Dartmouth stands in direct contrast to the reception given speakers by the faculty and students at the University of Alabama.

For example, I think it is generally understood that the junior Senator from New York is not likely to win any Gallup or Harris poll popularity contests in Alabama or Mississippi. Yet, not many months ago Senator KENNEDY came to the campuses at Tuscaloosa and Oxford, the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, and he was received and his views were given a hearing by the faculty and students at those institutions, regardless of any differences in opinion which may have existed between speakers and audiences.

Again, in contrast to the outrageous conduct at Stanford University and Harvard University toward, respectively, the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, I had occasion recently to accompany the Secretary of State to the University of Alabama campus, where he delivered an address on foreign policy. Mr. Rusk was cordially and respectfully received by the faculty and students at Tuscaloosa, as befits a Cabinet member of the U.S. Government who is a guest at an institution of higher learning in this country.

We are forced to conclude, then, that the "tolerance" level of Stanford, Harvard, and Dartmouth, as well as some other institutions thought to be enlightened leaders of American academia, may not be so high after all. And we are also forced to conclude that there must be a vital element missing in the standards being set and taught at these institutions.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen, I am, therefore, greatly disturbed over the serious implications of this trend to political disorder and intolerance in many of our country's major educational institutions. Obviously, the "right to dissent" as it is understood by some students on these campuses means the right to dissent so loudly as to deny any other point of view being heard. This, then, is not academic freedom, but a form of academic license that infringes upon the freedom of others.

We can all regret the need for the president and dean of a major American university to apologize for the unruly conduct of a student audience, as occurred last week at Dartmouth. But I must also admit to a considerable degree of pride that, in my own State of Alabama, the principles of patriotism, respect for our system, our Government, and our fundamental freedoms remain the solid foundation to our institutions of learning.

Mr. Speaker, although it is a rare occasion when I find myself in agreement with a general editorial statement of the Washington Post, that newspaper on May 5, 1967, expressed the growing concern of the country regarding the campus trend of which I speak.

This editorial follows:

STORM TROOPERS

When college children behave like children, as they sometimes will—engorging goldfish, infesting telephone booths, raiding panties from women's dormitories—one can laugh or sigh according to one's disposition and tolerance. But when they behave like Hitler Youth members—chanting slogans, stifling speech and wreaking violence—they betray their status as students. It would be folly to make light of such behavior or to treat it as a prank or even to condone it as an expression of adolescense. It hacks at the roots of freedom. It amounts to a very sick symptom of the unhappy polarization taking place in the American community.

The latest case in point, at Dartmouth College on Wednesday, involved a former Governor of Alabama, George Wallace, who had been invited to the campus by the college newspaper. He was heckled and physically threatened when he spoke; and after he had completed his speech, his car was surrounded, damaged and nearly overturned by a mob of fledgling storm troopers. The incident was, of course, money in the political bank for George Wallace who behaved with infinitely more dignity, intelligence, and wit than his assailants.

Dartmouth apologized, of course—as Howard and Harvard have recently had to apologize for similar unseemly happenings. But one wonders what they teach at these institutions. They had better begin teaching something about the real meaning of free speech and the democratic process and the rule of reason. Pretty soon, the way things seem to be going, they'll be burning books on college campuses, instead of reading them—because they don't like the authors.

FALSE NEWS PHOTOGRAPHS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a falsely captioned news photograph alleging American atrocities in Vietnam.

The photo to which I refer has been used by the magazine, the Minority of One, for the cover of its May issue. On the board of sponsors are Bertrand Russell, Linus Pauling, Prof. Pitirim A. Sorokin, and Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, U.S. Army, retired.

The picture shows an American soldier at the controls of a U.S. Army tank looking backward at the body of a man being dragged by a rope. The photo caption states that "In U.S.-'Aided' South Vietnam: 'Dusty Death' Is Administered to Guerrilla Suspects Caught by U.S. Military Personnel." The accompanying photo, from World War II, shows Nazis dragging live Polish partisans behind jeeps.

Upon inquiring at the Departments of State and Defense, I learned that the Vietcong shown in the photo was already dead, and that his body was pulled away with a rope to guard against the Communist practice of booby trapping bodies left on the battlefield, in order to blow up U.S. soldiers sent to bury them. Since the Buddhist religion requires prompt burial, a body left at the scene of battle is immediately suspect as a trap. In other instances, bodies are pulled away with a rope when they are badly decomposed.

I have asked the Post Office and Justice Departments to investigate the possibility that this false photo is an act of treason. But the main purpose of these remarks is to call attention to the tactics being used by some of those who obviously hold little love for their own country. At a time when America's young men are dying in Vietnam in defense of freedom, such lies betray their sacrifice and mock the free speech for which they fight.

GOVERNMENT JOBS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the May 4, 1967, issue of the Christian Science Monitor carried the following Associated Press dispatch:

The State Department has ordered a 2 percent cut in its employment ceilings here and around the world. The order abolishes an estimated 273 jobs and apparently is aimed both at economy and at curbing what critics contend is overstaffing in the big foreign-affairs agency.

This announcement reminds me that I gave the House an opportunity on April 26, 1967, to reduce the approximately 80,000 jobs in the Department of Interior and related agencies by 2 percent. This opportunity was given in an amendment I proposed that day to the bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. The amendment was rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

My amendment was based upon the fact, as disclosed on page 18 of part I of the hearing record, that at December 31, 1966, there were 4,820 job vacancies in the Department. Some of the vacancies came about as a result of a circular issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last September directing that employment levels be rolled back to the level of July 1, 1966, but some of it came about because of the inability of the Department to fill all jobs money had been appropriated for.

If the Department of Interior could operate throughout 1966 with 4,820 fewer jobs than were appropriated for last year, I cannot see why, in view of the critical budget situation that we face and the substantial deficit contemplated next year, the Department could not get along without increasing employment by 1,662 jobs.

My amendment would have done for the Department of Interior exactly what the State Department has now announced it is going to do on its own responsibility, as reported by the Associated Press. This is a clear example of how Congress has lost control of the purse strings—by appropriating money for more jobs than the executive departments need. Perhaps we will now begin to scrutinize more closely the agencies' requests for higher and higher levels of employment.

The State Department comes in for a great deal of criticism from time to time but in this instance it is setting Congress a good example. I hope we will take it to heart and stop giving departments more money than they actually need.

SUPPORT LEGISLATION PROHIBITING FLAG DESECRATION

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

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

There was no objection?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support measures now before the Judiciary Committee that would stiffen the penalties imposed on anyone found guilty of flag desecration. The States now have their own laws, and the penalties vary from a fine of a few dollars to $100, but my concern is that the States would be helpless to act when a violator crosses State lines. This legislation would allow the Justice Department to enter the case and prosecute. The founders of our Nation, when they wrote our freedoms into the Constitution, certainly did not intend for any of those freedoms to permit mutilation of the Nation's emblem. Mr. Speaker, I join the efforts of my colleagues who represent the beliefs of outraged Americans that contemptuous flag burning and mutilation have to cease.

CRIME AND POPULATION GROWTH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the standard rebuttal of those who say crime is no crisis in America is that "we have more crime because we have more people." That rebuttal simply will not stand analysis.

The FBI crime report covering the

1960 to 1965 period shows that the incidence of major crimes increased by 46 percent; in the same period, the Nation's population increased by only 8 percent. Crime grew nearly six times greater than population.

Neither is it accurate to say that population concentration in cities is the cause of urban crime growth. Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich, professor of sociology at St. Louis University, recently published total crime statistics for 18 major cities compared to population changes reflected in official Census Bureau figures. For the 10-year period, seven of those cities had population increases ranging from 10 percent to 71.42 percent while crime increases ranged from 47.29 percent to 186.80 percent. In only one of these seven cities, Dallas, was the rate of crime increase less than the rate of population increase.

The other 11 cities showed, not an increase, but a decrease in population ranging from 0.28 percent to 13 percent. Yet, all 11 cities had a total crime increase ranging between 11.64 percent and 168.44 percent.

The inescapable conclusion is that there is little correlation and probably only a negligible causal relation between demographic factors and our modern crime epidemic.

ERIC SEVAREID AND HIS COMMENTARY ON THE NEWS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend a news story reported that CBS news commentator, Eric Sevareid, has had discussions with leading Democrat officials from the State of North Dakota, regarding his possible candidacy on that party's ticket for U.S. Senator, against incumbent Republican Senator MILTON YOUNG.

With all the attention that has been given recently to the question of congressional ethics, I think this news story raises a question of journalistic ethics, which cannot be ignored by CBS.

To put this situation in proper perspective it must be recognized that Eric Sevareid's major responsibility with CBS is not to report the news, but to interpret and comment upon it.

This open admission by Sevareid that his sympathies lie with the Democrat Party would seem to raise questions about his own objectivity in political commentary on national and international issues. In my mind this has long been evident. The same obviously applied to former CBC commentator, Howard K. Smith, now with ABC.

The situation becomes even more critical because of the fact that the great television networks are not affected by the equal time provisions of the law, as they apply to local stations. The networks do not recognize any equal time requirements. It is doubtful that CBS would ever consider giving a Republican Party spokesman the opportunity to have 5 minutes of each evening on CBS news to reply to Sevareid, when his subject matter involves issues of political significance.

Assume, for example, that Sevareid is commenting upon a national issue in which the Republican Senator from North Dakota takes a different stance than Sevareid. Would such commentary from a supposedly nonpartisan or journalistically objective source, not enhance Sevareid's potential as a political candidate? And would it not have at least a subtle impact on constituents of all Republicans officeholders, whose views and positions almost by definition also differ from Sevareid's?

I realize that an effort might be made to draw a parallel in this instance to Gov. Ronald Reagan who is presumed to have drawn some advantage from his public exposure as a performer on television. But Reagan was not a political analyst on a network television program and it would indeed be stretching a point to make any valid comparison. Indeed, he was only helping market "progress" as the most important product of you know who.

I submit, there is a very real question of ethics involved in this situation which CBS cannot afford to ignore.

If CBS does not see fit to replace Sevareid, it might at the very least consider adding a disclaimer each evening to the effect that the views of this possible Democrat candidate for public office does not necessarily represent the views of CBS news—or do they?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—PERMISSION TO SIT TOMORROW, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967, DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit tomorrow, Tuesday, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE CANADIAN SENATE, THE HONORABLE SYDNEY J. SMITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from the President of the Canadian Senate, the Honorable Sydney J. Smith. He requests that I advise the House of the appreciation and gratitude of the Canadian Senate for the expressions of this House's congratulations to Canada contained in House Resolution 280, agreed to on March 20, 1967.

The letter follows:

SPEAKER OF THE SENATE,
Ottawa, Canada, April 28, 1967.

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

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been requested by my colleagues in the Canadian Senate to convey to you on their behalf, and to all Members of the United States House of Representatives, our appreciation and gratitude for the Concurrent Resolution introduced on March 14th last and adopted shortly thereafter. This thoughtful gesture of extending congratulations on the occasion of our Centennial of Confederation was received with gratitude and affection by all my colleagues, as indeed were the generous remarks made by the sponsors of the Resolution.

I have been honoured to place the Resolution, together with the remarks of its sponsors, on the official record of the Canadian Senate on April 19th, last, and I am sure that this is a most fitting prelude to the Tenth Meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, which we will be pleased to welcome to Canada in two weeks' time.

I am, my dear Mr. Speaker,
Yours sincerely,
SYDNEY J. SMITH.

THE TEACHER CORPS AS AN EXPRESSION OF AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL IDEALISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today there is hardly a school district, a school, or a community in America that is not looking for new tools for educational innovation.

What does innovation mean today? It means new schoolrooms. It means new ideas about who gets what in our schools. It means new machines and new equipment. But most of all it means new teachers, additional teachers, teachers imbued with the spirit of serving those who have been too little served by our public school system in the United States.

Under the forceful leadership of President Johnson the Congress established a national teacher corps to meet the educational needs of the rural and urban poor. The funds allocated for the program were limited compared with other expenditures. The number of teachers recruited was small. Yet the impact of the program has been great in every school district affected.

It is the intention of the administration to continue and strengthen the Teacher Corps. Under the committee's bill, the Commissioner of Education will be able to continue to arrange with the local school board—at their request—to send Teacher Corps teams to local schools. This completely preserves the local character and local control of the Corps.

In addition, committee amendments to the act provide that the poorest States

will receive the largest number of Teacher Corps members, if the supply of corpsmen exceed demand from other States. This provision links the Teacher Corps teams intimately to title I of the act which is geared to the number of low-income school children in a district.

The purpose of the Teacher Corps is to supply increased numbers of qualified educational personnel to needy children whose learning has suffered from educational and economic deprivation.

The Teacher Corps is probably one of the most idealistic yet practical education experiments which this country has undertaken in 25 years. It will test our resolve. It will test the ability of our youth. It will benefit our children—the leaders of tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to join me in assuring all our children the grand opportunity furnished to them through the Teacher Corps. Let us all support the approved committee version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967.

BENEFITS OF MODEL CITIES PROGRAM ALREADY SEEN IN TULSA, OKLA.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are daily reading about the benefits already flowing from the model cities program. On March 30, the Tulsa Tribune published an editorial, entitled "A Side Benefit," which described the efforts of Tulsa in preparing their application for a model city.

This editorial noted:

Regardless of the outcome of this application, however, the efforts of the many Tulsans involved will not have been wasted . . . For the committee debates should strengthen the entire city.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has long been searching for ways to stimulate our cities and our State governments to take an active role in planning for the future of their communities. The activities to date clearly shows that the model cities program is doing just that. It is motivating our mayors, our citizens, our business and civic leaders to take an active part in seeking new solutions to their problems.

I suggest that the model cities program has already proven successful in its initial stages. Tulsa, Okla., is but one example of successes across the country. With sufficient funding I believe the program will be even more successful.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues this informative and interesting editorial by inserting it in the RECORD:

A SIDE-BENEFIT

Tulsa now has a network of citizens' committees at work on the problems associated with poverty and blight in this community.

One group of committees, appointed by the mayor, is exploring Tulsa's chances of participating in the Model Cities program, which is a major national-local effort to revitalize poor neighborhoods.

The plans are for the future, but one side-benefit is already in view. Preparing these applications takes a lot of time and community-wide effort. Simply getting people and agencies together to work on these problems is "strengthening the abilities of cities to cope with their own problems."

That observation comes from the Massachusetts consulting firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., which has been active in developing Model Cities programs across the nation. It is true here, too. The firm reports:

"For the first time in a number of cities, the problem of planning a program application has brought together city agencies that have never met before in the same room. It is evident, too, that new groups of citizens and private firms are being brought into the development effort."

Tulsa has six such committees with dozens of members and they have been working toward a deadline which falls tomorrow. The discussions are truly community-wide, and that is good.

The Model Cities act, passed by Congress in 1966, emphasizes local initiative and responsibility. It calls for not just urban renewal, but expansion of job opportunities, less dependency on welfare payments, better educational opportunities and concerted attacks on disease, delinquency and crime.

The consulting firm urges cities to be "idealistic in purpose, yet pragmatic in approach." It recommends that cities set up specific and obtainable objectives, and that they protect themselves by building flexibility into their programs.

In this way, they "can avoid the situation where the validity of a single project or assumption could determine the success or failure of the entire program."

This is sound advice. To date, Congress has appropriated only enough money for a limited number of cities to undertake the initial planning phase. Competition for funds is bound to be keen.

Regardless of the outcome of this application, however, the efforts of the many Tulsans involved will not have been wasted if the plans are, as Arthur D. Little Inc. says, pragmatic and flexible. For the committee debates should strengthen the entire city.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF SUBVERSIVES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my position on House Joint Resolution 544, which I introduced last week, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the matter of employing subversives in the public schools.

The need for the proposed amendment arises from a majority opinion handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court this January, in the case of Keyishian against University of New York. The opinion to which I refer denies to a State government the right of refusing employment in the public schools to a schoolteacher on the grounds that he or she is advocating the violent overthrow of government in the United States or is knowingly a member of an organization advocating such doctrine. House Joint Resolution 544 is designed to overrule the decision of the Court in the case of Keyishian against University of New York.

In seeking to protect the individual American in his right to the free expression of political opinion, the Supreme Court has simply gone too far. It has declared, in the name of the Federal Constitution, that the State cannot refuse employment to a person openly advocating the destruction of the State. And that does not make sense. Surely, the authors of the Federal Constitution did not intend to include in the document the seeds of the destruction of the several State governments and of the Federal Government itself. Surely they did not intend to tie the hands of persons sworn to the protection of our constitutional principles, State and Federal alike. To have so intended would have set us on a course of national suicide, from the very beginning.

House Joint Resolution 544 empowers a State, following full judicial review, to disqualify from teaching in the public schools any person found guilty of willfully advocating the forceful overthrow of any Government in the United States, or of printing, publishing, editing, or selling any book or paper advocating such doctrine, or of willfully and deliberately becoming a member of an organization advocating such doctrine.

It must be admitted that in every case wherein a vaguely worded or ambiguous law is passed, concerning the political beliefs of public officials, there is always a chance that the law will be misused; that demogog may seize upon it, simply to embarrass their political opponents.

No such possibility exists here, however. The law is clearly stated. There is nothing ambiguous about it. The only persons it can touch are those who advocate, in one way or another, the overthrow of a Government in the United States, by violent means.

And if nothing is done to reverse the position of the Supreme Court in this regard, what then? My opinion is the same as that of the four justices of the Supreme Court who voted against the majority opinion in the case of Keyishian against University of New York. From their point of view, the doors of American education have been opened to communism—to the enemies of the Republic—who are free, therefore, to spread their propaganda, in the guise of schoolteachers. And even if discovered, they cannot be removed from their positions.

I heartily concur with the dissenting justices of the Supreme Court, and I urge the favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 544, as a means of preventing the continuation of this fantastic state of affairs.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that has arisen with respect to the proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] which would provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools in the form of block grants, has prompted many concerned residents of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District to write to me. Because I wish to respond to these inquiries as rapidly and as fully as possible, I insert in the RECORD materials which I believe should clarify this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that there has been much misunderstanding regarding the intentions and the expected consequences of this effort to insure both the most effective use of aid funds and the future freedom and independence of our schools. No one having a long-range interest in the education of our youth should pass judgment on this new approach without carefully studying the following statements by members of the House Education and Labor Committee:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES E. GOODELL, OF NEW YORK

In the current debate involving the Quie amendment to the administration's education bill, some points require emphasis. They can be stated quite simply, and I hope all individuals concerned with this issue will take the time to read the following:

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL ISSUE

The Quie amendment was specifically designed to avoid the church-state issue. It adopts exactly the same procedure as in present law, requiring public school officials to make equitable provision for private school students. Although the Quie amendment did not contemplate commingling of Federal and State funds, some private school officials raised this specter and said commingling would cut out private school students in 33 States that have strict church-state constitutional provisions. To reassure all concerned, Mr. Quie added a specific provision clarifying that there could be no commingling under his amendment. Other clarifications were added to the Quie amendment to meet all the initial reservations raised by private school officials. In addition, from the very beginning the Quie amendment has provided that the Commissioner could bypass any State that failed to make adequate provision for private school students. Under such circumstances the Commissioner could, in effect, proceed as under present law.

In truth, the private school officials are now divided over the Quie amendment. They agree that the bill itself makes sincere and ample provision for private school students, even expanding present provisions of the law. Some private school officials, however, now say in effect: "The only way you can guarantee adequate participation of private school students is to have authority centralized in an all-powerful Commissioner of Education in Washington. We cannot trust State school officials to include private school students." That is the real issue posed by those private school officials who still oppose the Quie amendment. No matter what provisions are added, as long as the Quie amendment gives greater flexibility and control of education at the State and local level, these particular private school officials will oppose it. Fortunately, many people concerned about fair treatment for private school students disagree vehemently with such opponents of the Quie amendment.

2. NO PUBLIC HEARING

The original Quie proposal, embodying a number of provisions beyond the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was introduced March 20, and was before the committee when hearings were held. Virtually every witness was questioned carefully as to the Quie proposal. The administration bill was refined in the light of committee hearings; so was the Quie amendment. It can be fairly said that most of the educational experts testifying agree with the basic approach of the Quie amendment.

3. LESS MONEY TO SOME STATES

The Quie amendment changes the allocation formula. In its original form it would have reduced money to New York, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. Education spokesmen contended a large number of States would receive less money under the Quie formula, including most Southern States. Mr. Quie denied this. In order to resolve any question in this regard, Mr. Quie added a specific provision that under no circumstances shall any State receive less money than it received under the previous allocation.

In sum, the Quie amendment represents a giant stride in the direction of giving State and local officials more discretion and control over education. It guarantees that private school students will be taken care of exactly as they are under present law. The real opposition to the Quie amendment is from those who favor continued centralized control of Federal education funds. That will be the choice before the House of Representatives when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is debated.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT H. QUIE, OF MINNESOTA

A number of misconceptions have been circulated about my amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), known as the Quie Amendment. It is extremely unfortunate that the Church-State issue has been introduced into the debate over the merits of my amendment and the amendments proposed by the Administration, H.R. 7819.

The Quie Amendment to ESEA is designed solely to return Federal aid to public and private school pupils in the form of "block grants" to the states, rather than through categorical grants. This method of getting aid to pupils would, in my view, be much more efficient and beneficial to students.

The rumor has been circulated that the Quie Amendment would take benefits away from private (parochial) school pupils. This is not true. The Amendment would continue every form of assistance now available for private (parochial) school pupils and teachers. In fact, it would even extend some of those benefits.

When I prepared the amendment, I deliberately wrote in sections to make certain that private school pupils would continue to receive the same benefits they enjoy under the present Act.

Programs in the local schools funded through the block grant must include arrangements for private school pupils to participate. In fact, no State plan could be approved unless it met requirements designed to safeguard pupils in private schools, because the funds must be used for the benefit of students both in public and private schools to the extent consistent with the number of children attending each. This is exactly the same as provided in ESEA. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 704. (a) (3) provides that, to the extent consistent with the number of children attending private elementary and secondary schools in school attendance areas selected for programs under Section 703, provision will be made on an equitable basis for including special educational services and arrangements (such as, but not limited to, dual enrollment, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment and other special educational arrangements) in which such children can participate;"

Federal funds for textbooks and library materials (a minimum of $120 million under the Quie Amendment) must include an equitable distribution on a loan basis for private school pupils and teachers. Moreover, my amendment expands to the present Act by including laboratory and other instructional equipment among these materials. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 704. (a) (4) provides that arrangements (whether through the State educational agency or some other State agency or commission) for the distribution of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment and materials for the use of teachers and pupils shall include provisions for the loan of such resources, textbooks, equipment and materials on an equitable basis for the use of teachers and pupils in non-public schools;"

My amendment includes still another safeguard for private schools, the so called "bypass" mechanism. If a State cannot legally provide for the loan of textbooks, instructional equipment and materials for private school pupils and teachers, the U.S. Commissioner of Education would arrange for such loans directly to them on an equitable basis from the funds allotted to these States, thus avoiding any State constitutional limitation. This is exactly the arrangement under which the ESEA and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) presently operate. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 705. (b) In any State which has a State plan approved under Section 704(b) in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for such testing and for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials and equipment for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year out of the State's allotment."

In addition, since the Quie Amendment will specifically prohibit the commingling of Federal with State funds, no State is restricted by its legal requirement on State funds in carrying out arrangements for the participation of private school pupils.

In conclusion, let me emphasize again, the Quie Amendment will not take benefits away from pupils who attend private (parochial) schools.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES JOHN N. ERLENBORN, OF ILLINOIS, AND WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, OF IOWA

Let us say, first of all, that we are Roman Catholics, and that both of us are products of parochial schools. We believe that erroneous information and even more erroneous interpretation has been circulated about this amendment.

It is not an anti-Catholic amendment, but it is anti-Federal bureaucracy. It intends to give school children better educational opportunities; and it intends to afford school administrators—both public and parochial—a better chance of bringing those opportunities to the children in their care.

MINK RANCHERS NEED EMERGENCY FHA FINANCING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have called on the Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration to use their authority in providing emergency financing to U.S. mink ranchers who find themselves caught in a financial vise between current high operating costs and deflated prices on current pelt stocks caused by free-flowing cheap imports.

In a letter to the Department and FHA, I noted that our Nation's mink farmers are in desperate need of financial credit to sustain them through this period of low prices for their pelts, caused by increased mink imports, and high overhead costs as the kitting—birth of young mink—season gets underway.

Mr. Speaker, emergency help is needed right now, while we work on the long-range problem of restoring the American mink industry to a profitable level through legislation such as mine to limit the increasing glut of mink pelts into the country. The U.S. mink industry, after spending millions of dollars to promote mink throughout the Nation and the world, now find cheap foreign imports have increased to the point that the imports account for 42 percent of domestic consumption. The result was an average auction price drop of about $4.50 per skin. In Minnesota, for instance, the mink industry estimates that over 50 percent of the current crop remains to be sold. Unless the price rises, the ranchers face economic disaster at the very moment when they are experiencing their yearly peak in feeding expenses as the young mink are born.

Production credit associations have been able to lend assistance in a few cases and local banks have helped some. But the greatest need is for priority treatment by the Farmers Home Administration in its loan program. With American mink buyers stepping up purchases of mink from foreign sources, the U.S. auction companies are no longer in a position to provide the primary credit to domestic producers, as has been the practice in past years.

That is why FHA should exert every effort to help mink farmers get through this crucial period of low prices, high imports, dried-up credit sources, and high carryover rate of last year's stocks.

FLAG DESECRATION SHOULD BE MADE A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House Judiciary subcommittee now holding hearings on legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime will approve the strong provisions of my bill, H.R. 3925, at the earliest possible time.

Unquestionably there is widespread public resentment against recent flag-burning and flag-marring incidents. The burning of our national flag at so-called peace demonstrations last month in New York should be reason enough for Federal legislation to prohibit such shameful and despicable incidents. Also in April, a college instructor in Indiana burned an American flag in class on a dare, while denying there was anything unpatriotic about the incident.

Accordingly, we must deter and punish any further efforts to deliberately damage the flag, which is the symbol of our freedom and proud heritage. At a time when American soldiers are engaged in a war halfway around the world, Congress should not hesitate to insure proper respect and protection for our national flag at home.

Under my bill, those who mutilate or desecrate the flag would be punished by imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to $10,000, or both. This penalty is the same as that prescribed for draft card burners by a 1965 amendment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

As further need for this legislation, I recall several flag-marring incidents which received nationwide publicity last year: An Illinois schoolteacher trampled on the flag in front of his class; demonstrators in Georgia pulled down the flag from courthouse grounds and proceeded to tear it, trample and spit on it; a speaker on a college campus in Indiana spit on the flag, then ripped it into pieces, threw it on the floor and stomped on it; and a New York theater sponsored the burning of the flag on stage.

It is my earnest hope that the subcommittee and full Judiciary Committee will see fit to approve this legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime.

RENT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 I sponsored the rent certification program which was included in the Housing Bill of 1965. The administration now refers to this as the section 23 program. This enables the Housing Assistance Administration to make use of privately owned, privately operated properties, paying full taxes, for low income people who are eligible for public housing. The program—when I last checked—was in use in all parts of the country, in 27 States and 94 cities. The HAA had a total of 21,512 units applied for, about 13,000 units under contract and approximately 10,000 people under roof.

I believe this is an excellent record on the part of the Housing Assistance Administration and its Housing Management Division. I hope that the successful operations to date continue.

It has come to my attention, however, that certain restrictive conditions are being added by the HUD secretariat, to the contracts made by the individual housing authorities. This was not the intention of the Congress.

To be specific, in Washington, D.C., the secretariat allows no rent certificate "section 23" units to be utilized except when they have been rehabilitated. The justification for the secretariat's action is that there is a low vacancy rate in Washington and to do otherwise might drive rents upward.

This may or may not be so. There were, however, no such intentions in the Congress at the time at the time of the Housing Act of 1965's enactment. Such conditions could not be added by any interpretation I can conceive. I regard the nature of such conditions as a contravention of the intent of Congress. It breaks faith with the people who so badly need decent, safe, sanitary housing. If such housing is available and does not need rehabilitation they should have its use.

Had the secretariat consulted Congress as to these restrictive conditions which it intended to add to contractual relationships, things might have been different. In this particular case, however, I find that once against the administration is trying to remake the rent housing program, which is working, so it will serve as a handmaiden to the rent supplement program which is not working. Consequently, I have today introduced legislation which will prevent the secretariat of HUD from misinterpreting the intent of Congress by adding restrictive conditions.

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues today in paying our respects to the late Victor A. Johnston, director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and formerly executive director of the Republican Party of Wisconsin.

Vic, who recently made his home during part of the year in the State of Florida, was highly respected as an adviser to senatorial Republican officeholders and aspirants. His impact both on the Republican Party and on the national political scene was substantial during his 18-year career as director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Victor A. Johnston was one of the unsung heroes of the two-party system. He went about his tasks out of the public limelight. We can be sure, however, that his memory will shine brightly in the hearts of those who had the privilege of

working with him. Vic will be missed both as an individual and as a party adviser in the years ahead.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a farmer in Lincoln County, Minn., commenting on the difficulties that his family has faced because of the critical agricultural situation. It certainly sums up the plight of our rural areas, and points to growing insistence by the people that something must be done—and done now.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share this letter with my colleagues in the House, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

I am a farmer living in Lincoln County, married and have three boys, ages 21, 17, and 13. Don't ask me why I'm in agriculture because my wife and I have had it up to our necks. We milk 25 cows, raise hogs, cattle, and chickens. At the present time, I'm sure we aren't breaking even on milking cows and today our milk check showed another 3 cents *drop* in price. Hogs used to be mortgage lifters but now you have to be pretty sharp to break even. Eggs are 19–20 cents per dozen, have been for six weeks or more, so the laying hens go to the soup factory next week. Holstein bulls are a good price which shows people are eating baloney and hamburger instead of steak.

What's to become of Lincoln County and all counties you represent under conditions like this? What kind of an administration do we have in Washington? Why doesn't someone give some consideration to the family farmers, who are raising some of the finest children in the world, and produces the food which *is so vital* to everyone's existence? LBJ worries more about foreign aid, putting a man on the moon, his poverty program and scores of other unnecessary things than what's really his chief concern—agriculture. Last night we heard a Catholic priest from Elkton, South Dakota speak on the farm problem at Tyler. He had attended the meeting in Ames, Iowa, where our Honorable Secretary Orville Freeman met with farmers and had made the remark that, "I can't see anything wrong out here, everything looks good and there's no problem in Agriculture"! Tell me, if you can, Mr. Zwach, is he really that stupid or doesn't he want to see for fear he'll lose his Federal pay check?

I'm speaking for 95 percent of the people in Lincoln County when I say LBJ better pull his head out of the sand along with his aids, because all over farmers are getting a raw deal. We can't hang on much longer and you better believe this.

Government spending the way they do, can't go on. This Viet Nam war is needless. Money, men, and munition plants are the ones gaining, at the cost of human life. If you or I had pulled the crooked deals of Adam Clayton Powell, Bobby Baker and scores of others have done, would we be around? You know the answer.

Do all you can to push the bill for postal driveway delivery to all farms. We have been driving over a mile for our mail for over 50 years and yet the school bus picks up our boys at the driveway every day. Mail service is terrible and gets worse all the time in spite of hikes in postal rates.

Consumers of milk scream their heads off by having to pay 23 to 25 cents per quart for milk, but say nothing when they pay 80 cents per quart for beer.

The N.F.O.—Farm Bureau—Farmers Union and the Grange should all get together and form one good, solid farm organization and demand a price for their farm products. Without it we have nothing and will get nothing.

DOCUMENTATION OF CITIZENSHIP FOR CHILDREN BORN ABROAD

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague the gentlemar from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN] in introducing a bill to reform the method of documentation of U.S. citizenship for children born overseas to American parents.

Under this bill, Department of State certification of American citizenship would be adequate proof of this citizenship. This would do away with the hardships and burdens on thousands of American families who return home to face an administrative burden trying to prove their children are actually American citizens.

This situation occurs because there is no law requiring the acceptance of this State Department certification of birth as evidence of U.S. citizenship. The bill I am joining my colleague [Mr. MACHEN] in proposing, would simply require the U.S. Attorney General to issue a certificate of citizenship to those persons who hold the State Department certification of birth, and thus simplify an otherwise complicated process.

I am personally well aware of the problems involved in the present process. When I was called back into the service during the Korean conflict, my daughter was born in Germany. And today, with our increasing involvements and commitments in the free world, there are more American citizens facing similar situations overseas.

This bill would be a simple answer to these problems and I urge my colleagues to take quick action to adopt it.

LOWER PRICES AND HIGHER COSTS—THE MAJOR PROBLEM FACING AGRICULTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from Mr. H. L. Selvig, a farmer who lives at Plaza, N. Dak. He sums up, in a few words, the major problem facing agriculture—lower prices and higher costs. Mr. Selvig writes:

In looking over our farm records this morning we find in 1947 on a ½ sec. of land, our wheat sold for $2.60 and flax $5.85 per bushel. And taxes were $67.08. In 1966, or 20 years later, we got $1.40 for our wheat and $2.80 for the flax and taxes $286.68. And we have rec'd. notice that our taxes will be a lot more in 1967.

With Freeman fixing grain prices we better sell this land.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, PRESIDENT TRUMAN

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is both a great honor and a matter of personal pride to stand here in the well of the House again today, as I have done on this occasion since 1959, to pay tribute to so great and distinguished an American, and to claim proudly as a constituent, former President Harry S. Truman. On this day as he celebrates his 83d birthday, I wish to extend to him, on behalf of millions of his fellow Americans, and on behalf of his fellow Missourians and fellow townsmen, the fondest wishes for continued health and happiness.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished Member of this body who has the honor to represent former President Truman and the Fourth District of Missouri in this House.

Great Presidents are usually measured in terms of their contribution to their day and generation. Once in a while a man comes along who serves not only his generation but many generations.

In my mind, Harry Truman is one of those men. He cut the pattern for American foreign policy not only for his own administration but for many administrations to succeed him. President Truman's accomplishments and foresight loom larger with every passing year; both by the judgments of his day and of future generations he certainly will be listed among the most distinguished of our Presidents.

I commend the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to the fact that this is the birthday of this eminent American and I join him in wishing happy birthday to President Truman. Mrs. Albert and I hope that he will have many more birthdays and that they will all be happy.

Mr. RANDALL. I am very grateful for the contribution of our majority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although former President Truman was a President of these United States as a

Democrat, and although on occasions he has been somewhat critical and harsh of those of us on this side of the aisle, I think all of us regardless of political affiliation, wish him many more years of health and happiness on this, his 83d birthday.

Mr. RANDALL. I appreciate very much the kind remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join Members on both sides of the aisle who are wishing the former occupant of the important chair of the Presidency of the United States, my own fellow Missourian, Hon. Harry S. Truman, many happy returns.

It has been my privilege since serving in the executive branch during World War II under his administration to have been designated by him on occasion, although poles apart politically perhaps, as the acting White House physician when he journeyed into the Ozarks or when the White House physician or his present doctor, Dr. Graham, was not available. I have always honored this.

We have had him in our town to dedicate armories and other institutions named Truman, and after his cousin, Gen. Ralph Truman and others who have been great men in the history of our country.

Indeed, former President Truman did bring history into the concept of evaluating matters and the future trend of this Nation's problems.

We hope he has many happy returns and that the arthritis which plagues him on his 83d birthday may disappear before his 84th birthday rolls around.

Many happy returns, President Truman.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my colleague from Missouri.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I had occasion to become involved in a conversation with Sir Robert Menzies, who at that time was Prime Minister of Australia. He spoke in glowing terms of his friend, Harry Truman. He said that there were three things that stood out in his mind about Harry Truman. One was his personal integrity and another was the fact that he was loyal to his friends, and the last was his great capacity for making a decision when the decisionmaking was very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I share those sentiments and I, too, want to join my colleagues in wishing our former President a happy birthday and many more of them.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, very much for bringing us this appraisal of Mr. Truman from the former Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate and commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling to the attention of the House this fine day, the 83d birthday of former President Truman. I certainly join my friend in the well in extending to President Truman best wishes on this day, with every wish for his health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and appreciate the fact that he took this time today to give some of us an opportunity to express our great admiration and our best wishes to the great former President on his birthday. I served the complete number of years that Harry Truman was Vice President and President, and one of the things that sticks in my mind in regard to this great man from Missouri is the fact that he had the capacity to make decisions, rough, hard, difficult decisions, in times of need.

I go back to the time when he had to carry on the work of the United Nations which had been started by his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I go back to the time when he made the decision to use the atomic weapon in Japan.

I go back to the time when he made the decision to find out if it was feasible to make the hydrogen weapon. I have often wondered what would have happened had he not made that tremendously important decision at the time he made it, because on the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we told him that we thought this thing had to be explored to find out if you could unite and fuse the light elements of hydrogen to cause this tremendous explosion a thousand times greater than the fission of the atom in the atomic weapon.

At that time he made the right decision on the recommendations that we and others had proposed. It was a decision fraught with the greatest possibilities for humanity and the world. We did not know at that time that the Soviets were working on a hydrogen weapon; but we had every reason to believe that this was being done. Nineteen months after we successfully exploded the hydrogen device, the Soviets exploded a hydrogen device.

Now, think for a moment; if at that time in the world's history the Soviets had had sole possession of the hydrogen bomb, could they or would they have issued ultimatums to the other nations of the world? Would they have said, "Get out of Europe or we will let you have one of these weapons at a strategic place"? What would our position have been? What would have been the positions of the nations of Europe at that time? If that kind of ultimatum had been given to them, would they have borne the responsibility of an impact of a weapon of this kind in case the Soviets decided to use it?

We were not in that position. We were not in that position due to the fact that Harry Truman made the decision to spend, if necessary, a billion dollars to find out if you could have a hydrogen weapon.

We began to have it in inventory in a usable fashion at the time the Soviets proved that they could also fuse the light elements of hydrogen. World history, there is no doubt in my mind, was affected because we were in a position of strength due to the decisiveness of Harry S. Truman. We were in a position where we could not be intimidated or threatened as we would have been had another course been taken; that is, if we had appointed a commission to study the problem, for instance, for a couple of years.

So this man made many other decisions, but these are three of the great decisions that I want to call to the attention of Members today and to add my tremendous respect and admiration for a man who served his country and served it well. I thank you very much.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman. Those remarks are most welcome because they come from one who is knowledgeable and speaks with authority as a member and former chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

As we are given only one opportunity on this earth to develop our skills and to make some contribution to the betterment of mankind, the manner in which we develop our talents determines our place in history. And as time mellows our historic perspective, the greatness of our forebears is revealed. Each generation is faced with challenges which force it to seek out men of leadership, determination, resourcefulness, and courage, thrusting upon them the responsibilities for decisions which literally mold the course of history and charging them with the responsibility of maintaining the peace and security of humanity.

The Truman years were years of challenge, years in which the security and peace of the world were threatened, and thus thrust upon the shoulders of this great man were burdens and decisions almost unequaled and certainly unparalleled throughout our history. I would never want to be one who took a part in trying to distort any event in history, but I am sure I am correct in saying I believe history will support the claim that President Truman will go down in the records as one of the truly great American Presidents of our time.

His courage was outstanding in those critical hours of decision which seem to run the whole gamut of his administration. His confrontation with Stalin at Potsdam, his acceptance of the responsibility for the use of the atomic bomb, his unhesitating response to the challenge against the United States in Korea, the fortitude which caused him to carry through the 1948 election campaign to an electoral triumph that had been widely regarded as an impossibility—these attest to his courage, bravery, fortitude, and, yes, his greatness.

To courage, he added a gift for seeing issues clearly and for stating them in plain and sometimes blunt terms; but

ones which were clearly understood by his countrymen. Many Americans esteem this gift of his—a rare one in political life; in and of itself a special form of courage.

Now, to merely reiterate the accomplishments of the Truman years would be a dry recitation of facts of which I am sure the Members are all aware. But to try to perceive them in the perspective of the time in which they were necessitated would reveal some of the impact and significance of Mr. Truman's mark upon history.

On March 12 of this year, we took time to observe the 20th anniversary of the Truman doctrine, the cornerstone of American postwar diplomacy.

It was on March 12, 1947, that Mr. Truman went before a joint session of the Congress to announce a policy that was to prove to be a milestone in U.S. history. Under the terms of that policy, American military and political power were extended throughout the world.

President Truman's immediate purpose on that March 12 day in 1947 was to request $400 million in economic and military aid with which to rescue Greece and Turkey. Greece was on the edge of political and economic collapse, in grave peril from the Communist guerrilla movement. Turkey, along with Greece, was about to lose her military and economic support from Great Britain.

One of the first great decisions of that administration which became the cornerstone of American postwar policy, is today called the Truman doctrine. Under the direction of this policy, the United States has assumed the burden and, yes, the responsibility of world leadership as the mightiest nation on earth. The core of the Truman doctrine, as it has been known, is that the United States declared her willingness and determination to support free peoples resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It operated under the premise that totalitarian regimes imposed upon free peoples by direct or indirect aggression undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

But the responsibility of world leadership did not stop with the creation of the Truman doctrine. Three months later the Marshall plan was instituted—one of the most humanitarian ventures ever undertaken by one nation for the benefit of its fellow states. It led to the economic recovery of the states of Europe and the development of bonds of friendship.

The Truman doctrine led, in a series of related steps, to the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to the entire policy of containment of communism by a network of military alliances stretching from the United States to Europe and across Asia.

Recently—very recently, in fact—there was a meeting of what is called the Council of Europe. The Council held a session a week or so ago to observe the 20th anniversary of the Marshall plan, which at the depths of the post-war depression helped to rebuild the devastated economies of France, England, Belgium, the Netherlands, and other allies.

Significantly, at the time of that meeting, there was not a single Frenchman, not one single member of the Gaullist government, who got up to say a word in memory of the Marshall plan. But there was an old gentleman, the 90-year-old dean of the French National Assembly, Marius Moutet, who could not stand it any longer, and who jumped to his feet to say:

> Maybe the Gaullists don't want to mention the Marshall plan, but I am going to mention it. France owes a great debt of gratitude to the United States and we will never forget it. If the French Government wants to remain silent, I will not.

Deputy Moutet went on to say:

> My voice will speak out for the people of France. We will always remember the Marshall plan.

The Truman years witnessed many challenges to America's determination to maintain peace.

The impact of the Truman doctrine upon the events abroad was immediate and powerful. Turkey and Iran were fortified against Soviet pressures. The previous attitude toward the power of the Communists in Western Europe was so altered that the Communists were dropped from the Governments of France and Italy within about 2 months.

American policies and actions growing out of the Truman doctrine have been successful in maintaining international order, in helping nations to preserve their independence, in promoting economic and social progress, and in keeping the peace.

The United States came a long way from the isolation and noninvolvement policies of our Founding Fathers by the end of the Second World War, but not until the leadership of the Truman administration did she fully and permanently assume the responsibility for this new leadership.

In the years of the Truman Presidency, mankind took tremendous steps toward the unsure future—steps unparalleled almost throughout the entire previous course of history.

I will mention two, which we believe to be of great significance:

First, we must remember that here we are dealing with the transition period, the transition from the pre-atomic era into the age of nuclear energy, into an age of advanced technology and science. The advancement into the nuclear age, or atomic age, challenged and tested man's ability to maintain peace and with that peace the responsibility for the future of humanity.

The atomic era challenged mankind, and especially its leaders, with the choice of using nuclear energy, on the one hand, for the benefit of mankind, or, on the other hand, for the destruction of mankind and civilization. Never before in the history of the civilized world had any one nation possessed the ability to destroy in an instant that which had been built up over the thousands of years of history or with the same power of the atom to build and expand the horizons of human achievement.

Realizing only through peace could mankind ever hope to achieve the peaceful utilization of the atom rather than the destructive force and power that it had, he fostered and encouraged the plans for the creation of a permanent organization in which the nations of the world could peacefully meet. I refer to the United Nations.

Much to the credit of President Truman, the United Nations found its home here in the United States. A President forced, because of the exigencies of the time, to be a President of war, found a way also to be a President who thought in terms of the future peace and security of the world. The establishment of a lasting international organization dedicated to the cause of peace in a time of turmoil was the second great transition in the thinking of the world which occurred under the Presidency of Harry S. Truman. The Truman years saw the materialization of the United Nations, an organization dedicated to peace, at about the same time man became possessed of the capability to destroy his neighbor as well as himself.

I think we might take a moment to turn to recall some of his triumphs in terms of the domestic programs proposed and accomplished by Mr. Truman.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I am pleased to yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is well that we pause on an occasion like this to pay our respects to one who has occupied the most responsible position in the world, the office of the President of the United States, whether one has passed into the great beyond or is living, as is our dear friend Harry Truman today.

I join with my friend from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] and others in congratulating former President Harry S. Truman on his birthday anniversary. I know it is with the sincere hope and prayers of all of us that God in His infinite wisdom will bestow upon him countless future similar anniversaries. I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues when I also convey to Mrs. Truman our kindest regards, because we all know the very important part that Mrs. Truman has played in the life of Harry S. Truman.

Harry S. Truman, the 33d President of our country, is already recognized as one of the outstanding Chief Executives in our entire Nation's history. It was my pleasure and it is my pleasure to have known him very closely, to have been very closely acquainted with him, and to have carried out as leader of the House the programs that he recommended to the Congress of the United States both in the field of foreign affairs and in the field of domestic affairs. We all remember the dramatic recommendations in the confrontation with international communism that Harry Truman made. We all remember the difficulty in connection with some of them, in having them pass through the two branches of the Congress and be enacted into law.

We remember the courage of Harry Truman in West Berlin, Greece, Korea, and elsewhere. We remember the decisiveness with which he approached any question with which he was confronted.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman was a man

who consulted with others and obtained their advice. But the whole world knew that when a decision was made that should have been made on the presidential level, Harry Truman made that decision.

Mr. Speaker, his years of experience developed within him extraordinary abilities and outstanding courage, a very important element in all walks of life, particularly in public life and more particularly when one is the chief executive of our Nation.

And, over and above all, he must possess the quality of courage. Even those who did not like him while he was in public life, admit that Harry Truman was abundantly possessed of that necessary quality, the quality of courage. I attended many of the meetings—all of the meetings with the leaders that took place, as I have with other Presidents, without regard to party—concerning the national interests of our country. I introduced the lend-lease bill in this body, a bill known as 1776, a very important piece of legislation, highly emotional.

The bill, as we look back, was a bill that strengthened the peoples of the free nations of the world against the attempts of international communism to subvert both from within and without, or as the result of a combination of both.

I remember the criticism directed against Harry Truman when he ordered the atomic bomb to be dropped in Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, when that criticism was directed against Harry Truman, my mind went back to an occasion when I was with former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, prior to his death, at a time when we were taking back the Philippines from the Japs and at a time when General MacArthur was mopping up. I was with Franklin D. Roosevelt on one occasion, and he told me that he had before him at that moment three different plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the next action to be taken by our country. Two of them were in different parts of continental China and one was right direct to the heartland of Japan. I never have forgotten—and I never shall forget and I can mention it now although I could not mention it at the time—Franklin D. Roosevelt told me that if the estimates of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—if he made the decision that the next invasion, or next move, would be the heartland of Japan, that invasion inevitably would result in 1 million American casualties.

As I left there I knew Franklin D. Roosevelt would make that decision if it was necessary. But then he passed into the great beyond, and it was necessary for Harry Truman to make that decision.

There is another moral question involved. What about his concern for 1 million American casualties that the Joints Chiefs of Staff in their recommendations, or in their report, or in their plan, whatever you want to call it, said would be involved when they made their report to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt? The decision he would have to make involved the possibility of 1 million American casualties.

In World War II that meant approximately 200,000 dead and 800,000 wounded in varying degrees. So there was a moral question of dropping the bomb on the poor people of Hiroshima. But there was also the moral question of 1 million American casualties.

I have often addressed the question to myself: "What would I have done under the circumstances if I had been President of the United States?" and with all humbleness I am frank to state I would have made the same decision Harry Truman made.

So I saw Harry Truman in action, as a man whose intuition was remarkable, as a man who could look into the future, and with those intuitive instincts of his unerringly to see history in the making. Such intuition is a remarkable possession for any person. Very few of the male sex have it, although it is more or less abundantly possessed by those of the female sex, but Harry Truman had a powerful sense of intuition, and he certainly exercised it in the national interest of our country. So I repeat that his contributions are history.

He not only helped make history, but he made history at times where action was simultaneous with the decision he made.

It is well that we pause to pay tribute to a great man, a humble man, one who if he were here would remonstrate at our praising him as we are, and thinking of him as we are. He is all the greater because of his humbleness. He is a man whose place in history will grow more and more when the historians of tomorrow—two generations from now—are able to objectively appraise without the emotionalism of a living generation, the motives and the purposes of individuals who participated in the making of history and in the one man who, under our form of government, in the final analysis makes the decision—the President of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, we all wish Harry Truman—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans—every happiness on this day, and hope God will permit him to be with us for countless years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I am sure I am right when I say, when Mr. Truman reads the remarks which have just been made on this observance of his 83d birthday, he will be pleased. I know his gracious lady will also be pleased with these remarks because they come from one who was on the scene. Both will know the observations just made were not hearsay but were made by one who was majority leader of this House during those years, and by one who was in the very center of the action of which he spoke about and a part of the very important events which transpired in the days described in the remarks of one who for so many years was the majority leader of the House and now is our distinguished Speaker.

Lest we forget to recall some of the important domestic accomplishments under Mr. Truman, I want to mention just one. Another great triumph of the Truman years and the postwar period was the Employment Act of 1946 whose goals were maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

On the 10th anniversary of that act, former President Truman wrote—

> There is almost no other piece of domestic legislation enacted while I was president to which I would attach greater importance or greater significance.

This legislation proclaimed a new responsibility of government: namely, the promotion of conditions for employment opportunities for the able, willing, and those seeking to work.

The act was not only a milestone in the development of modern democratic government, but it has also had a deep and, I believe, a wholesome influence on the private economy.

Businessmen, labor leaders, and consumers can now plan their activities with more confidence that the Government will take action if a major downswing or deflationary pressure should develop as well as action to control inflationary pressures.

The act required the President to transmit to Congress, within 60 days from the beginning of each regular session, a detailed economic report that included recommendations for legislation that the President deemed necessary or desirable for stimulating or regulating the economy.

The Employment Act set up a three-man Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President. The council's duties were to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report, to study economic developments and trends, to appraise the policies of the Federal Government in the light of the policy objectives of the act, and to recommend to the President policies which would attain the purposes of the act.

On the legislative side, provision was made for a joint congressional committee charged with the function of making a continuing study of the American economy. This joint committee was required by the act to file a report each year with the House and the Senate containing its findings and recommendations concerning each of the main recommendations made by the President in his economic report.

In establishing these administrative and legislative requirements, Congress gave institutional expression to the acceptance by Government of a new responsibility for the economic well-being of the Nation. The act was signed by President Truman on February 20, 1946, as landmark legislation to maintain a stable American economy.

The Truman years were also marked by any number of other crises that required decisions that could be made by no other person than the one on whose office desk there was a plaque with these words:

> The buck stops here.

It took uncommon steadfastness and presence of mind to commit our Nation to choices between paths which were dimly visible and with unforeseen consequences, and with results unpredictable.

As an elder statesman he now has the opportunity to look upon his life in public service, to assess his mark upon history

and to look at the world which he helped to create, and to look upon the problems and the challenges that are resting upon the shoulders of those who have followed him.

For many their impact in history is mainly one of having made the world no worse for their existence. But for President Truman, his was a contribution that led actively and positively to forward the thrust of America's role in world leadership.

Perhaps it is worth a certain sadness today that Mr. Truman now views a world still in turmoil and sees that the peace he so agonizingly sought during his term in office is still the distant goal of man.

But the tragedy and the sacrifices of war and the seeming continued existence of that hatred, mistrust, and lack of understanding all seem to be a part of the human condition.

Therefore, no individual can be measured necessarily by his success in overcoming these evils but rather by his determination, dedication, and commitment to the ever-continuing battle to meet these challenges.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I want to thank the very able gentleman from Independence, Congressman RANDALL, who so well represents the district in which our former President Truman now lives.

I would like to join him in his remarks to pay tribute on his birthday to our great President, Harry S. Truman, a man who was more concerned with the welfare of the American people than with any image that he might have for the moment—a man who spoke a language that all Americans could understand and a language that required no bureaucratic translation.

I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] again in wishing Mr. Truman many more years of health and happiness and to thank him for the service that he has rendered to our country.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my colleague, and friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to rise to say now, as one who did not always agree with Mr. Truman when he was President of the United States, that today, looking back in retrospect, I see his light becoming brighter with each passing day. More and more the image of a great President becomes apparent. We could use many more people of the courage of Harry Truman; many more people of his decisiveness and understanding. It is my privilege to wish him well on this particular day, and I am particularly happy to do so in respect to the fact that I can look back over the years with our disagreements and now look upon him as a great individual, a great President.

Mr. RANDALL. We are all grateful for the contribution of our friend from Louisiana. On the occasion of this 83d birthday I think we can say that if only one thing seems more clearly certain than another about Mr. Truman, it is, that as President, he never shrank from a necessary decision. Discussing the Truman years at a Freedom Dinner recently, his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, praised his Chief Executive's foreign policy and his powers of decision, when he said:

> When the Truman Government found its footing in foreign affairs, its policies showed a sweep, a breadth of conception and a boldness of action which were new in his country's history. We had seen it in the early domestic policy of the New Deal and in our vast military effort in World War II, but never before in foreign policy.
>
> The 1947 assumption of responsibility in the Eastern Mediterranean, the 1948 grandeur of the Marshall Plan, the response to the blockade of Berlin and the NATO defense of Europe in 1949, the intervention in Korea in 1950—all these constituted expanded action in a truly heroic mold. All of them were dangerous—all of them required a rare capacity to decide and act. All of them were, we know now, rightly decided and vigorously carried through.

It has been said many times that the rarest gift that God can give a man is the ability to have a capacity for decision, and this, President Truman had in abundance and to a unique degree. The anguish of decision was and still is the duty of every President. If there is a lesson to be learned by any office-holder, it is to copy President Truman's example to be as perceptive and then, most of all, decisive.

Presidents come and go. Each leaves his mark on the course of history. Each contributes in his own distinctive manner toward the contribution of his Nation in the improvement of humanity. A nation can honor its heroes by laying wreaths at the graves or by building memorials to their deeds. But to the Presidents who are still alive it can give only gratitude. To be honored and acclaimed by one's fellow citizens and to be referred to in the Nation's history books is a mark of distinction. But to be held in the hearts of one's countrymen is the greatest tribute that a nation can offer to a man, especially to one of its former Presidents.

Therefore, I say it is from the hearts of your fellow Americans comes the greeting, "Happy birthday, President Truman."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a one-time Missouri farm boy who proved he was big enough to handle the biggest job in the world is 83 years old today and still busily at work setting the record straight. Not as active as he used to be, he nevertheless keeps sharp watch on the events of the day and expresses his views with customary vigor. One of his characteristic opinions is that people should not make a "fuss" over his birthdays, but I think every American who remembers this man's courageous work as President of the United States wants to pay him honor on this day.

We have been blessedly fortunate as a people and as a country to have had Presidents who, in nearly all instances, rose to their responsibilities. Mr. Truman will go down in history as one of our best Presidents, I am sure. To him, and to the gentlewoman, a lady to her fingertips, who has shared his life—Mrs. Bess Truman—and to their wonderful family, every Member of the House would want to send greetings today.

We truly hope that Mr. Truman and his successor in office, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, now at Walter Reed Hospital, enjoy many, many more years of useful life in the service of a country to which both men have devoted their entire lives. Happy birthday, Mr. Truman. Get well quick, Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation joins in celebration of the birthday of former President Truman, the outstanding leader of our people in times as perilous and trying as any in our country's history. I was privileged to be a freshman Congressman during his administration. My primary hobby is the study of history. I assert, without doubt, that the great stature of this man will grow in the perspective of history. None of our leaders have had more difficult decisions to make; and he made them excellently. My constituents join me in sending our best wishes to him and to his devoted and able wife on this great occasion. We wish them many happy and glorious returns of the day.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, Harry Truman, on his 83d birthday.

I knew Harry Truman when he was Grand Master of Masons in Missouri in the 1930's. He came to Kirksville, Mo., when I was teaching in the high school there. Several of our mutual friends arranged for me to meet there with him. It was at that time I discovered he had an interest in American history and loved to talk about American history.

After that I observed Harry in public life, first as a U.S. Senator—following his noted work on the special committee investigating war contracts and other matters publicly involved with legislation and public policy; later, of course, with all Americans I observed him as Vice President of the United States.

I remember very well the date of President Roosevelt's death and his taking office. I noted his humility and recall his humility and sincere expression of hope to serve well, be a worthy successor, and make a contribution to the American system. Establishment of a better life and a better understanding of Americans worldwide was his constant goal. I shared his concern along with other Americans for a peaceful world and one where the basic freedoms could be extended and serve fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, I never voted for Harry and I disagreed often with many of his policies—both on domestic fronts and foreign fronts—but I do agree with the vast majority of Americans that Harry Truman did his best to serve his country. He had a greatness about him as well as a concern for better Government. He supported the Intergovernmental Organization Committee designed to in-

crease the efficiency and effectiveness of government. When this proposition passed and became law, he named a former President, Herbert Hoover, to the Commission as chairman. It then became known as the Hoover Commission.

On one occasion when I met and visited with him—and I remember the date, January 9, 1959—he told me what he had said to Mr. Hoover. It was "I want to take the political stench out of the Hoover name." It is well known that he and President Hoover were great personal friends. I remember so well the last time he was in West Branch, Iowa. It was on the occasion of the dedication of the library. Herbert Hoover was there. So was Harry Truman. A number of speeches were made honoring Herbert Hoover that day—on his birthday. Among the best, if not the best, was made by Harry Truman. I thought history was made that day, Mr. Speaker, when these two great men got together to renew old friendships, to make all of us see our purpose as Americans, each through their public utterances. Together they made another contribution to the history and heritage of our country. This, also, lent greatness to the American character. It showed the world that men could be antagonists, but when that was over they could be and many would be and all should be friends. It was a fine example of sportsmanship and good will. It was my pleasure that day to visit with both of these great men.

Since that time I have been in personal contact with both President Hoover and President Truman and have had the benefit of assurance from both that there is a great respect that each had for the other. Also, when I saw Mr. Truman he seemed to want to talk about American history and I enjoyed talking to him. After I had a part in organizing the United States Capitol Historical Society, I received many letters of accommodation and good wishes. The very first letter I received was from President Kennedy and very soon after that I received a nice letter of accommodation and good wishes from Harry Truman. Each, in his own way, had a part in encouraging what was a feeble effort at one stage to contribute to a better understanding of American history and later a substantial contribution was made possible because we had men like Harry Truman. He was a great supporter of the historical society and saw to it that "We, the People" was sold in his library at Independence. I saw him next at Mr. Rayburn's funeral in Texas. Again, we had a nice visit. Again, he voiced his interest in history. He said:

Good luck to you in your promotion of American history.

I think this is an exact quote of his:

Every American ought to know more about American history, for when he does, he will understand what America stands for and the result will be better citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I saw Harry was in his library at Independence a year ago last March. Again we had a nice visit. This time, with his great interest, the reaction people were finally evidencing to his work for peace in the world. My colleagues have already spoken of all of them. Again I want to say while there may be mistakes in administration, there were no mistakes in his heart. He desired to do good and to be known for what he said rather than what he had as material possession. There is much we can learn from the example of his life and I commend it to every American and join my colleagues in giving his salute and paying this respect to him today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks upon the occasion of this birthday tribute.

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

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBILITY OF NEWS MEDIA

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hesitated to address you today on this subject, but after an examination of my own thinking, my own conscience, I can do no less.

It may not be understandable to some, but I am sure it is understandable to many that I have—and I have had throughout my life—a fetish for accuracy. Strange as it may seem, in my many years that I spent in the newspaper world—some 23—as an editor, and previously as a reporter, before coming to the Halls of Congress, I insisted upon accuracy in newspapers and among those under me discharging their responsibilities in the freedom of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States—which I hold so dear to myself because of my profession and because of my background.

I stand with those who believe with Voltaire:

I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

The freedom for each American guaranteed by the Constitution for free expression is something sacred to all of us. Perhaps even more sacred than that one amendment, the first of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution, is the Constitution of the United States. I believe it was Gladstone who said:

I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect at a single stroke (so to speak), in its application to political affairs.

It is because of my dedication to that Constitution, because of my belief in the first amendment of the Constitution, that I am compelled to rise today, not in anger, but in sadness, to direct the attention of the Members to the manner in which this freedom of the press and the usage of the first amendment can be prostituted for purposes which I cannot understand.

As I indicated, I do not rise in anger, nor do I rise in a critical manner in an effort to take away from those who want to express an opinion other than mine, their right to do so, but I must insist, I must demand, that the news media of this country—whether it be the newspapers, the radio, or television—confine themselves to the facts in reporting the news. At the moment, I direct attention to a cartoon which appeared May 7 in the Washington Post, by one of America's great and acknowledged cartoonists, Mr. Herblock. Perhaps it is because I recognize his ability and his worth and the tributes which have been paid and the honors given him that I am all the more saddened that this man of great stature has wandered down the path of misrepresentation, inaccuracy, and obviously misleading statements in order to put over a point of view.

I do not disagree with him and his views. He is well qualified and certainly able to express them. I do recognize the force that he has at his command for molding public opinion—not the reporter, not the editorialist, not the news commentator, but that most effective of all media—a picture. It was the Chinese who said that one picture is worth a thousand words. So it becomes more necessary to understand that the cartoonist has within his grasp multiple powers over the voice and the pen.

Of course, the cartoon cannot be printed in the RECORD, so I shall attempt to accurately describe exactly what it says, and then discuss it. I shall not comment upon its inaccuracies until I have described it.

The cartoon is in the usual cartoon form, signed by "Herblock" in the left-hand corner, and over the top is this, in quotes: "We'll Teach You Patriotism and Respect for the Law."

Depicted in the right-hand side of the cartoon are three individuals.

One individual is holding in his hand and burning the U.S. Constitution. Tagged as his identification is "L. MENDEL RIVERS."

The next individual is holding a sign entitled "'Let's Forget the First Amendment'—House Armed Services Committee members." This individual is identified as "E. Hébert, Jr."

The next individual has no name attached to him, but is holding a sign which reads "Hell with the U.S. courts," and over his left shoulder is the Confederate flag.

In the upper left-hand corner are two apparent youngsters, I presume—they look like youngsters. One is holding up a sign which says, "To hell with the draft." The other supposedly is holding up a draft card, or a paper, which says "Draft Act," and is in the act of burning it.

This is the cartoon, described accurately. Now I shall comment on its accuracy and discuss with the Members what might be the intent of the cartoonist. I shall not attempt to probe his intent. I merely read what the cartoonist apparently intends.

Let us begin with the designation of "E. Hebert, Jr.," which obviously refers to me. Well, this is minor, and it is not

important, but it is just an example of the fallacies and inaccuracies. My name is not "E. Hébert, Jr." I have never been called "Junior" in my life. My father's name was Felix Joseph Hébert. My name is FELIX EDWARD HÉBERT, but not "Junior."

Until last Saturday in the report of the New York Times I have never seen myself referred to as "Junior."

Of course, this is inconsequential, but whoever is "E. Hébert, Jr." might take objection to it; I do not know. But at least this is the starting inaccuracy.

Holding up the sign, " 'Let's forget the first amendment'—House Armed Services Committee members," causes me to say that not a single member of the House Armed Services Committee—the entire 40 of them—with one exception, has said "Let's forget the first amendment," and that exception was me. I said it; not the other Members of the House. Yet they are all being held up to ridicule, including myself, as saying, "Let's forget the first amendment."

How did I say it, after discussing my feeling for the first amendment? I hold here in my hand the transcript of the hearing of last Friday before the House Armed Services Committee.

I direct your attention to page 897 at line 24 which is quoting me in reply to a statement by Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, following a lengthy colloquy and dialog as to why the Department of Justice was not enforcing the law by bringing to the bar of justice the Carmichaels and the Kings and the other individuals of that ilk who are going about the country today making statements which, if they are not treasonable, then I do not know what treason is. They are urging individuals to break the law, urging our people to defy the law, talking at mob demonstrations, telling our boys, "Do not enlist," "Do not be drafted," praising Ho Chi Minh as a great savior of the world, spewing forth the Communist line better than it is spewed from Hanoi or Peking. The American public is asking the $64 question and the $164 question, "Why are not these people prosecuted?" Now keep in mind. In discussing this let me make it crystal clear that I do not want to equate in any way dissent and disloyalty. I recognize and defend the right to dissent, but I condemn and damn disloyalty and the challenge to the fighting men of this country and to their patriotism. There is a strong and clear line of demarcation between dissent and disloyalty. This is to what I address myself here, that is, not to dissent but to disloyalty.

Now, be this as it may, the law is clear on this subject. I shall put into the RECORD the entire colloquy in which it says in no uncertain terms that any individual whosoever in time of war shall frustrate or attempt to incite to mutiny or urge disloyalty or urge nonconformity to the law shall be prosecuted—by whom? By the Justice Department. Every time this questioning turned to that subject and the law, the cloak of immunity of the first amendment was raised—the umbrella of the first amendment. I shall discuss this more in detail tomorrow as far as the Department of Justice is concerned, but I am emphasizing it here in order that you might understand and realize just how this expression was used. It was in this context that the Department of Justice would say, "Well, we cannot prosecute and we will not prosecute them and we do not intend to prosecute them because they come under the umbrella of the first amendment." Now, this is not the function of the Justice Department. The function of the Justice Department is to prosecute and defend the law. It is not the function of the Justice Department to engage in judicial decisions and make decisions before the law is tested. It may very well come under the first amendment, and, knowing the Supreme Court as well as I do, it undoubtedly will come under the first amendment, if I am to judge the future by the past, because the murderers, the rapists, and the Communists run wild because of Supreme Court decisions today. However, I am not engaging in that dispute now and I am not talking about that discussion now. I am talking about what the law says and what is written in the law.

And, Mr. Speaker, strangely enough, the Assistant Attorney General testified and said he had never heard of the statute. But, anyway, he insisted that no matter what it would be, it would come under the coverage of the first amendment.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is in that context and in that direction that I made the statement, "Let us forget the first amendment."

So, Mr. Block, or Herblock, whatever his name may be, lifts out of context "Let's forget the first amendment," and attributes it to every member of the House Armed Services Committee, which is not true and not accurate and indicates that we subscribe to forgetting the first amendment and its full protection of the freedom of speech. That is what its effect has and that is undoubtedly what it was intended to be, while nothing could be further from the truth—nothing could be further from the truth.

There is in the testimony—I have it right here—the first sentence, and here is another page of the discussion and nothing was said about that—of course not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me show you just how far some people go. I detest hate, racism, and bigotry. I come from Louisiana, the Deep South, and I am proud of that fact. I believe that every man has the opportunity, and the equal opportunity, regardless of race, color, or creed, to have that equal opportunity. I believe in privileges for none, whether they be white, black, green, pink, or yellow. I am not a racist. I am not a bigot. I am not intolerant. I recognize your right to disagree with me. I only ask your respect.

At no time during these hearings was anything mentioned about the North or the South, at no time.

At no time was the word "Confederacy" used. At no time was the race question raised and particularly so, because the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and I, coming from that section of the country, would be immediately suspect. So it was not raised. We were not talking about these violators as Negroes or Chinamen or Indians. I do not know what they want on the campuses of this country. True, many white people disgrace the campuses of our country, in my book, and thereby do a disgrace to this country. I do not care about their color or race. The race issue has no place in this.

Mr. Speaker, the cartoon portrayed a third man with a Confederate flag on his shoulder. What does he mean by that? Whether he means to raise it or not, he immediately arouses the race issue; he immediately wants to indicate that the race issue is involved in this consideration. It is not.

What does he mean when he says, "To hell with the courts." No one said that. It was not even uttered.

Perhaps, I would like to say it, but I do not say it, because I respect the courts which have a valid and a legal place in our constitutional form of government, and I will follow any court-ordered decision validly given in the future. However, it is confusing, upon occasion to follow some of the Court's orders. I have decried certain decisions of the Supreme Court. I shudder to think where this country is going, based upon some of the decisions which the Court has rendered, and not in civil rights questions alone.

Mr. Speaker, if I were any one of those nine men I might not be able to sleep at night, based upon some of the decisions which the Court has rendered.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I have a right to criticize this sacrosanct body, or I do not. But, I hope that I am protected by the first amendment; I hope so in the eyes of some people.

Then the other quote: "We will teach you patriotism and respect for the law."

Nobody said that during the hearings. Here are the hearings. You cannot find that quotation in the hearings, but yet it is attributed to the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

I would add the Committee on Armed Services needs no defense from me, but I must defend them with the record.

Then up here, the draft card with two young kids. What do you think youngsters in their formative years—their impressionable years—think when they see a cartoon like this placed before their view? Here is a great newspaper with a large circulation. Here is an outstanding cartoonist, a man of great scope and ability, telling in effect these youngsters: "Do not pay any attention to them. Burn your draft card. To hell with the draft. These are old fuzz-doodles, old racists, old bigots, old, stupid individuals, they do not know what they are talking about. Pay no attention to them."

That is what I object to. I object to the inaccuracy. If the gentleman could have drawn his cartoon and quoted correctly and accurately, he would hear no voice of mine raised against it. I would defend his right to draw it. I will defend the right of every individual to disagree with this country, and the President of the United States, in the conduct of the war, but for my part I stand with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed to be addressed as a "hawk." I want to be a hawk because I want to win, and I want to get those boys back here. But if some people want to be doves, and fly around and flutter their little eyes, then that is their business, or anybody else's business, and they have a right to do it. They have the right to dissent. They have the right to criticism. They have a right to criticize the manner in which this war is being carried on. But they do not have—nobody has the right to arouse to riot and to mutiny, whether this country is at war or not at war. I deny the right of anybody to use the Constitution of the United States to destroy the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution we are all supposed to be guaranteed the right of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But this type of thing as enunciated in this cartoon, and as enunciated by the Department of Justice on the witness stand, that if I want to use LSD or smoke marihuana, and they deny me that, then they have taken my happiness away. That is what it means.

It means this: that there is no law on the books of the Federal Government or of a State that does not violate the first amendment if you want to stretch it that far, ad infinitum, and ad ridiculum, if Latin could be put in that context.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to bring to your attention. I do not care if Mr. Herblock wants to embrace Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh, or anybody else, or if he wants to take his stand at the side of the Carmichaels and the Kings and the other individuals who are trying to bring disruption to this country—I cannot stop him. He well can do it. That is his right. But, Mr. Speaker, by the same token, I reserve the right and privilege to put my arms around General Westmoreland. I prefer to embrace those kids who are giving everything they can give, and not delay one day their return from Vietnam. General Westmoreland has told us, and I share that opinion, that every day these people contribute to the extension of this war—a war that has claimed 10,000 lives and 50,000 casualties. I want these kids back home as quickly as we can get them home.

Now, Mr. Herblock wants to embrace those who wish to give aid and comfort to the enemy by getting in the headlines of the newspapers in Peking, Moscow, and Hanoi, that this country is divided. As General Westmoreland stated, they are depending on the Achilles heel for their victory.

If Mr. Herblock wants to side with the Communists, that is his business. His business.

But in siding with them, if he so desires, let him at least be a little accurate in his presentation—particularly because of the great force and effect that a cartoon has.

I know the futility of engaging in a contest with a newspaper. I know that. I sat on that throne a long time and I knew the futility of those who would write letters in. I had the upper hand when I was on the paper. I had more ink and more paper than any character could have who could write and send letters in.

I always had the last word. I recognize this. I recognize the unevenness of the contest and of the debate. I recognize the difference in exposure and the audience. But I do recognize and do retain for myself my own conscience and my own belief and what I believe America is and what we should do in America.

Oh, I am old fashioned. I am rather naive. I would rather stand on the gallows with Nathan Hale and say, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," than to stand up on a platform rabble rousing and in denunciation of my Government and telling fellow Americans not to defend that Constitution that guarantees them the right and guarantees me the right to say the things they want to say and that I want to say.

This is my observation today.

Tomorrow during the discussion of the procurement bill to furnish these fighting men with arms, I shall have more to say on the Department of Justice, which I suggest to you is most derelict in its duty. It could easily find reasons to go into other fields which do not concern them but it can find many reasons not to prosecute. Not one single newspaper in this country, not one radio station or one television station carried the affirmative statement that the Department of Justice refused and is refusing and will continue to refuse to prosecute these individuals who have committed what I think are crimes against the law.

To my mind, that would be a good lead—but no, the lead was that members of the House Committee on Armed Services said, "Forget the first amendment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am ended. I am finished—but I would ask for accuracy and truth in reporting.

Do not take my word—what I have said and uttered here today. Do not accept that as the truth and the fact. Do not accept my conclusions and my observations. These are my opinions. These are my own expressions. I would instead ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to place in the RECORD the entire dialog unexpurgated, unedited, and unchanged—but a raw, accurate report by the reporter of the House Armed Services Committee on last Friday—the colloquy between Mr. Vinson and myself—with nothing changed—and to put this in the RECORD at this point.

Read the record—not the conclusions or the evaluations—but read the raw record and tell me how an individual can come up with this type of misleading, inaccurate, inflammatory cartoon such as Mr. Herblock has presented to his viewers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if the material that he desires to put in the RECORD was in a public hearing?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was in a public hearing.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Hébert.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Vinson, I have several questions I desire to explore here.

In the very opening, may I say I want to make a very distinct distinction between the right to speak and the acts of disloyalty or treason or sedition. I will stand in the forefront to defend any man a right to dissent, but in this right to dissent I am afraid we are going into an area of what is certainly treason and sedition as being exhibited on public platforms throughout this country today and on the university campuses of our nation.

I understand that an opinion was asked of a previous Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, as to why some of these individuals who are uttering treasonable and disloyal statements, not statements of dissent or opinion, but treasonable statements and seditious statements, that they could not be prosecuted because we are not in a declared war.

Do you subscribe to that opinion? This is hearsay of Mr. Katzenbach's opinion. Now I am asking you now, is this a reason why certain acts now committed which would be treasonable or seditious if we were in a declared war are not being prosecuted—the individuals who are guilty?

Mr. VINSON. First, Mr. Congressman, I am not aware of the precise opinion that you refer to. We received considerable mail from the House and from the Senate last year in regard to such utterances, but I don't recall any response that drew the line between a declared war and an undeclared war.

However, the case that was previously referred to where the Chief Justice enunciated the clear and present danger test was, I believe, a case under the sedition laws and not under Selective Service. So we are back to the degree and proximity proposition.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, of course, now, you have indicated by your reply, Mr. Vinson, that these letters in multiple numbers are coming from Members of Congress of the House and the Senate. You will agree with me, I am sure, that these letters reflect the thinking of the American people or else you wouldn't get such letters in such quantity. I think we can be in agreement on that?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, I think so, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. HÉBERT. After all, who is the Constitution of the United States except the American people and what they want? They adopted the Constitution.

Mr. VINSON. The problem with that is that a great deal of the Constitution is to protect minorities and dissenters, and not——

Mr. HÉBERT. We have been made aware of that in the last several years, of the interpretation of that.

What I am trying to get at is this—I may ask your opinion, and may I say I appreciate your position as a lawyer, because undoubtedly you have demonstrated very adequately that you are a good lawyer because you could undoubtedly carry a client far and beyond two years if you were called upon to do so, which in the law is right, that is even under the Constitution.

Now, these utterances—and I am sure you are familiar with them since the general public is well acquainted with them—of individuals standing before crowds arousing those crowds to treasonable heights, to mutiny against the Government, to defiance of the laws, and supposing we were at war on a formal declaration would these utterances and these actions be indictable?

Mr. VINSON. I don't think the existence or nonexistence of a war has any legal relevancy. It obviously might have some psychological relevancy.

Mr. HÉBERT. Wait, never mind, let's don't wander into the field of psychology and all this sort of thing. Let's get down to the facts. I am a country boy like my chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read this, then I will give it back to you. Under Title 18, Sec-

tion 2388 of the Code, among other things, these are the words of that section, quote:

"Whoever, when the United States is at war, wilfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or wilfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment in service of the United States to the injury of the service or to the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined $10,000", and so forth, "20 years."

Then I am finished.

Could we make this applicable to the Selective Service and Training Act? This says "enlistment." The Selective Service and Training Act says "procurement." Why isn't this applicable now?

Mr. VINSON. I would not like to answer that off the top of my head, Mr. Chairman. You definitely and distinctly have First Amendment problems.

Mr. HÉBERT. This is existing law, Mr. Vinson. This is existing law. This thing as Mr. Rivers has pointed out and read and was the section I had in mind when I asked these questions, what does it say, the exact language?

The CHAIRMAN. "When the United States is at war".

Mr. HÉBERT. "At war."

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is the only thing that might proscribe your capacity to enforce the intendment of this statute.

Mr. BATES. There is an amendment to include the present emergency in a later section.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is what I am trying to get at. Of course now the refuge there is when the United States is at war. Technically, and when there is no desire to prosecute these individuals, technically the lawyer and the law can stand behind that technicality, and I am damned sick and tired of technicalities when we have treason in this country and sedition.

What I am trying to find out is this: If that is the prohibition, because it says "at war," and the technicality is we are not at war, wouldn't it suffice to say "are engaged in armed conflict"? Three little words. Or "in armed conflict"? Wouldn't that bring these individuals to the bar of justice?

Mr. VINSON. Well, my previous statement was keyed to the First Amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. The First Amendment, as Justice Holmes said.

Mr. VINSON. The First Amendment I stated really wasn't relevant, as to the First Amendment, whether you are in war or not in war. I was not referring to this statute.

Mr. HÉBERT. Let's forget the First Amendment. I know that will be the refuge of the Supreme Court, I recognize that. But at least the effort can be made and the demonstration given to the American people certainly that the Department of Justice, and most assuredly the Congress, is determined to eliminate this rat-infested area in this country. But if we are going to stand idly by and merely say we can't do it and all of a sudden go back to the First Amendment, as Justice Holmes so well said you can't cry fire in a theater, free speech ends there.

This begging the question of the First Amendment continuously rather upsets me a little bit, and upsets not only me but millions of American people. They want to know a very simple answer, why can the Carmichaels and why can the Kings, and other individuals of that ilk stand before the American people and institute riot, incite defiance of the law, while the Justice Department stands idly by and the Congress takes no action to strengthen that law?

Now, all we can do is strengthen the law. We can't enforce it. That is not our jurisdiction or our problem. But we can give you the weapons to use.

Now the law says this. It is clear and distinct, "at war." If there is a technicality there, why can't we say "or engaged in armed conflict"? And may I ask you, Mr. Vinson, under that law couldn't you prosecute these individuals?

Mr. VINSON. I am unfamiliar with this particular statute, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. HÉBERT. What is that?

Mr. VINSON. I am unfamiliar with this particular statute. This statute is administered by the Internal Security Division of the Department. However, as the statute was read to me, it related only to those in service.

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir. Read it again. The very opening sentence is very clear. I can even understand it and I am not a lawyer.

Mr. BATES. You have to read both sections there I think really to get an understanding.

Mr. HÉBERT. Read them.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course in the prosecution, the prosecution comes under you, I don't care what division enforces it.

Mr. HÉBERT. You are speaking for the Department of Justice today.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless it has been changed since I was down there, you are the prosecutor.

Mr. VINSON. Not under the Internal Security statute.

Mr. SLATINSHEK. Title 18, Section 2388, reads as follows: "Activities affecting armed forces during war: (a) Whoever when the United States is at war wilfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military-naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies, or whoever when the United States is at war wilfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or wilfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

And the statute continues, and there is a succeeding section in the statute, Section 2391 of Title 18, which provides a temporary extension of Section 2388 and therefore makes it effective during the current period, despite the fact we are not at war. It simply provides—this portion of Title 18, this section, will be effective during periods of emergency, such as the one we are now in, which was declared December 16, 1950, and has not been terminated.

So the question of war is not really particularly pertinent now. The question is whether or not this statute would apply under the particular situation and whether this statute, when it speaks of recruiting and enlistment service, would cover anyone who interferes with the Selective Service procurement function.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is what I am trying to develop, Mr. Slatinshek. Would my suggestion of adding "armed conflict" strengthen the first section which you read.

However, can you tell us, Mr. Vinson, why there has been no prosecution under the existing law, which certainly is clear enough? We are in an emergency, declared by President Truman. The emergency has never been revoked in the Korean War. We are acting in many areas under the aegis of that so-called emergency. Why hasn't anybody been prosecuted to date?

I admit this, that the Justice Department can't make the decisions that overrule the Supreme Court decisions, which I know that is what they would be, but anyway you can't hit a ball unless you take the bat off your shoulder and find out if it is going to be fair or foul.

Why hasn't the Justice Department proceeded to find out? And remember this too, sir, that twelve men will sit in that jury box and make this decision—twelve men will make the decision after the evidence, and they will decide what the facts are, and of course the Supreme Court will upset it, I know that, but anyway at least it can be shown to the American people that the Justice Department wants to prosecute.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we are more concerned with the rights of these people than we are with the existence of this republic.

I don't want to—you don't form the policy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hébert, have you finished?

I have promised Mr. King, then we will come to you, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want an answer to the question, Mr. Vinson. You represent the Department of Justice here today.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You are speaking for them and you are head of the Criminal Division. If this isn't criminal, I don't know what criminal is.

Mr. VINSON. Well, that is——

Mr. HÉBERT. Why hasn't this been done?

Mr. VINSON. It is a criminal statute.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is a criminal statute. Are we going to get caught in a place of who handles what division?

Mr. VINSON. No, sir, I can assure you no one has been prosecuted under this statute because the Department felt no one has violated the statute.

Mr. HÉBERT. No one violated the simple and clear language that has just been read to you? These individuals, and there have been hundreds of others besides that, unidentified people, because trouble hasn't been taken to identify the people on these campuses?

Why, a simple man like myself can understand that language, or maybe I wasted years in the business I was in before I came here, understanding words.

I can't understand it, and if you tell me that the Department of Justice can't understand, there is a case for prosecution and presentation, let's test the law. Let's find out whether it is valid or not, whether it is inadequate or not. And if it is inadequate, we want to pass something.

I intend to offer a bill in this committee to strengthen that first section by putting the words in "or armed conflict". What good are the words going to do if the Congress passes the law and the Department of Justice fails to prosecute under the explicit direction of the law and explicit intention of the Congress. And we I think are backed by the American public today. We are not backed by the Department of Justice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Congressman, that goes back to preceding colloquy with the chairman, when I stated that any law that deals with utterances must be read in light of the First Amendment. The First Amendment is not absolute; as you point out, the fire in the theater. But there is a line which must be drawn and which has been drawn.

Mr. HÉBERT. Here, Mr. Vinson, the Department of Justice is performing a judicial function. It is not the Department of Justice's function or authority to make judicial decisions. That is up to the courts.

Of course, the courts go beyond that and legislate—I recognize all these facets—but it is the primary duty of the Department of Justice to prosecute when a prima facie case is made, and certainly I don't think anybody with an average intelligence, except maybe below the average of me, or like me, can't understand and read clearly and distinctly what that statute says. And that is, it is the duty and responsibility of the Department of Justice to prosecute and let the

courts make the determination. This is just merely a lawyer's opinion, that is all it is.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week, one of the great newspapers of America, the Milwaukee Journal, received its fourth Pulitzer Prize.

All Wisconsin citizens are proud of the accomplishments of this newspaper and it is significant that the Pulitzer Prize was awarded to the Journal for its outstanding efforts on behalf of stiffening the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin.

For the information of my colleagues, I include as part of my remarks a series of newspaper articles describing the work done by the Journal and its excellent staff on the subject of water resources and its subsequent receipt of the Pulitzer Prize:

JOURNAL IS AWARDED PULITZER FOR FOURTH TIME

The Milwaukee Journal Monday was awarded a Pulitzer prize for meritorious public service.

The Journal won its prize for "its successful campaign to stiffen the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin."

The Pulitzer award committee described the Journal effort as a "notable advance in the national effort for the conservation of natural resources." The award was announced in New York city.

The Journal shared the prize in the public service category with the Louisville Courier-Journal, which was cited for a successful campaign to control the Kentucky strip mine industry.

It was the fourth time The Milwaukee Journal or members of its staff had won Pulitzer prizes, considered the top award in American journalism.

The first, in 1919, was, like this year's, given to the newspaper for meritorious public service. The other two Journal Pulitzer prizes were for individual achievement. Cartoonist Ross Lewis received a prize in 1935, and Journal reporter Austin C. Wehrwein won in 1953 for international reporting.

The Pulitzer prizes were endowed by Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the World, New York city, in a bequest to Columbia university. They are awarded annually by the trustees of the university.

A gold medal is given for meritorious public service. Other Pulitzer awards in journalism are $1,000.

The Journal's entry this year was a portfolio centered around a series on water pollution published a year ago in three issues of the Sunday Picture Journal. Also submitted were editorials demanding antipollution action, news stories describing subsequent passage of the state's pollution control program by the legislature and letters to The Journal praising its campaign.

The Picture Journal issues of Apr. 17, Apr. 24 and May 1 last year were devoted entirely to the theme "Pollution: The Spreading Menace."

Journal editor Richard H. Leonard said, "The Milwaukee Journal is deeply gratified by this recognition of its efforts to fight one of the great menaces of our times—the pollution of our lakes and rivers. The Journal has long regarded conservation of our natural resources as one of its most important objectives. We will continue the fight."

The sections were a team effort involving a dozen photographers, writers, artists and editors on The Journal's staff.

The project was planned and supervised by picture editor George J. Lockwood, editor of The Picture Journal. Most of the photos were made by Journal photographer George P. Koshollek, Jr. One of the most dramatic, however, was an aerial color picture by staff photographer Clarence P. Schmidt.

Richard C. Kienitz, The Journal's natural resources writer, did the basic reporting. Journal writer Robert W. Wells assisted Lockwood in editing the text.

Olesen wrote editorials

Editorial writer Don Olesen wrote the editorials.

Other writers contributed to the prize winning sections. Reporter Paul G. Hayes, who specializes in planning, wrote "A Tale of 5 Rivers." Outdoor writer Tom Guyant did an essay, "Wild as the Wolf," on the unspoiled Wolf river.

Photographer Allan Scott produced an eight page color portfolio on the upper Wolf river.

Staff artist Gregg Klees prepared full color maps and Pulitzer cartoonist Lewis turned out a full color cartoon dramatizing the need for action on pollution. Its caption: "Only you, Paul Bunyan, are big enough to do this cleanup job."

Artist Al Berg worked with Lockwood on the page layouts.

Action was demanded

As the series ended, an Olesen editorial demanded state action to provide "more facilities, more enforcement, some new laws, a better co-ordinated antipollution effort, public awareness and indignation—and more dollars."

The editorial agreed with a Green Bay critic of state antipollution efforts that there was slender comfort in knowing that "while other states might be up to their necks in pollution, we're only up to our knees."

The congratulatory letters submitted included letters from Gov. Knowles and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

The Picture Journal series already had been honored in several other nationwide competitions.

Kienitz, Koshollek and Lockwood last month shared second place awards of $500 each in the Edward J. Meeman conservation contest for their work on the sections.

The Meeman awards, named for the late conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, were given by the Scripps-Howard Foundation.

Schmidt's aerial photo, showing wastes pouring into the Fox river waterway at Neenah-Menasha, was ranked second in the National Press Photographers' association competition this year.

Pictures won award

Koshollek's pollution pictures placed first in the Inland Daily Press association competition last fall.

The 27 pages in the three issues were the largest concentration of color photos on a single subject The Journal had ever published.

It is relatively rare, but not unprecedented, for the Pulitzer judges to cite two newspapers in the public service category. It has done so three other times in the half century of Pulitzers.

The Journal's first public service medal, in 1919, was only the second year that this distinction had been awarded.

Americanism cited

That Pulitzer resolution cited The Journal for its "strong and courageous campaign for Americanism in a constituency where foreign elements made such a policy hazardous from a business point of view."

The Journal was one of the first newspapers during World War I to recognize the "uncivilized methods employed by the German government in its war against civilians."

The Pulitzer committee hailed The Journal's exposure of German ruled alliances in this country, its opposition to Wisconsin congressmen who resisted war efforts and its editorials attacking elements that put Germany above America.

Cartoonist honored

Lewis' Pulitzer in 1935 was for the best American newspaper cartoon of the year "in some commendable cause of public importance."

The cartoon, picturing a huge figure of violence looming over strikers and standing next to an industrial plant, bore the caption: "Sure I'll Work for Both Sides."

Lewis, who still is drawing Journal cartoons, is widely regarded as one of the nation's best political cartoonists.

In 1953, Wehrwein won the international reporting award for a series of 25 articles entitled "Canada's New Century." The story told of Canada's economic boom and its relationship to the United States.

The Journal sent Wehrwein thousands of miles, traveling coast to coast, to get the facts.

Wehrwein then was a writer on The Journal's business news staff. He subsequently became a New York Times reporter and now is on the editorial board of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

VETERAN NEWSMEN RESPONSIBLE FOR AWARD WINNING CAMPAIGN

The four men primarily responsible for the stories, photographs and editorials that won a Pulitzer prize Monday all are veteran members of The Journal staff.

George J. Lockwood, picture editor, edited the series in The Picture Journal, George P. Koshollek, jr., Journal staff photographer, took most of the pictures. The reporting was done by Richard C. Kienitz, The Journal's natural resources reporter. Don Olesen, editorial writer, wrote the editorials on water pollution.

Journal man since 1956

Lockwood, 35, was born in Albany, N.Y. He is a graduate of Syracuse university, and received a master of arts degree from the University of Minnesota in 1957. He served in the navy 1953–'55.

Lockwood has been with The Journal since 1956. He was a police reporter and later moved to general assignment, then to the picture desk. He was named editor of The Picture Journal in 1962. In 1966, he was promoted to picture editor.

Koshollek, 41, grew up in Stevens Point. During World War II, he served with the navy on Guam. He returned home to attend Stevens Point State college, and joined The Journal staff in 1949. His assignments for the Journal have been varied, including a trip to Castro's Cuba. He also photographed President Kennedy's funeral. He has won dozens of major photo prizes.

Wisconsin native

Kienitz, 48, is a native of Neenah. He has been with The Journal since 1953. Before that he was news editor of the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald. Kienitz was a member of The Journal's state news desk before becoming natural resources writer. Kienitz studied at the University of Wisconsin, and served with the air force in Italy during World War II.

Olesen, 45, was born in Madison. He is a graduate of Swarthmore (Pa.) college. In

World War II, he served with the army in the China-Burma-India theater.

He began his journalistic career reporting for the Washington (D.C.) Daily News. He later worked as a reporter for the Washington Post. He also was a staff member of the Lakeland Boating magazine before joining The Journal staff in 1957. Olesen wrote boating and skiing news before he became an editorial writer.

PULITZER STARTED IN MUDDY TRIPS

This is how a Pulitzer prize winner is born.

The Milwaukee Journal's series on water pollution, which won American journalism's top award Monday, had its beginnings in August, 1965.

Richard H. Leonard, then managing editor and now editor, and Arville Schaleben, an associate editor, were discussing the fall plans for news and picture projects with other editors.

The conversation went into such things as "a series on education . . . The Journal's Drive Alive campaign . . . and something on water pollution."

George J. Lockwood, editor of The Picture Journal, volunteered that the pollution story would best be told with color photography in The Picture Journal. As he puts it, "In about 10 seconds I had the toughest assignment of my career."

Many gave leads

Lockwood, now also picture editor of The Journal, began to research the story in Milwaukee, Waukesha and Madison. Game wardens, regional planning officials, public health inspectors and others concerned provided all sorts of leads, such as:

Chicken entrails turn the Root river blood red in summer; South Milwaukee pours its sewage—about 65% untreated—into Lake Michigan, and a knitting mill in the Appleton area dyes effluent a rainbow of colors in a huge settling pond.

By mid-October, Lockwood had enough information to provide a shooting schedule for a photographer.

Photographer George P. Koshollek, jr., many times a prize winner, was assigned to the job for three weeks. Before he was through, Koshollek would cover 3,000 miles of the state in waders and hunting boots, in boats and planes.

Writer joins him

Richard C. Kienitz, conservation writer who is based in Madison, was assigned to join forces with Koshollek.

They found pollution everywhere, in every county, in creeks, lakes and rivers.

After Koshollek's trip, Leonard and Schaleben spent an afternoon examining the color pictures. The editors insisted on complete documentation of each picture and also insisted that the paper mills—the biggest single polluters in the state—be allowed to show their side of the campaign to clean up the waterways.

Kienitz, Koshollek and Lockwood spent two days in the Fox River valley in talks and tours with officers of the state's paper industry.

Goes to Madison

Lockwood took all the pictures to Madison, where he and Kienitz met with Theodore Wisniewski, director of the state committee on water pollution, who detailed the polluting elements shown in the pictures.

By this time, it was 1966. The word was out that the legislature would meet in May for a special session to develop antipollution laws. Timing for publication of the series became critical.

Apr. 17 was selected for the opening installment. The third and final story would appear May 1, a day before the special session was convened.

Results approved

Half a dozen other Journal staffers contributed to the team effort. They included photographer Clarence P. Schmidt, writers Tom Guyant, Paul G. Hayes and Robert W. Wells, artist Gregg Klees and cartoonist Ross A. Lewis, himself a Pulitzer winner.

Lockwood took four weeks to complete the editing and layouts. The other editors approved the result with minor changes.

Lockwood and Al Berg, a Journal artist, went to Chicago to the Cuneo Press, where The Picture Journal is printed. They looked over the engraver's shoulders as he prepared plates. Color can be spoiled if photographs do not have expert reproduction.

On Apr. 17, Wisconsin citizens picked up The Picture Journal and "Pollution: The Spreading Menace" hit them between the eyes. This was the first of three Picture Journals devoted to pollution.

The Journal's editorial columns took up the cause. For Journal editorial writers, who have been defenders of natural resources for decades, this was no new crusade.

The editorials, written by conservation specialist Don Olesen of the editorial writing staff, demanded state action.

Reactions pour in

Reaction was swift. Of the pollution series, Gov. Knowles wrote: "In spite of the hard work done by pollution committees, meeting for the last eight months, it is most difficult to present the problem adequately to the public without your help."

Stewart L. Udall, United States secretary of the interior, said the series was "one of the most effective and constructive pieces on water pollution I have ever seen."

At the bottom of his letter he wrote: "Keep slugging."

The series reached many desks. The federal department of agriculture wanted to reproduce the color photo. So did Audubon magazine.

On June 10, the state legislature wrote the end of the series. It passed and sent to the governor for his signature a bill that Udall has since called "the finest piece of legislation yet enacted in the national fight to preserve clean water."

SERIES ON FOUL WATER ACCLAIMED BY MANY

The Milwaukee Journal's 1966 campaign against water pollution, honored Monday with a Pulitzer prize, won acclaim from high officials and ordinary citizens soon after it was printed.

Praise came from Gov. Knowles, congressmen and cabinet members.

The Journal's efforts were credited with a major role in getting passage of Wisconsin's 300 million dollar pollution control law.

Patrick Lucey, then lieutenant governor, said The Journal's photography "portrayed the pollution problem as no amount of words could have done."

Gov. Knowles, applauding "the efforts of The Milwaukee Journal and its staff for its accomplishment," said the paper was to be congratulated for bringing the pollution story to the attention of the state.

"Most effective"

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall wrote that The Picture Journal series was "one of the most effective and constructive pieces on water pollution that I have seen."

"The pictures are superlative and the text shows both the in depth research and the deft word handling of a truly excellent reporter," the secretary wrote.

Udall later praised the new Wisconsin control bill.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), introducing a "clean waters act of 1966" in congress, made a senate speech recommending that his fellow senators read The Journal's series. It would, he said, shock every citizen and every public official into action.

"Finest combination"

H. W. Poston, regional program director in Chicago for the federal water pollution control administration, called the project the "finest combination pictorial and narrative job of water pollution reporting I have ever seen." He said he had distributed copies to key people in the field.

William A. Riaski, Glenview, Ill., executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, wrote: "Your paper has a long history of being in the forefront in publicizing the urgent conservation issues. The present series on 'The Spreading Menace' will add another star to your crown."

Some demur

Reader Frank Cetin, 5246 N. 44th st., wrote that he had "never heard or read anything on the subject that impressed me as much."

W. J. MacNeill, secretary of the Green Lake (Wis.) Lake Property Owners association, reported that his board of directors had voted unanimously to express appreciation to The Journal "for this public spirited and powerful assist to the fighters for 'clean water.'"

Not all the reaction was laudatory. In South Milwaukee, Mayor Chester Grobschmidt objected strenuously because some pictures in the series showed South Milwaukee's cataract of municipal sewage—65% untreated—pouring into Lake Michigan.

Village Trustee James Ackley of Pewaukee complained about a picture of the debris clogged Pewaukee river. "We have done our level best to keep pollution down," he said.

But in the Madison suburb of Shorewood Hills, the village board officially commended The Journal's series and trustee Victor Johnson said it should be "required reading."

THE PULITZER AWARD

It is significant that the two newspapers that share the Pulitzer prize award for meritorious public service were honored for achievements in a common cause—the mounting struggle to restore and protect the nation's natural resources.

The Milwaukee Journal was cited for "its successful campaign to stiffen the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin" and the Louisville Courier-Journal for its fruitful efforts to control the ravages of strip mining in Kentucky.

Both efforts simply are different phases of the new national wave of conservation awareness which concerns itself with the natural world around us—air, water, land—and the worsening of much of it. It is the crisis of man's marvelous and sometimes mindless technology and its impact on natural resources. It is the problem caused by perhaps 70% of our population crowded into 1% of our total land area.

The Journal's campaign undoubtedly was a significant factor in passage of Wisconsin's landmark 1966 water quality law, designed to provide some of the money, manpower and enforcement teeth needed to begin cleaning up our waterways. The Courier-Journal's long struggle against unchecked surface or strip mining of coal resulted in a tough new law to control the practice in Kentucky. Both campaigns have had an impact in other states.

Wisconsin, however, may have a tough new law to curb pollution, yet the Milwaukee river is murky and sometimes foul as it flows through the state's largest city. Many of our inland lakes are sickened in season with a carpet of green algae. Even portions of our inland oceans, the Great Lakes, are blighted.

Both efforts, in Wisconsin and in Kentucky, are beginnings only. Now must come the essential, the tedious and never ending business of translating law into effective action. It will require patience, determination

and, most of all, the wisdom to use with intelligence and restraint the technology which is our triumph.

LEGISLATION LONG OVERDUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of us saw the photos of the burning of the American flag in Central Park in New York on April 15 which were carried by many newspapers across the Nation. This was the latest and most spectacular of a number of cases in which the flag was mutilated and held up to derision.

I am also sure that most of those who read about the New York case boiled with indignation that those so-called Americans responsible for the burning were not apprehended, expeditiously tried, and socked with a stiff fine and jail sentence. The truth of the matter is, of course, that there is no Federal statute to cover this abuse, and some of the local and State statutes are mere wrist slaps as penalties go.

I can well imagine the exasperation of organizations like the veteran groups, many of whose members saw American soldiers die in defense of causes exemplified by the flag. One need only remember the scene of the four marines on Mount Suribachi straining to erect the American flag while the battle raged around them.

There is no excuse why legislation now before Congress cannot be evaluated, amended if necessary, and enacted into law promptly. Hearings are now in progress on the House side, and it is hoped that resulting legislation will be presented to the full body as soon as possible.

Legislation was first introduced in the House to correct abuses of the flag by Congressman RICHARD ROUDEBUSH during the 89th Congress. Similar legislation, which I also introduced last year, was again submitted this year by Congressman ROUDEBUSH and other interested Members, reflecting the concern of many citizens for corrective action. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, for instance, adopted a resolution last year calling for a Federal statute to cover flag abuses. Indicative of the feeling that many citizens have experienced on this issue is the VFW press release of May 8, 1967, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

VFW BACKS FLAG DESECRATION LEGISLATION BEFORE HOUSE PANEL

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 8.—The Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Joseph A. Scerra, Gardner, Mass., today told a Subcommittee of the House of Representatives that "it is the position of the VFW that the Congress must make desecration of the Flag a crime. Present laws concerning disrespect for the Flag are inadequate to meet the times."

Testifying before the House Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, headed by Rep. Byron Rogers (Colo.), Scerra said in part: "Our organization has long been intensely concerned over the public defilement and desecration of our National Flag. During the past several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been the leader in bringing this development to the attention of the Congress. Unfortunately, these incidents which have been accelerating of late have received nationwide and international publicity."

The Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief told the House panel that the VFW lends its "support to a bill presented by Rep. Richard L. Roudebush (Ind.), a former VFW Commander-in-Chief, and to similar bills which propose to make it a crime to desecrate our Flag. Roudebush's bill is H.R. 1207."

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars at its 67th National Convention in New York City last August adopted a resolution which resolves that 'we strongly support legislation providing punishment of one year in prison and a $1,000 fine for any person who publicly and willfully destroys, mutilates or desecrates the American Flag.'

"It is incredible to the VFW that legislation of this kind should be necessary," Scerra said. "It is becoming almost commonplace throughout this great Nation to read that certain fringe elements of our society have in some way or other publicly desecrated our Flag. It is believed that because this is our National Flag, a national law should be enacted by the Congress so that there will be uniformity both in the administration of the law and the attachment of penalties for conviction of crimes under the act."

"What is most regrettable," the VFW leader said, "is that defilement of our Flag has been interpreted by other nations and particularly by North Vietnam as a substantial resentment of the American people to the Vietnam war effort in that country. The Flag of the United States is a Federal banner and a Federal concern. Let us guard that concern. We believe that the Congress should act expeditiously to establish penalties as provided in the legislation pending before this committee in order that debasement of the Flag of the United States in the areas of contempt and sedition can no longer be accomplished with impunity."

"VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS"—AN ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday night, April 20, the Honorable Harold E. Stassen addressed the Honors Convocation of the University of Maryland. Drawing on his experience at the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and during the Eisenhower administration, Governor Stassen proposed a course toward peace in Vietnam which emphasizes a comprehensive expansion and strengthening of the United Nations. So that his proposals may be widely read and discussed, I would like to include his speech in the RECORD at this point:

VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address of Harold E. Stassen to the Honors Convocation at the University of Maryland, Apr. 20, 1967)

Honors Awards Winners, Students, Faculty and friends of the University of Maryland:

As we meet in this Honors Award Convocation, our country is deadlocked in a bitter bloody unending war in Vietnam. The other side in that war is supported by the Communist Governments of Mainland China and of the Soviet Union. General William Westmoreland, the Commanding General of the United States and Allied Forces in Vietnam, stated a week ago that in the way in which he was engaged in fighting it, there was no end in sight to that War.

Nothing will have a more profound effect upon the future lives of the young men and young women who are awarded honors at the University of Maryland tonight than the future course of that Vietnam War and its worldwide implications.

Therefore, in addition to directly joining in the acclaim to each and every student who on this night is honored for special attainment at this great University, it seems to me that I would honor you most if I spoke out earnestly and emphatically of the path of peace in Vietnam and in the world.

In doing so, I speak with respect for those who have different views. I speak with recognition of the sincerity of those who have divergent opinions.

I do not speak as either a dove or a hawk. I do not speak in a partisan sense, as I am mindful thoroughly that the divergence of views cuts across party lines.

Nor do I consider that in speaking I am exercising merely the right of dissent. I consider that I am exercising the right of a free people to endeavor to change the course of their government when they are convinced that it is mistaken!

And I am convinced that the present course of our government in Vietnam is tragically mistaken and must be changed!

In speaking in positive and definite terms about an issue as far-reaching as that in which we are engaged this evening, I know full well the danger of appearing to be arbitrary or seeming to be categorical. Let me simply say with humility that I do not wish to be any of these. I do continue to listen to and read of all other views on Vietnam. I do continue to be willing to meet and discuss or debate the views on Vietnam of any one with different views, whether they be in the Administration or out of it; in my political party or in the other political party.

The correction of this tragic mistake, the turning toward what I feel certain is the path of peace, is so important that the task cannot be approached in superficial terms or with personal preferences.

Permit me also to preface my remarks with a brief reference to the experience of which I speak. In my student days at the University of Minnesota, in my junior year, as I participated in a Convocation such as you are engaged in tonight, I decided that the top priority in my life would be to make a contribution to peace with justice for humanity.

This decision led to many steps through the years, some understood and some not understood.

Out of my continuing study and my experiences, I am certain that the path of peace in Vietnam is marked by three major inseparable parallel courses of action.

First of all, the United States must take an open, creative initiative to modernize and strengthen the United Nations through a rewriting of the Charter, a rewriting which would declare all peoples eligible for membership, whatsoever may be their current

form of government and thereby encompass within the eligibility both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, both Nationalist China on Formosa and the Republic of China on the Mainland, both the Federal Republic of Germany in the West and the Communist Government of East Germany, both North Korea and South Korea.

Your first reaction may be that they are too complex. May I emphasize that there are no simple answers to the whole inter-related matters of the emergence of peoples from Colonialism, at a time when there is a world-wide competition between the systems of modern Russia and Chinese Communism and modern American peoples' capitalism, and in an age of nuclear weapons on both sides that would make a world war a holocaust for all humanity.

Let us take up these three inseparable parallel courses of action of the path of peace in Vietnam in detail.

Let us do so in the form of some of the questions and answers which have arisen in the process of my current advocacy of this path of peace to the Administration and to Senators and Congressmen. I have been asked these questions and have given these responses.

1. Why do you state that you do not believe there can be an American War solution in Vietnam?

Because extensive American War action is self-defeating in that it creates new guerillas and new opposition among the young men of the nation faster than it can possibly lead to the killing of guerrillas and the killing of young soldiers of the opposition.

Vietnam is a territory of approximately the size of the State of New Jersey with 24,000,000 people living within it. Approximately one-half of these are North and approximately one-half are South. This division of the country was established by the French as they ended in 1954 their postwar nine-year endeavor to reassert Colonial administration. The feeling against Colonialism, and the feeling that centers on the color differences, are so deep, and the feeling against bombing on the part of all people is so intense, that our American direct military action in the past two years has built up greater opposition rather than lessened it.

In that modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, a new sound financial base must be established; a new Central Council or Regional Council with weighted voting must be added; improved methods for peaceful solutions need to be brought forward, such as a World Court of Equity, a Board of Arbitration and a Panel of Mediators. The beginnings of a small elite United Nations Police Force must be organized.

Parallel to the initiation of this first course of action, implemented immediately, there must be a change in the United States policies in Vietnam with new orders to quiet down the War; to stop hunter-killer drives through the jungles and over the mountains, to stop the bombing except in direct defense against attack or the imminent threat of attack; to maintain a very powerful military presence in Vietnam, but to do so deliberately with the minimum of casualties for Americans and for the Vietnamese.

The third of the courses of action likewise to be started contemporaneously is an extensive program with highest priority to advance the educational, economic, social and political well-being of the peoples of Vietnam and particularly of the youth of Vietnam, and generally of the less fortunate peoples of the world. The major resources and the great productive potential of our country which will be released by the quieting down of the War in Vietnam would be utilized for these purposes.

I realize full well that these three inseparable parallel courses of action may well at first sound unrealistic to you. Let me assure you that I believe they are realistic and practical and essential.

Our American men in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have carried on an outstanding courageous performance of duty. They are heroes, and they deserve to be so regarded. They are endeavoring valiantly to carry out the orders to bomb and to seek out and kill the opposing forces.

Furthermore, I recognize the sincerity of purpose of President Johnson and his Administration in changing from the patient advisory, educational and supply role which the United States had from 1954 to 1965, over into direct extensive American military combat. But I point out the difference of results. In ten years under Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower from 1954 to 1964 only one hundred Americans were killed in the entire ten-year period. Vietnamese casualties were also relatively limited. The young men were gradually getting educated and prepared for goverment, a process which the French under Colonialism had not permitted.

When President Johnson changed the orders and moved into direct American military combat and extensive bombing that unfortunate weekend in February 1965, the result was to accelerate the guerilla movement. The further result was to solidify the people of North Vietnam in the supply of their armed forces. Now after more than 8,000 American deaths and many times this number of American casualties and many, many times this number of Vietnamese casualties, South and North, the opposing military forces in South Vietnam are more numerous today than they were in February 1965. More young Vietnamese reach military age each month than the highest claims of enemy killed! This is one indication of the futility of the present course of action.

American military forces have a very important role to play in standing in a defensive posture in South Vietnam to safeguard against any military takeover and to safeguard against any Chinese intervention in Vietnam. But American military might cannot force negotiations. The long resistance to Colonialism, the feeling of color, the cultural background, all combine in a result that every time President Johnson says to the North Vietnamese "you come to the negotiating table or I will bomb you more intensively," he makes it more difficult, if not impossible, for them to come to the negotiating table. In my judgment they will die before they knuckle under to these actions and threats. The American military forces cannot obtain a decisive military victory. The extensive jungles cannot be permanently occupied. The Cambodia haven for the opposition cannot be obliterated. The Communist support cannot be threatened away. The other side can escalate with more missiles and longer range missiles and more guerillas for each escalation of the United States. Even if the United States took the extreme action of completely devastating North Vietnam, a vacuum would be created which in the long term future the Chinese Communists would fill. Certainly this is not a solution of Vietnam!

Our priority aim should be changed! Our priority aim should be to *win the people of Vietnam*, rather than to *win the war in Vietnam!*

2. What is the basis for your feeling that if both Vietnams were to be proposed for membership in the United Nations at this period of history as a part of the modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, and if the United States unilaterally quieted down the War, this could lead to a solution?

My conviction on this is based on my lifelong experiences and studies. As you may know, on behalf of President Eisenhower, I was in charge of the mutual security and foreign operations programs in all countries. Before that, during World War II, as Assistant Chief of Staff for Administration for Admiral William Halsey, I had the responsibility for bringing together all of the various Intelligence Information from the American Commands, including General MacArthur's and from Lord Mountbatten's British Command. It was my duty to see to it that this Intelligence Information in turn reached the Commanders who needed to know within Admiral Halsey's combined fighting forces. At the end of World War II, in the Drafting of the United Nations Charter under appointment by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, I was in direct charge of drafting and negotiating the provisions for trusteeship which related to dependent peoples and mandated territories and Colonial changes. Long before that, in college days, one of my specialties was the study of the Far East. I know something of the peoples, the jungles, the rice paddies, and most of the leaders.

I am convinced that the opportunity to have full status within the United Nations for the peoples of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and their governments; the parallel quieting down of the War by unconditional decision of the United States; the opportunity for the young men to turn to education and to the development of their country in an economic sense; repeated amnesty offers to the opposing forces; genuine social, economic, and political reforms; will together cause the guerilla forces and the war actions to wither away. This will be the effect whether the leaders of the guerillas and the officials of the government of North Vietnam agree or not. These actions will also cause new leaders to arise who fit these new circumstances, even as President Magsaysay rose in the Philippines during similar policies which we instituted in the Philippines during Presdent Eisenhower's Adminstration.

So long as we continue currently the concept of the 1954 French Agreement that one or the other of the Vietnam governments will take over a United Vietnam, we rivet into the situation an unending bitter bloody struggle.

3. Do you believe in peace at any price?

Certainly not! The United States must continue to be prepared to fight a modern war with all of its devastation, if it becomes necessary to defend freedom, or to defend our national security, or to defend against aggressive war. I served in World War II in active and extensive combat with Admiral Halsey in a number of the major battles and campaigns of the Pacific. My philosophy has not changed. But I do believe that we should be prepared to pay a very large price of patience for peace. We should be prepared to pay a substantial price of economic and educational assistance for peace. We should be prepared to pay an extraordinary price of diplomatic endeavor, of pioneering, of leadership efforts in the United Nations, and of thoughtfulness for the differences of cultures, aspirations, and circumstances of other peoples, all for peace!

We should exercise exceptional moral restraint upon the use of American combat forces in direct military action.

We should recognize the change of the nuclear age in that it is no longer sane to try to solve an international problem by the means of direct combat force. We must continue to be very powerful and very alert but recognize the profound change that since the ultimate use of military force is a nuclear holocaust of mutual devastation, there should be an extraordinary moral restraint upon the first use of military force.

4. Do you consider Communism to be a threat?

Definitely. We must ever be very alert to the threat of Communism, particularly through the dictatorships of states under Communism. Very powerful military force on our part must not only be prepared for the ultimate tragedy which a Third World War

would mean, but we must also be so powerful and alert as to discourage any miscalculation on the part of any Communist dictatorship. Thus our military position should minimize the danger that any opposing force would ever think it could get by with an attack upon the United States.

But the actual change from Communism toward freedom, I am convinced, will not come about through war action. It can only come about through the inherent internal pressure for more freedom on the part of the peoples within the Communist States. I have long held and expressed this view. I suggest that there is increasing evidence in support of it within all of the Eastern European States and within Russia itself.

A sharp confrontation with the Communist dictatorship States leads to the tragedy of war, war with mutual devastation. But patient and powerful defensive resistance, designed to provide the time for the internal evolution of the peoples' desire for freedom; programs aimed at improving the conditions of such peoples' evolution toward freedom; and actual progress in the United States in the true wellbeing of all of our citizens without discrimination; these three combined constitute the foundation for a successful American world policy for the decades ahead.

Time for such peoples' evolution is particularly important now in the instance of China, which relatively is in the early stage of Communist dictatorship. Even now the internal ferment in China, which I had predicted, is becoming evident. Out of this ferment, I am convinced will arise, gradually and powerfully, a reassertion of the individual Chinese desire for freedom, and a persistent demand for the rights of the Chinese family. This process will be facilitated if we open up the windows of communication with China, and if we avoid, skillfully and without appeasement, the sharp aggressive confrontation which would trigger a world war.

I was in the center of the studies and discussions in President Eisenhower's Administration which gave rise to the President's "opening up" proposals at the Summit Meeting in 1955. This "opening up" has been followed through ever since with the extensive reciprocal visits of delegations and exchanges of exhibitions in the years since then. I believe all objective students are now quite well agreed that this "opening up" has been a part of the process by which the evolution toward the individual freedom of the Russian people, and toward a better prospect for peace, has occurred. The strong defensive position of NATO and of the United States; the favorable development of the Marshall Plan and of the European Common Market; the successful Austrian negotiation for sovereignty and independence; the Berlin Food Program for East Germans; and many other steps; were and are a part of the process. But the "opening up" was and is a crucial and indispensable element in the favorable result. May I emphasize that it is a favorable result for the people of Russia as well as for the people of the United States. It is also a favorable result for the people of the other nations of the world. One of the basic facts of the modern space-atomic age is the high degree of true mutual interests of all peoples of all nations.

5. Why do you now advocate universal eligibility for membership in the United Nations?

The developments in the space atomic age seem to me to make it so clear that this is now truly one world. Its problems cannot be resolved without recognizing it as one world. The most intense dangers and difficulties today are those which were left outside of the United Nations; that is to say the divided Germany, the Vietnam situation, and Mainland China.

At the time the original Charter was drafted, it was basically a matter of the nations that had been working together and standing together in World War II forming an organization to continue their quest for peace. As time moved on, former enemy states such as Italy and Japan were taken into membership. But in the most crucial area of the divided states emerging from World War II to wit: Germany, China, Vietnam, and Korea, all these were left outside of the United Nations. I believe that any objective study, any thorough fresh review of the situation and of the best prospects for moving into the next decade without war, will conclude that all of these problems areas should be within the framework of the United Nations. Therefore, all of the peoples should be included within the universal eligibility for membership, whatever may be their current form of government.

6. Explain what you mean by amending the United Nations Charter without a veto; could not, for example, the Nationalist Government of China on Taiwan veto any change in the Charter?

Neither the Nationalist Government of China nor any other one government can arbitrarily veto any amendment in the Charter if that amendment is brought about through the Charter amending convention process as provided in Article 109.

First of all the amending convention can be called without a veto. This requires any seven votes of the Security Council and two-thirds of the Assembly.

Once such a convention is called and convened, it has complete authority in and of itself to amend any portion of the Charter. It can amend Article 109 and Article 23. Such a convention can decide, for example, that for the contemporary period of history both Chinas should be eligible for membership, and neither one should have a permanent seat in the Security Council, and neither one should have the right of vetoing amendments or of any other kind of veto.

In other words, each state in the world in such a convention would have the sanction of its own true position in the world and would not have any arbitrary or legalistic absolute power.

It is quite evident that it would not make much sense to go forward with a revised United Nations Charter unless both the United States and the U.S.S.R. would become members and ratify the revised Charter. But even these great powers would not be entirely immune from the thorough consideration of the views of others. Under extreme circumstances, the rest of the world could move forward without any one major power. The aim, of course, would be, as I have emphasized, to follow the concept that this is one world in the space age and that all peoples should be eligible for membership whatsoever may be their contemporary form of government, and whether or not we approve of that form of government.

The aim would be to establish the improved structure of the organization of the United Nations so that there was a better prospect for the working out of peaceful change, the evolution of increasing freedom, progress in true well being of all peoples, and the growth of improved methods of settling differences between nations without war.

I emphasize that at the time the original United Nations Charter was drafted in 1945, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Senator Tom Connally, and I and others foresaw this need of updating the Charter and specifically provided this means of the amending convention which had not been included in the original Dumbarton Oaks draft. We specifically did not want to permanently freeze the organization. We did not want to stagnate the United Nations for all time with the permanent members that were then emerging from World War II.

7. What other changes would you want to see brought about within the United Nations Charter in such an amending convention, to, as you put it, "modernize and strengthen the organization"?

A. A new method of financing;
B. A new Council of Regional Secretaries;
C. A World Court of Equity;
D. A United Nations Board of Arbitration;
E. A United Nations Panel of Mediators;
F. A United Nations Police Force.

8. What do you mean by a Council of Regional Secretaries?

This would be a new Council which would function between the large Assembly, with its one-vote one-State, and the Security Council, with its veto votes. It would function with weighted voting and its members would be elected through weighted voting within the respective Regions of the World. It would have a number of approximately 11. These Regional Secretaries would meet regularly with the Secretary General. They should be empowered to make recommendations on any matter within the scope of the Charter.

The town hall effect of the Assembly has value and would be continued. But the Assembly cannot be the sole functioning body for the future. Likewise, the Security Council, perhaps with a reduced number of permanent seats, would still function and still have a restraint upon the actual major combat military moves of the United Nations.

But a Council of Regional Secretaries could be an important part of the gradually developing effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and in furthering progress in a comprehensive sense for all humanity.

9. Why do you propose a World Court of Equity, when there already is a World Court?

The present World Court has many limitations in its origin, its emphasis, and in the United States' reservations to it. The greatest need is for the approach to world problems that is comparable to what we know as "equity", and comparable to the original development of the English Equity Courts. It is a procedure that can take into account the totality of facts. It can lead to an amendment of agreements, as well as their interpretation; to a recommended modification of boundaries; as well as the study of old shifting boundaries; to the comprehensive inter-related conditions and requirements for reality and fairness and justice, as well as one specific treaty or documentary interpretation. Equity provides a key to lifting away from past outmoded conditions or injustices without chaos.

With a limited power of enforcement, and a basic procedure of referring its decisions, if necessary, to the United Nations itself, I believe the United States Senate could be convinced to approve membership in such a new World Court of Equity without reservation. Other members of the United Nations would likewise ratify without reservation. This World Court of Equity would then be available as one of the alternative means of reaching peaceful answers to difficult problems in the world such as Kashmir, between India and Pakistan; the Jordan River, between Israel and the Arabian States; and other similar intense problems. It would also be available to lead into the very important new areas of the equities and orderliness of the use of outer space, and the equities and orderliness of the use of the resources under the sea.

10. What type of amended financial support for the United Nations do you suggest?

The best method of strengthening the financial arrangements within the United Nations would be to provide for a small United Nations charge or fee upon all international movements of goods, materials and machinery. A one-percent charge would provide quite an adequate financial base. This provision could be included within the revisions of the Charter, arising out of a Charter-amending session. Since there is a direct relationship between the stability of international relations and the large volume flow of

export and import, there is a certain amount of logic in placing the cost of the maintenance of the United Nations upon this flow of goods, materials and machinery. It is a bit like charging a gas tax for the funds to maintain the highways upon which the automobiles may then operate in increasing numbers and with greater facility.

There is a small but significant precedent for this kind of approach to the financing of the United Nations. In the Suez Canal crisis ten years ago, when the Canal was closed through the sunken ships, the United Nations borrowed the money and issued the contracts to salvage companies to clear out the Canal. Then a United Nations surcharge of five percent was placed upon all ships going through the Canal, and this surcharge was used to pay off the United Nations debt. Complete payment was concluded within a few years time.

Some automatic regular source of revenue paid in by all peoples is an essential part of the modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, and I have not heard of any better proposal than the foregoing.

11. What about your recommendation for a United Nations Police Force?

If strong financing is arranged, a small standing United Nations Police Force in United Nations uniforms, ready to move in promptly in situations of border disputes or instability, could help nip trouble in the bud before it becomes a major matter. Such a United Nations Police Force can fit in with the moving of these differences toward the United Nations Board of Arbitration and the World Court of Equity, rather than toward an intense struggle between military forces in War.

It would be best to recruit the members of this elite Police Force from among the nationals of the smaller states, and limit the percentage of men in the force from any one member state. Through various provisions of this kind, it could be made a truly United Nations Force to psychologically as well as physically advance the potential for peace.

12. What would be the nature of a United Nations Board of Arbitration?

There could be many variations. But the probable makeup would be three individuals from three different member states, none of which had any major direct interest in the contending states in any particular dispute.

Such a United Nations Board of Arbitration would be an additional and important alternative for settling differences without War.

13. How would the United Nations Panel of Mediators function?

This would be another alternative method available for the solution of differences between nations without resort to military force. Through a standing Panel of such mediators there could be more rapid action in moving one of them into a difficult problem, and a more sustained long term attention until solutions are reached.

There would be many parallels to the diverse methods and successful functioning of mediators in labor-management disputes in the United States.

14. Do you agree that you cannot trust the Communist dictators?

Yes, I agree. But I also emphasize that we should always keep in mind both the people and the government in a Communist dictatorship or any other dictatorship state. The people within a dictatorship are members of the same human race as the people in a free and democratic state. They have in large measure the same aspirations and the same human nature. They will develop internal pressures for more individual freedom, for more dignity, and for more economic and educational progress. This pressure from the people has been the basic, modifying force against dictatorships from the earliest beginnings of history. It is very evident that it operates now within the Communist dicatorships. The United States should ever think through its policies in terms of advancing the future wellbeing of all humanity on this earth under God. Within that context it can and will also advance the wellbeing of the people of the United States. But a narrow nationalism, or offensive military moves, or oppressive economic actions, against an entire people caught currently under a Communist dictatorship are, and will continue to be, shortsighted and in error.

15. What do you consider to be the greatest policy problem for the United States?

The tendency to polarize our viewpoint or think only in the two extremes. The most desirable course is usually in between these extremes. Thus in Vietnam, the greatest emphasis has been upon either greater United States military action and escalation, or withdrawal. Both of these in my view are a grave mistake. The maintenance of a presence in Vietnam, but the quieting down of the War, and the bringing forward of the diplomatic alternatives and of the economic, educational and cultural advances is the course that should be followed. I sometimes refer to it as "The Fourth Alternative." It is the path of peace in Vietnam.

These in-between solutions have in the past proved to be right in instance after instance. But to reach such solutions we must resist either one of the polarized extremes with all of their seeming attraction of simplicity, and the emotional advocacy of their sincere partisans. These in-between solutions need to be arrived at with the best available information, plus a sensitivity to the basic moral principles which should guide our nation.

May I close with a call to action. If upon reflection you become convinced that the creative path of peace which I advocate is right; if you conclude that you prefer it over either of the extremes of continued or escalated American war action on the one hand, or withdrawal on the other hand, then I suggest you take one or more of the following steps:

1. Write to the President.
2. Write to your Senators and Congressmen, or better yet, get together a delegation to go to Washington to call on them.
3. Propose resolutions in organizations of which you are a member.

Above all, do not underestimate the impact which you and the members of your generation can have upon the policy of our nation and of the world.

May I express the hope that all of you will decide that during your lifetimes, whatever may be your occupation, you will give some of your time and your energy and your intelligence to this cause of peace.

May I further express the hope that some one or more of the honor students of this night at the University of Maryland will decide to give top priority throughout his or her lifetime to this cause of peace, peace with justice for all humanity on this earth under God.

CONGRESSMAN McCLURE TO CO-SPONSOR WIDNALL-PERCY HOME-OWNERSHIP PLAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, individual homeownership is a goal sought by most Americans, but one that has eluded a sizable segment of the populace.

The role of Government in this matter has always been under dispute. The late Senator Robert A. Taft, author of one of the first Federal housing bills, justified it this way:

> The object of a housing policy should be to see that there is a housing plan which provides decent shelter and decent housing for all those [American] families . . . It is claimed that private enterprise without any aid from the government can solve the problem. I think that's contradicted by the facts and figures.

Today, however, prosperity is very nearly universal, and one would think that all the Government need do would be to establish an economy in which all who so desire could work and flourish.

But today's economy is "managed." And the housing proposals of the Federal planners range from Government-owned projects that will be tomorrow's slums to the rent supplement program.

Congressman WIDNALL and Senator PERCY have devised an alternative program in which the Federal Government works in partnership with private enterprise and slum residents themselves. Financing of the program comes from the sale of bonds guaranteed for a fee by the Government. Local nonprofit housing associations would be supported in their efforts to rehabilitate or construct housing for sale to families unable to obtain ordinary financing. The Government would pay the difference between the market rate of interest and a lower rate charged to the homebuyer. When a homeowner increases his income to a higher level, he will make repayments into a revolving fund to help other low-income buyers. Prospective buyers are able to reduce the cost of their home by contributing their own labor to its construction.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I regret there is a need for a housing program. From a philosophical standpoint, I regret that we turn once again, hat in hand, to the Federal Treasury. But from a realistic standpoint, I know that the choice narrows down to a rehash of welfare-state failures or the hope of a permanent cure that lies in the Widnall-Percy plan. For this reason, I have decided to cosponsor the Republican proposal.

Recently, a newspaper columnist wrote that this measure was being offered in an attempt to deter the presidential hopes of our former Vice President, and to boost similar ambitions on the part of the bill's chief sponsor. Had I felt the motivation for the bill was anything but a humanitarian one, I would not be endorsing it today, and I would vehemently object to anyone construing my cosponsorship as either a repudiation or an endorsement of any potential candidate.

MUTUAL FUND PROPOSALS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the New York Times editorialized on the currently pending SEC mutual fund industry proposals. One comment from the Times deserves particular attention:

Congressional hearings ought to make clear that mutual funds are not on trial.

How very true that is.

I commend to my colleagues the editorial which follows:

MUTUAL FUND RESPONSIBILITY

After failing to win agreement in direct negotiations with the mutual fund industry, the Securities and Exchange Commission has reluctantly taken its case to Congress. It is asking for approval of reforms designed to give a fairer deal to mutual fund investors.

The industry's refusal to strike a compromise with the S.E.C. is based in part on its belief that there is no real need for reform. It points to its extraordinary growth over the past twenty years as proof that investors are being well served. And it takes the position that the S.E.C.'s proposals to reduce sales charges and management fees and to abolish the "front-end load"—the practice of deducting up to half of initial payments on long-term installment agreements—will cripple the industry and hurt investors.

It is true that the S.E.C. has not established an ironclad economic case for some of its reforms. Yet investors are subject to excessive sales charges; they do not benefit from economies of scale or from price or performance competition, and the industry's high commissions are conducive to high-pressure sales practices. In asking for new safeguards the S.E.C. is not seeking to put efficient mutual funds out of business. Indeed, its recommendations are designed to see to it that mutual funds continue to operate at a profit.

Clearly the future of mutual funds is not at stake. The S.E.C. has in fact testified to their value as a medium for diversifying risk for small investors. But the mutual fund industry has not undertaken to reform itself, nor has it shown the responsibility and maturity that should accompany control over nearly $40 billion in shareholder assets.

The industry hopes that its size and its influence in Congress will serve to maintain the *status quo*. But the needs of the nation's investors and potential investors in mutual funds must also be taken into account. They should not be compelled to pay excessive sales charges or exorbitant management fees. And people who have no reason to buy mutual funds should not be pressured into signing up for them by fast-talking salesmen earning fat commissions.

Congressional hearings ought to make clear that mutual funds are not on trial. But their practices are. It is up to Congress to see that the industry takes a more responsible attitude in dealing with the public.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LIX

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, two former standard bearers of the two great political parties have advocated the elimination of the draft. In 1956, the Democratic candidate, the late Adlai E. Stevenson, spoke out against conscription. Although severely criticized by his opponents, Stevenson said:

I don't see how we can ever get anywhere against the rigid, negative position that we cannot even discuss the matter or even look forward to the time when we can do away with compulsory military service.

In 1964, the Republican Party nominee for President, Senator Barry Goldwater pledged that if elected:

I would do everything in my power to end the draft system altogether in favor of a fully professional military force.

Mr. Speaker, although supporters of abolition of compulsory military service may represent different political parties and opposing philosophies, they are, however, united in their concern for the freedom of the individual in a democratic society. Conscription is an alien institution in American life, and because it is compulsory, it is in direct conflict with our notion of liberty and it should be abolished.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have heard over the last 10 days a number of statements from both sides of the aisle about the possible effect the Republican substitute to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would have on the participation of children from parochial schools. Most of the statements were very general in nature. As a lawyer, I have grave reservations about Mr. QUIE's substitute bill and would like to outline my specific concerns.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

First, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a success. It has involved children attending parochial schools in many ways: dual enrollment, special evening and weekend classes, and special public school services in parochial schools to name a few. This progress did not come about by chance. The law was carefully designed to meet the church-state problems. We realized that for many years Federal aid to education was thwarted by this issue and a solution was painstakingly devised. Funds are provided to public schools with the specific proviso that public school programs should be extended to all children whether they are in school or are dropouts, or whether they attend public schools or parochial schools.

We thus laid down several guidelines to assure participation of children in parochial schools while at the same time set up restrictions to prevent any unconstitutional practices.

Basically, the law provides:

First. State administration must be consistent with State law.

Second. Funds must not enrich or directly benefit any private schools.

Third. Title and control of all material must remain with the public authority.

Fourth. Materials used by children in private schools must be in use or approved for use in the public schools.

Fifth. Grants are to be made to the local school district. The flexibility built into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was to permit all States to participate even though State laws governing its operation vary greatly over the United States.

STATE CONSTITUTIONS

As we all know, State constitutions and laws vary greatly and in many respects impose stricter limitations in the area of church-state relations than does the U.S. Constitution. Many State constitutions prohibit any aid "direct or indirect" to church-related institutions. All State constitutions go into greater detail than the U.S. Constitution to spell out the line of separation between church and state. The difference is best illustrated by various rulings on providing public transportation for children attending private schools. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), held that such transportation did not violate the first amendment. Since that decision, the highest courts in four States have ruled that public transportation of parochial school children violated their State constitution.

In spite of these greater State constitutional restrictions, the administration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has continued virtually unaffected. Time and again, State attorneys general have ruled that the State constitution does not apply to Federal programs, the entire cost of which is paid for with Federal moneys kept separate from State and local funds.

Two examples of these rulings are as follows:

First. In Nevada where dual enrollment has been ruled to be unconstitutional, the attorney general said that although Nevada law forbids the use of State, county, or municipal funds to benefit any sectarian society, the State may accept and use funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 "providing the moneys are designated as Federal moneys and kept in separate funds."

Second. In New York the attorney general ruled that the constitutional provision which forbids direct or indirect aid forbids dual enrollment even where the program is entirely paid out of Federal funds. He added, however, that no violation would occur "if the entire cost of the program in this State—including administration thereof—is paid out of Federal grants without the use of any State or local property or credit or public money at any stage of the program."

PROBLEMS UNDER H.R. 8983

While I cannot be completely sure States will be unable to participate fully

in the Republican substitute, I am not convinced some of the statutory gloss added to the bill, such as anticommingling provisions, resolves all the issues. The basic concept behind a block grant is contrary to the legal philosophy seen in these State rulings. A block grant is designed to provide general aid to States to operate State, not Federal, programs. Even if this block grant proposal does not reach this end result, it does involve the State to a much greater degree.

There are basic differences between the administrative mechanisms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and those contained in H.R. 8983. Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a school district prepares a proposal based on its allocation of funds provided for in the law. All funds are distributed by the Federal Government and are identifiable as Federal funds. Under the proposed substitute a State department of education has almost total discretion concerning reallocation of funds within a State and would be charged with the responsibility for general administration. Such a program obviously requires substantial State participation. Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is administratively similar to H.R. 8983 but the State law problem was recognized and a provision was made in the law to bypass these State restrictions. The substitute bill has retained this bypass, but only as it relates to provisions for books and equipment.

Other portions of H.R. 8983 raise similar State law problems. For just one example, section 703(1) authorizes grants for programs and projects designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, yet there appears no statement that these grants must be limited to *local school* districts. In fact, a contrary implication exists in section 704(a)(6) which gives a local education agency or other applicant denied assistance a right of a hearing before the State educational agency. Does a reading of these sections together mean that a parochial school can request constructional assistance? If this be true, then severe State law questions exist.

In closing, while it may be true, as has been said by many, that there are no church-state impediments in H.R. 8983, I have not been convinced that all these problems have been carefully reviewed and solved. With so much at stake—a multibillion-dollar program that is working well—I cannot support a bill that seemingly has internal inconsistencies and has not been considered and refined by our committee process.

For my colleagues, I am introducing into the RECORD those State constitutional provisions which relate to the church-state issue:

STATE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Article I

Sec. 3. That no religion shall be established by law; that no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect, society, denomination or mode of worship; that no one shall be compelled by law to attend any place of worship; nor to pay any tithes, taxes or other rates for building or repairing any place of worship, or for maintaining any minister or ministry; that no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this State; and that the civil rights privileges and capacities of any citizen shall not be in any manner affected by his religious principles.

Article IV

Sec. 263. No money raised for the support of public schools shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

Article I

Sec. 4. No law shall be made respectig an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Article VII

Sec. 1. The legislature shall by general law establish and maintain a system of public schools open to all children of the State, and may provide for other public educational institutions. Schools and institutions so established shall be free from sectarian control. No money shall be paid from public funds for the direct benefit of any religious or other private educational institution.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Article II

Sec. 7. The mode of administering an oath, or affirmation, shall be such as shall be most consistent with and binding upon the conscience of the person to whom such oath, or affirmation, may be administered.

SEC. 12. The liberty of conscience secured by the provisions of this Constitution shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned touching his religious belief in any court of justice to affect the weight of his testimony.

Article IX

Sec. 10. No tax shall be laid or appropriation of public money made in aid of any church, or private or sectarian school, or any public service corporation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Article II

Sec. 24. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship; or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment, denomination or mode of worship above any other.

Sec. 25. Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to good government, the General Assembly shall enact suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceful enjoyment of its own mode of public workship.

Sec. 26. No religious test shall ever be required of any person as a qualification to vote or hold office, nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious belief; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be guaranteed in this State; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this State.

Article IV

Sec. 30. Neither the Legislature, nor any county, city and county, township, school district, or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, or grant anything to or in aid of any religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose, or help to support or sustain any school, college, university, hospital, or other institution controlled by any religious creed, church, or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of personal property or real estate ever be made by the State, or any city, city and county, town, or other municipal corporation for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever; provided, that nothing in this section shall prevent the Legislature granting aid pursuant to Section 22 of this article.

Article IX

Sec. 8. No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools; nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction thereon be permitted, directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of the State.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Article II

Sec. 4. Religious freedom.—That the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity, on account of his opinions concerning religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination against his consent. Nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article IX

Sec. 7. Aid to private schools, churches, etc., forbidden.—Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian society, or for any sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property, ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

Sec. 8. Religious test and race discrimination forbidden—Sectarian tenets.—No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as a teacher or

student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Article I

Sec. 3. The exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be free to all persons in this state; provided, that the right hereby declared and established, shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state.

Sec. 4. No preference shall be given by law to any Christian sect or mode of worship.

Article VII

Sec. 1. It being the duty of all men to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe, and their right to render that worship, in the mode most consistent with the dictates of their consciences; no person shall by law be compelled to join or support, nor be classed with, or associated to, any congregation, church, or religious association. But every person now belonging to such congregation, church or religious association shall remain a member thereof until he shall have separated himself therefrom, in the manner hereinafter provided. And each and every society or denomination of Christians in this state, shall have and enjoy the same and equal powers, rights and privileges; and shall have power and authority to support and maintain the ministers or teachers of their respective denominations, and to build and repair houses for public worship, by a tax on the members of any such society only, to be laid by a major vote of the legal voters assembled at any society meeting, warned and held according to law, or in any other manner.

Sec. 2. If any person shall choose to separate himself from the society or denomination of Christians to which he may belong, and shall leave a written notice thereof with the clerk of such society, he shall thereupon be no longer liable for any future expenses which may be incurred by said society.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Article I

Sec. 1. Although it is the duty of all men frequently to assemble together for the public worship of Almighty God; and piety and morality, on which the prosperity of communities depends are hereby promoted; yet no man shall or ought to be compelled to attend any religious worship, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of worship, or to the maintenance of any ministry, against his own free will and consent; and no power shall or ought to be vested in or assumed by any magistrate that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control the rights of conscience, in the free exercise of religious worship, nor a preference given by law to any religious societies, denominations, or modes of worship.

Sec. 2. No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, under this State.

Article X

Sec. 3. No portion of any fund existing, or which may hereafter be appropriated, or raised by tax, for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of any sectarian, church or denominational school; provided, that all real or personal property used for school purposes, where the tuition is free, shall be exempt from taxation and assessment for public purposes.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Declaration of Rights

Sec. 5. Religious freedom; liberty of conscience, etc.—The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State, and no person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of consicence (sic) hereby secured shall not be so constrewed (sic) as to justify licentiousness or practices subversive of, or inconsistent with, the peace or moral safety of the State or society.

Sec. 6. Religious preferences; public aid, etc.—No preference shall be given by law to any church, sect or mode of worship and no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect or religious denomination or in aid of any sectarian institution.

Article XII

Sec. 13. Restriction on use of county or district school funds.—No law shall be enacted authorizing the diversion or the lending of any County or District School Funds, or the appropriation of any part of the permanent or available school Fund to any other than school purposes; nor shall the same, or any part thereof, be appropriated to or used the support of any sectarian school.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Article I

Section I

Paragraph XII. Freedom of conscience. All men have the natural and inalienable right to worship God, each according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no human authority should, in any case, control or interfere with such right of conscience.

Paragraph XIII. Religious opinions; liberty of conscience. No inhabitant of this State shall be molested in person or property, or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinions; but the right of liberty of conscience shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State.

Paragraph XIV. Appropriations to churches, sects, etc., forbidden. No money shall ever be taken from the public Treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religionists, or of any sectarian institution.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

Article I

Sec. 3. No law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peacably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Article IX

Sec. 1. The State shall provide for the establishment, support and control of a statewide system of public schools free from sectarian control, a state university, public libraries and such other educational institutions as may be deemed desirable, including physical facilities therefor. There shall be no segregation in public educational institutions because of race, religion or ancestry; nor shall public funds be appropriated for the support or benefit of any sectarian or private educational institution.

IDAHO STATE CONSTITUTION

Article I

Sec. 4. Guaranty of religious liberty.—The exercise and enjoyment of religious faith and worship shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege, or capacity on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, or excuse acts of licentiousness or justify polygamous or other pernicious practices, inconsistent with morality or the peace or safety of the state; nor to permit any person, organization, or association to directly or indirectly aid or abet, counsel or advise any person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination, or pay tithes against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship. Bigamy and polygamy are forever prohibited in the state, and the legislature shall provide by law for the punishment of such crimes.

Article IX

Sec. 5. Sectarian appropriations prohibited.—Neither the legislature nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian or religious society, or for any sectarian or religious purpose, or to help support or sustain any school academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church, sectarian or religious denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation, to any church or for any sectarian or religious purpose.

Sec. 6. Religious test and teaching in school prohibited.—No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as teacher or student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian or religious tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color. No books, papers, tracts or documents of a political, sectarian or denominational character shall be used or introduced in any schools established under the provisions of this article, nor shall any teacher or any district receive any of the public school moneys in which the schools have not been taught in accordance with the provisions of this article.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Article II

Sec. 3. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity, on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, or justfy practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent, nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of [religion].

Article VIII

Sec. 3. Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property ever be

made by the State, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF INDIANA

Article I

Ses. 2. Right to worship.—All men shall be secured in the natural right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences.

Sec. 3. Freedom of thought.—No law shall, in any case whatever, control the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 4. No preference to any creed.—No preference shall be given, by law, to any creed, religious society, or mode of worship; and no man shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support, any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent.

Sec. 5. No religious test for office.—No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of trust or profit.

Sec. 6. No money for religious institutions.—No money shall be drawn from the treasury, for the benefit of any religious or theological institution.

Sec. 7. Competency of witness.—No person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness, in consequence of his opinions on matters of religion.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IOWA

Article I

Sec. 3. The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing places of worship or the maintenance of any minister, or ministry.

Sec. 4. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office, or public trust, and no person shall be deprived of any of his rights, privileges, or capacities, or disqualified from the performance of any of his public or private duties, or rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity, in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion; and any part of any judicial proceedings shall have the right to use as a witness, or take the testimony of, any other person not disqualified on account of interest, who may be cognizant of any fact material to the case; and parties to suits may be witnesses, as provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

Bill of Rights

Sec. 7. Religious liberty. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any person be compelled to attend or support any form of worship; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, nor any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. No religious test or property qualification shall be required for any office of public trust, nor for any vote at any election, nor shall any person be incompetent to testify on account of religious belief.

Article 6

Sec. 8. Nonsectarianism. No religious sect or sects shall ever control any part of the common-school or university fund of the state.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Bill of Rights

That the great and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and established, we declare that:

Sec. 1. Rights of life, liberty, worship, pursuit of safety and happiness, free speech, acquiring and protecting property, peaceable assembly, redress of grievances, bearing arms.

* * * * *

Second: The right of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of their consciences.

* * * * *

Sec. 5. Right of religious freedom. No preference shall ever be given by law to any religious sect, society or denomination; nor to any particular creed, mode of worship or system of ecclesiastical polity; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, to contribute to the erection or maintenance of any such place, or to the salary or support of any minister of religion; nor shall any man be compelled to send his child to any school to which he may be conscientiously opposed; and the civil rights, privileges or capacities of no person shall be taken away, or in anywise diminished or enlarged, on account of his belief or disbelief of any religious tenet, dogma or teaching. No human authority shall, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 189. School money not to be used for church, sectarian or denominational school. No portion of any fund or tax now existing, or that may hereafter be raised or levied for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of, any church, sectarian or denominational school.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Article I

Sec. 4. Every person has the natural right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any preference ever be given to, nor any discrimination made against, any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship.

Article IV

Sec. 8. No money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister or teacher thereof, as such, and no preference shall ever be given to, nor any discrimination made against, any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship. No appropriation from the State treasury shall be made for private, charitable or benevolent purposes to any person or community; provided, this shall not apply to the State Asylums for the Insane, and the State Schools for the Deaf and Dumb, and the Blind, and the Charity Hospitals, and public charitable institutions conducted under State authority.

Article XII

Sec. 13. No appropriation of public funds shall be made to any private or sectarian school. The Legislature may enact appropriate legislation to permit institutions of higher learning which receive all or part of their support from the State of Louisiana to engage in interstate and intrastate education agreements with other state governments, agencies of other state governments, institutions of higher learning of other state governments and private institutions of higher learning within or outside state boundaries.

Article XIV

Sec. 15(A)(L). Appointments and promotions, examinations; discrimination. Permanent appointments and promotions in the Classified Civil Service of the State and of cities having a population exceeding two hundred fifty thousand, according to the last preceding decennial census of the United States for which the final report of population returns have been printed, published and distributed by the Director of Census, shall be made only after certification by the appropriate Civil Service Departments pursuant to a general system based upon merit, efficiency, and fitness, under which certificates shall be based on examinations which, so far as practical, shall be competitive, and all employees in the Classified Service shall be competitive, and all employees in the Classified Service shall be employed from those eligible under such certification. No person in the "State" or "City Classified Service," having gained civil service status shall be discriminated against or subjected to any disciplinary action except for cause, and no person in the State or City Classified Service shall be discriminated against or subjected to any disciplinary action for political or religious reasons, and all such persons shall have the right to appeal from such actions.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MAINE AND AMENDMENTS

Article I

Sec. 3. All men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested or restrained in his person, liberty or estate for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, nor for his religious professions or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace, nor obstruct others in their religious worship;—and all persons demeaning themselves peaceably, as good members of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the laws, and no subordination or preference of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law, nor shall any religious test be required as a qualification for any office or trust, under this state; and all religious societies in this state, whether incorporate or unincorporate, shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and contracting with them for their support and maintenance.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MARYLAND DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

Art. 36. That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought by any law to be molested in his person or estate, on account of his religious persuasion, or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent, or maintain, or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain, any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; provided, he believes in the existence of God, and that under His dispensation such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor either in this world or in the world to come.

Art. 37. That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God; nor shall the Legislature prescribe any other oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

Art. 38. That every gift, sale or devise of land to any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or to any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination, or to, or for the support, use or benefit of, or in trust for, any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination; and every gift or sale of goods, or chattels to go in succession, or to take place after the death of the Sellor or Donor, to or for such support, use or benefit of any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any Religious Sect, Order or De-

nomination, without the prior or subsequent sanction of the Legislature, shall be void; except always, any sale, gift, lease or devise of any quantity of land, not exceeding five acres, for a church, meeting-house, or other house of worship, or parsonage, or for a burying ground, which shall be improved, enjoyed or used only for such purpose; or such sale, gift, lease or devise shall be void. Provided, however, that except insofar as the General Assembly shall hereafter by law otherwise enact, the consent of the Legislature shall not be required to any gift, grant, deed or conveyance executed after the 2nd day of November 1948, or to any devise or bequest contained in the will of any person dying after said 2nd day of November 1948, for any of the purposes hereinabove in this Article mentioned.

Art. VIII, sec. 3. School Fund

The School Fund of the State shall be kept inviolate and appropriated only to the purposes of education.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Declaration of rights

Art. II. It is the right as well as the Duty of all men in society, publickly, (sic) and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and the preserver of the Universe. And no Subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, Liberty, or Estate, for worshipping GOD in the manner and season most agreeable to the Dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not Disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious Worship.—

Art. III. (As amended by Art. XI of the Articles of Amendments) [As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a Community, but by the institution of the public Worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the Legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several Towns, Parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own Expence (sic), for the institution of the Public worship of GOD, and for the support and maintenance of public protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made Voluntarily—And the people of this Commonwealth have also a right to, and do, invest their legislature with authority to enjoin upon all the Subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid, at stated times and seasons, if there be any on whose instructions they can Conscientiously and conveniently attend—provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public Teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.—And all monies, paid by the Subject to the Support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on whose instructions he attends; otherwise it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said monies are raised—And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good Subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the Law: And no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.]

Articles of amendment

Art. XI. "Instead of the Third Article of the Bill of Rights, the following Modification and Amendment thereof is substituted.

As the public workship of GOD and instructions in piety, religion and morality, promote the happiness and prosperity of a people and the security of a Republican Government;—Therefore, the several religious societies of this Commonwealth, whether corporate or unincorporate, at any meeting legally warned and holden for that purpose, shall ever have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers, to contract with them for their support, to raise money for erecting and repairing houses for public worship, for the maintenance of religious instruction, and for the payment of necessary expenses: And all persons belonging to any religious society shall be taken and held to be members, until they shall file with the Clerk of such Society, a written notice, declaring the dissolution of their membership, and thenceforth shall not be liable for any grant or contract, which may be thereafter made, or entered into by such society:—And all religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

Art. XLVI. (In place of Article XVIII of the Articles of Amendment of the constitution ratified and adopted May 23, 1855, the following article of amendment, submitted by the constitutional convention was ratified and adopted November 6, 1917.) Article XVIII. Section 1. No law shall be passed prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

Sec. 2. All moneys raised by taxation in the towns and cities for the support of public schools, and all moneys which may be appropriated by the commonwealth for the support of common schools shall be applied to, and expended in, no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is expended; and no grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized by the commonwealth or any political division thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any school or institution of learning, whether under public control or otherwise, wherein any denominational doctrine is inculcated, or any other school, or any college, infirmary, hospital, institution, or educational, charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and superintendence of public officers or public agents authorized by the commonwealth or federal authority or both, except that appropriations may be made for the maintenance and support of the Soldier's Home in Massachusetts and for free public libraries in any city or town, and to carry out legal obligations, if any, already entered into; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society.

Sec. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the commonwealth, or any political division thereof, from paying to privately controlled hospitals, infirmaries, or institutions for the deaf, dumb or blind not more than the ordinary and reasonable compensation for care or support actually rendered or furnished by such hospitals, infirmaries or institutions to such persons as may be in whole or in part unable to support or care for themselves.

Sec. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any inmate of a publicly controlled reformatory, penal or charitable institution of the opportunity of religious exercises therein of his own faith; but no inmate of such institution shall be compelled to attend religious services or receive religious instruction against his will, or, if a minor, without the consent of his parent or guardian.

Sec. 5. This amendment will not take effect until the October first next succeeding its ratification and adoption by the people.

Article XLVIII

Sec. 2. Excluded Matters.—No measure that relates to religion, religious practices or religious institutions; or to the appointment, qualification, tenure, removal, recall or compensation of judges; or to the reversal of a judicial decision; or to the powers, creation or abolition of courts; or the operation of which is restricted to a particular town, city or other political division or to particular districts or localities of the commonwealth; or that makes a specific appropriation of money from the treasury of the commonwealth, shall be proposed by an initiative petition; but if a law approved by the people is not repealed, the general court shall raise by taxation or otherwise and shall appropriate such money as may be necessary to carry such law into effect.

Neither the eighteenth amendment of the constitution, as approved and ratified to take effect on the first day of October in the year nineteen hundred and eighteen, nor this provision for its protection, shall be the subject of an initiative amendment.

No proposition inconsistent with any one of the following rights of the individual, as at present declared in the declaration of rights, shall be the subject of an initiative or referendum petition: The right to receive compensation for private property appropriated to public use; the right of access to and protection in courts of justice; the right of trial by jury; protection from unreasonable search, unreasonable bail and the law martial; freedom of the press; freedom of speech; freedom of elections; and the right of peaceable assembly.

No part of the constitution specifically excluding any matter from the operation of the popular initiative and referendum shall be the subject of an initiative petition; nor shall this section be the subject of such a petition.

The limitations on the legislative power of the general court in the constitution shall extend to the legislative power of the people as exercised hereunder.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Article I

SEC. 2. No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws; nor shall any person be denied the enjoyment of his civil or political rights or be discriminated against in the exercise thereof because of religion, race, color or national origin. The legislature shall implement this section by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 4. Every person shall be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, or, against his consent, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion. No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purpose. The civil and political rights, privileges and capacities of no person shall be diminished or enlarged on account of his religious belief.

Article IX

SEC. 11. There shall be established a state school aid fund which shall be used exclusively for aid to school districts, higher edu-

cation and school employees' retirement systems, as provided by law. One-half of all taxes imposed on retailers on taxable sales at retail tangible personal property, and other tax revenues provided by law, shall be dedicated to this fund. Payments from this fund shall be made in full on a scheduled basis, as provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Article I

SEC. 16. The enumeration of rights in this constitution shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by and inherent in the people. The right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any religious or ecclesiastical ministry, against his consent; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State, nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries.

Sec. 17. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the State. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification of any voter at any election in this State; nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequency of his opinion upon the subject of religion.

Article VIII

Sec. 3. The legislature shall make such provisions, by taxation or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of public schools in each township in the State.

But in no case shall the moneys derived as aforesaid, or any portion thereof, or any public moneys or property, be appropriated or used for the support of schools, wherein the distinctive doctrines, creeds or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect are promulgated or taught.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Article 3

Sec. 18. No religious tests as a qualification for office shall be required; and no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect or mode of worship; but the free enjoyment of all religious sentiments and the different modes of worship shall be held sacred. The rights hereby secured shall not be construed to justify acts of licentiousness injurious to morals or dangerous to the peace and safety of the state, or to exclude the Holy Bible from use in any public school of this state.

Article 8

Sec. 208. No religious or other sect or sects shall ever control any part of the school or other educational funds of this state; nor shall any funds be appropriated toward the support of any sectarian school, or to any school that at the time of receiving such appropriations is not conducted as a free school.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Article I

Sec. 5. Religious freedom—liberty of conscience and belief—limitations.—That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worshop Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person shall, on account of his religious persuasion or belief, be rendered ineligible to any public office of trust or profit in this state, be disqualified from testifying or serving as a juror, or be molested in his person or estate; but this section shall not be construed to excuse acts of licentiousness, nor to justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state, or with the rights of others.

Sec. 6. Practice and support of religion not compulsory—contracts therefor enforcible.—That no person can be compelled to erect, support or attend any place or system of worship, or to maintain or support any priest, minister, preacher or teacher of any sect, church, creed or denomination of religion; but if any person shall voluntarily make a contract for any such object, he shall be held to the performance of the same.

Sec. 7. Public aid for religious purposes—preference and discriminations on religious grounds.—That no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister or teacher thereof, as such; and that no preference shall be given to nor any discrimination made against any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship.

Article IX

Sec. 8. Prohibition of public aid for religious purposes and institutions.—Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any religious creed, church or sectarian purpose, or to help to support or sustain any private or public school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other institution of learning controlled by any religious creed, church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation or personal property or real estate ever be made by the state, or any county, city, town, or other municipal corporation, for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Article III

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed, and no person shall be denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his opinions concerning religion, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, by bigamous or polygamous marriage, or otherwise, or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace, or safety of the state, or opposed to the civil authority thereof, or of the United States. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any ministry, religious sect, or denomination, against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article V

Sec. 35. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denomination or sectarian institution or association.

Article XI

Sec. 8. Neither the legislative assembly, nor any county, city, town, or school district, or other public corporations, shall ever make directly or indirectly any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, or make any grant of lands or other property in aid of any chuch, or for any sectarian purpose, or to aid in the support of any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary, scientific institution, controlled in whole or in part by any church, sect or denomination whatever.

Sec. 9. No religious or partisan test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as teacher or student; nor shall attendance be required at any religious service whatever, nor shall any sectarian tenets be taught in any public educational institution of the state; nor shall any person be debarred admission to any of the collegiate departments of the university on account of sex.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Article I

Sec. 4. All persons have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship against his consent, and no preference shall be given by law to any religious society, nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious beliefs; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths and affirmations. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Article VII

Sec. 11. No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the state accept any grant, conveyance, or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes. Neither the State Legislature nor any county, city or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation from any public fund, or grant any public land in aid of any sectarian or denominational school or college, or any educational institution which is not exclusively owned and controlled by the state or a governmental subdivision thereof. No religious test or qualification shall be required of teacher or student, for admission to or continuance in any public school or educational institution supported in whole or in part by public taxation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of his religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article XI

Sec. 2. The legislature shall provide for a uniform system of common schools, by which a school shall be established and maintained in each school district at least six months in every year, and any school district at least six months in every year, and any school district which shall allow instruction of a sectarian character therein may be deprived of its proportion of the interest of the public school fund during such neglect or infraction, and the legislature may pass such laws as will tend to secure a general attendance of the children in each school district upon said public schools.

Sec. 9. No sectarian instruction shall be imparted or tolerated in any school or university that may be established under the constitution.

Sec. 10. No public funds of any kind or

character whatever, state, county, or municipal, shall be used for sectarian purposes.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Part first

Art. 5th. Every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and reason; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession, sentiments, or persuasion; provided he doth not disturb the public peace or disturb others in their religous worship.

Art. 6th. As morality and piety, rightly grounded on evangelical principles, will give the best and greatest security to government, and will lay, in the hearts of men, the strongest obligation to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society, by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and of public instruction in morality and religion; therefore, to promote these important purposes, the people of this state have a right to empower, and do hereby fully empower, the legislature, to authorize, from time to time, the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, within this state, to make adequate provision, at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality:

Provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their own public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance. And no person, of any one particular religious sect or denomination, shall ever be compelled to pay towards the support of the teacher or teachers of another persuasion, sect, or denomination.

And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves quietly, and as good subjects of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another, shall ever be established by law.

Art. 6th. And nothing herein shall be understood to affect any former contracts made for the support of the ministry; but all such contracts shall remain, and be in the same states as if this constitution had not been made.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Article I

Sec. 3. No person shall be deprived of the inestimable privilege of worshiping Almighty God in a manner agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; nor under any pretence whatever be compelled to attend any place of worship contrary to his faith and judgment; nor shall any person be obliged to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing any church or churches, place or places of worship, or for the maintenance of any minister or ministry, contrary to what he believes to be right or has deliberately and voluntarily engaged to perform.

Sec. 4. There shall be no establishment of one religious sect in preference to another; no religious or racial test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust.

Sec. 5. No person shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil or military right, nor be discriminated against in the exercise of any civil or military right, nor be segregated in the militia or in the public schools, because of religious principles, race, color, ancestry or national origin.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Article II

Sec. 11. Every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no person shall ever be molested or denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his religious opinion or mode of religious worship. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any religious sect or denomination; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article IV

Sec. 31. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, educational or other benevolent purposes to any person, corporation, association, institution or community, not under the absolute control of the state, but the legislature may, in its discretion, make appropriations for the charitable institutions and hospitals, for the maintenance of which annual appropriations were made by legislative assembly of nineteen hundred and nine.

Article XII

Sec. 3. The schools, colleges, universities and other educational institutions provided for by this Constitution shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted to the State by Congress, or any other funds appropriated, levied or collected for educational purposes, shall be used for the support of any sectarian, denominational or private school, college or university.

Sec. 9. No religious test shall ever be required as a condition of admission into the public schools or any educational institution of this State, either as a teacher or student and no teacher or students of such school or institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatsoever.

NEW YORK STATE CONSTITUTION

Article I

Sec. 3. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state to all mankind; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article XI

Sec. 4. Neither the state nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used; directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught, but the legislature may provide for the transportation of children to and from any school or institution of learning.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall be forever guaranteed in this state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinion on matters of religious beliefs; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article VIII

Sec. 147. A high degree of intelligence, patriotism, integrity, and morality on the part of every voter in a government by the people being necessary in order to insure the continuance of that government and the prosperity and happiness of the people, the legislative assembly shall make provision for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of the State of North Dakota and free from sectarian control. This legislative requirement shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of North Dakota.

Sec. 152. All colleges, universities, and other educational institutions, for the support of which lands have been granted to this state, or which are supported by a public tax, shall remain under the absolute and exclusive control of the state. No money raised for the support of the public schools of the state shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school.

Article XVI

Sec. 203. First. Perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF OHIO

Article I

Sec. 7. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any form of worship, against his consent; and no preference shall be given, by law, to any religious society; nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. No religious test shall be required, as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious belief; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths and affirmations. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws, to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Article VI

Sec. 2. The General Assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school trust fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools through and efficient system of common schools throughout the State; but, no religious or other sect, or sects, shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of, any part of the school funds in this State.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Article I

Sec. 2. Religious liberty—Polygamous or plural marriages.—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of the State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; and no religious test shall be required for the exercise of civil or political rights. Polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Sec. 5. Public schools—Separate schools.—Provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all the children of the State and free from sectarian control; and said schools shall always be conducted in English; provided, that nothing herein shall preclude the teaching of other languages in said public schools * * * etc. further, that this shall not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children.

Article II

Sec. 5. Public money or property—Use for sectarian purposes.—No public money or

property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary, or sectarian institution as such.

OREGON

CONSTITUTION OF OREGON

Article I

Sec. 2. Freedom of worship. All men shall be secure in the Natural right, to worship Almighty God according to dictates of their own consciences.—

Sec. 3. Freedom of religious opinion. No law shall in any case whatever control the free exercise, and enjoyment of religeous (sic) opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience.—

Sec. 4. No religious qualification for office. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of trust or profit.

Sec. 5. No money to be appropriated for religion. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any religious (sic), or theological institution, nor shall any money be appropriated for the payment of any religeous (sic) services in either house of the Legislative Assembly.—

Sec. 6. No religious test for witnesses or jurors. No person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness, or juror in consequence of his opinions on matters of religeon (sic); nor be questioned in any Court of Justice touching his religeous (sic) belief to affect the weight of his testimony.—

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Article I

Sec. 3. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship.

Sec. 4. No person who acknowledges the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments shall, on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

Article III

Sec. 17. No appropriation shall be made to any charitable or educational institution not under the absolute control of the Commonwealth, other than normal schools established by law for the professional training of teachers for the public schools of the State except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each House.

Sec. 18. No appropriations shall be made for charitable, educational or benevolent purposes to any person or community nor to any denominational and sectarian institution, corporation, or association: Provided, that appropriations may be made for pensions or gratuities for military service and to blind persons twenty-one years of age and upwards, and for assistance to mothers having dependent children and to aged persons without adequate means of support, and in the form of scholarship grants or loans for higher educational purposes shall be given to persons enrolled in a theological seminary or school of theology.

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Article II, Bill of Rights

Sec. 3. No law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. There shall be complete separation of church and state.

Sec. 5. * * * There shall be a system of free and wholly nonsectarian public education * * *. No public property or public funds shall be used for the support of schools or educational institutions other than those of the state. Nothing contained in this provision shall prevent the state from furnishing to any child noneducational services established by law for the protection or welfare of children.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Article I

Sec. 3. Freedom of religion.—Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; and all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness; and whereas a principal object of our venerable ancestors, in their migration to this country and their settlement of this state, was, as they expressed it, to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civil state may stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concernments; we, therefore, declare that no man shall be compelled to frequent or to support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever, except in fulfillment of his own voluntary contract; nor enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods; nor disqualified from holding any office; nor otherwise suffer on account of his religious belief; and that every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and to profess and by argument to maintain his opinion in matters of religion; and that same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect his civil capacity.

CONSTITUTION OF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Article I

Sec. 4. Religious worship—freedom of speech—petition.—The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government or any department thereof for a redress of grievances.

Article XI

Sec. 9. Property or credit of State shall not benefit sectarian institutions.—The property or credit of the State of South Carolina, or of any county, city, town, township, school district, or other subdivision of the said State, or any public money, from whatever source derived, shall not, by gift, donation, loan, contract, appropriation, or otherwise, be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance of any college, school, hospital, orphan house, or other institution, society or organization, of whatever kind, which is wholly or in part under the direction or control of any church or of any religious or sectarian denomination, society or organization.

Article XVII

Sec. 4. Supreme Being.—No person who denies the existence of a Supreme Being shall hold any office under this Constitution (Note: Cf. Torcaso v. Watkins, (1961) 367 U.S. 488)

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Article VI

Sec. 3. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed. No person shall be denied any civil or political rights privilege or position on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse licentiousness, the invasion of the rights of others, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the state.

No person shall be compelled to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. No money or property of the state shall be given or appropriated for the benefit of any sectarian or religious society or institution.

Article VIII

Sec. 16. No appropriation of lands, money or other property or credits to aid any sectarian school shall ever be made by the state, or any county or municipality within the state, nor shall the state or any county or municipality within the state accept any grant, conveyance, gift or bequest of lands, money or other property to be used for sectarian purposes, and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution aided or supported by the state.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Article I

Sec. 3. Right of worship free.—That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

Sec. 4. No religious or political test.—That no political or religious test, other than an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and of this State, shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this state.

Article IX

Sec. 1. Ineligibility of ministers and priests to seats in legislature—Whereas Ministers of the Gospel are by their profession, dedicated to God and the care of souls, and ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their functions; therefore, no Minister of the Gospel, or priest of any denomination whatever, shall be eligible to a seat in either House of the Legislature.

Sec. 2. No atheist or disbeliever shall hold a civil office.—No person who denies the being of God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, shall hold any office in the civil department of this State.

(Note: Cf. Torcaso v Watkins, (1961) 367 U.S. 488)

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Article I

Sec. 4. There Shall Be No Religious Test for Office.—No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, in this State; nor shall anyone be excluded from holding office on account of his religious sentiments, provided he acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being.

Sec. 5. How Oaths Shall Be Administered.—No person shall be disqualified to give evidence in any of the Courts of this State on account of his religious opinions, or for the want of any religious belief, but all oaths or affirmations shall be administered in the mode most binding upon the conscience, and shall be taken subject to the pains and penalties of perjury.

Sec. 6. Freedom in Religious Worship Guaranteed.—All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No man shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority ought, in any case whatever, to control or interfere with the rights of conscience in matters of religion, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious society or mode of worship. But it shall be the duty of the Legislature to pass such laws as may be necessary to protect equally every religious denomination in

the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship.

Sec. 7. No Appropriation for Sectarian Purposes.—No money shall be appropriated, or drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any sect, or religious society, theological or religious seminary, nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purposes.

Article VII

Sec. 5. Permanent School Fund; Interest; Alienation; Sectarian Schools.—The principal of all bonds and other funds, and the principal arising from the sale of the lands herein before set apart to said school fund, shall be the permanent school fund, and all the interest derivable therefore and the taxes herein authorized and levied shall be the available school fund. The available school fund shall be applied annually to the support of the public free schools. And no law shall ever be enacted appropriating any part of the permanent or available school fund to any other purpose whatever; nor shall the same or any part thereof ever be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school; and the available school fund herein provided shall be distributed to the several counties according to their scholastic population and applied in such manner as may be provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF UTAH

Article I

Sec. 4. The rights of conscience shall never be infringed. The State shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of public trust for any vote at any election; nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror on account of religious belief or the absence thereof. There shall be no union of Church and State, nor shall any church dominate the State or interfere with its functions. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or for the support of any ecclesiastical establishment. No property qualification shall be required of any person to vote, or hold office, except as provided in this Constitution.

Article III

Ordinance

First:—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Fourth:—The Legislature shall make laws for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of the State and be free from sectarian control.

Article X

Sec. 1. The Legislature shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a uniform system of public schools, which shall be open to all children of the State, and be free from sectarian control.

Sec. 12. Neither religious nor partisan tests or qualification shall be required of any person as a condition of admission, as teacher or student, into any public educational institution of the State.

Sec. 13. Neither the Legislature nor any county, city, town, school district or other public corporation, shall make any appropriation to aid in the support of any school, seminary, academy, college, university or other institution, controlled in whole, or in part, by any church, sect or denomination whatever.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VERMONT

Chapter I

Art. 3rd. That all men have a natural and unalienable right, to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences and understandings, as in their opinion shall be regulated by the word of God: and that no man ought to, or of right can be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any minister, contrary to the dictates of his conscience, nor can any man be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments, or peculia(r) mode of religious worship; and that no authority can, or ought to be vested in, or assumed by, any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control the rights of conscience, in the free exercise of religious worship. Nevertheless, every sect or denomination of christians ought to observe the sabbath or Lord's day, and keep up some sort of religious worship, which to them shall seem most agreeable to the revealed will of God.

Chapter II

Sec. 64. Laws for the encouragement of virtue and prevention of vice and immorality, ought to be constantly kept in force, and duly executed; and a competent number of schools ought to be maintained in each town unless the general assembly permits other provisions for the convenient instruction of youth. All religious societies, or bodies of men that may be united or incorporated for the advancement of religion and learning, or for other pious and charitable purposes, shall be encouraged and protected in the enjoyment of the privileges, immunities, and estates, which they in justice ought to enjoy, under such regulations as the General Assembly of this State shall direct.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Article I

Sec. 16. Religious freedom.—That religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forebearance, love and charity toward each other.

Article IV

Sec. 58. Prohibitions on General Assembly as to suspension of writ of habeas corpus, and enactment of laws referring to religion and other laws.— * * * No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry, whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect, their civil capacities. And the General Assembly shall not prescribe any religious test whatever, or confer any peculiar privileges or advantages on any sect or denomination, or pass any law requirinlg or authorizing any religious society, or the people of any district within this State; to levy on themselves, or others, any tax for the erection or repair of any house of public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry; but it shall be left free to every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support such private contract as he shall please.

Article IX

Sec. 141. State appropriations prohibited to schools or institutions of learning not owned or exclusively controlled by the State or some subdivision thereof; exceptions to rule.—No appropriation of public funds shall be made to any school or institution of learning not owned or exclusively controlled by the State or some political subdivision thereof; provided, first, that the General Assembly may, and the governing bodies of the several counties, cities, and town may, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the General Assembly, appropriate funds for educational purposes which may be expended in furtherance of elementary, secondary, collegiate or graduate education of Virginia students in public and nonsectarian private schools and institutions of learning, in addition to those owned or exclusively controlled by the State or any such county, city or town; second, that the General Assembly may appropriate funds to an agency, or to a school or institution of learning owned or controlled by an agency, created and established by two or more States under a joint agreement to which this State is a party for the purpose of providing educational facilities for the citizens of the several States joining in such agreement; third, that counties, cities, towns and districts may make appropriations to nonsectarian schools of manual, industrial or technical training and also to any school or institution of learning owned or exclusively controlled by such county, city, town or school district.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Article I

Sec. 11. Religious Freedom—Absolute freedom of conscience in all matters of religious sentiment, belief and worship, shall be guaranteed to every individual, and no one shall be molested or disturbed in person or property on account of religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment: Provided, however, That this article shall not be so construed as to forbid the employment by the state of a chaplain for such of the state custodial, correctional and mental institutions as in the discretion of the legislature may seem justified. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror, in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned in any court of justice touching his religious belief to affect the weight of his testimony.

Article XXVI

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured and that no inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Article III

Sec. 15. No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever; nor shall any man be enforced, restrained, molested or burthened, in his body or goods or otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief, but all men shall be free to profess, and, by argument, to maintain their opinions in matters of religion; and the same shall, in no wise, affect, diminish or enlarge their civil capacities; and the legislature shall not prescribe any religious test whatever, or confer any peculiar privileges or advantages on any sect or denomination, or pass any law requiring or authorizing any religious society, or the people of any district within this State, to levy on themselves, or others, any tax for the erection or repair of any house for public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry, but it shall be left free for every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support such private contract as he shall please.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Article I

Sec. 18. The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; nor shall any control of, or interference with, the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship; nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies or religious or theological seminaries.

Sec. 19. No religious tests shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion.

Article X

Sec. 3. The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable; and such schools shall be free and without charge for tuition to all children between the ages of four and twenty years; and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Article I

Sec. 18. Religious liberty. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall be forever guaranteed in this state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to hold any office of trust or profit, or to serve as a witness or juror, because of his opinion on any matter of religious belief whatever; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the state.

Sec. 19. Appropriations for religion prohibited. No money of the state shall ever be given or appropriated to any sectarian or religious society or institution.

Article III

Sec. 36. Prohibited appropriations. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denomination or sectarian institution or association.

Article VII

Sec. 12. Sectarianism prohibited. No sectarian instruction, qualifications or tests shall be imparted, exacted, applied or in any manner tolerated in the schools of any grade or character controlled by the state, nor shall attendance be required at any religious service therein, nor shall any sectarian tenets or doctrines be taught or favored in any public school or institution that may be established under this constitution.

VETERANS' VIEWS ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in January 1966 and again in January of this year I directed that a survey be made of veterans discharged from general hospitals operated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. The purpose of this survey was to obtain a further insight into the quality of medical care provided in VA hospitals and from the point of view of the veteran who received such care. The committee is gratified to learn, through these two surveys, that almost 98 percent of the veterans indicated that in general they received good hospital care. The questionnaire was received by 21,462 veterans and 7,425 of those responded when the survey was ended on March 13. Each of the general hospitals was instructed to distribute the questionnaire to the first 200 patients discharged during the period and to have the patient complete the questionnaire and mail it after leaving the hospital. The complete survey is printed as House Committee Print 64. A summary of the survey is shown by the tables which follow:

Summary of 1967 survey, overall and by each VA general hospital

[Asterisk (*) denotes favorable response]

Question	Total responses	Number of respondents		Percent yes or no	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1. (a) Have you ever been a patient in a VA hospital before?	6,966	5,171	1,795	74.2	25.8
(b) If "Yes," in this hospital?	4,990	4,108	882	82.3	17.7
2. Did the admitting doctor interview you in a friendly and understanding manner?	7,206	*6,959	247	*96.6	3.4
3. About your room—					
(a) Was it attractive?	6,929	*6,614	315	*95.5	4.5
(b) Was it clean when you arrived?	7,211	*7,088	123	*98.3	1.7
(c) Was it ventilated?	7,152	*6,689	463	*93.5	6.5
(d) Was it well lighted?	7,194	*7,081	113	*98.4	1.6
(e) Was your bed comfortable?	7,204	*6,998	206	*97.1	2.9
4. About your comfort—					
(a) Were you annoyed by noises?	6,800	922	*5,878	13.6	*86.4
If "Yes," was this due to—					
(1) Visitors?		273			
(2) Roommate?		544			
(3) Equipment?		401			
(4) Hospital personnel?		472			
(5) Radio or TV sets?		459			
(b) Were you annoyed by so-called hospital odors?	7,226	286	*6,940	4.0	*96.0
(c) Were you awakened too early in the morning?	7,176	840	*6,336	11.7	*88.3
(d) Were Were hospital routines arranged so you could generally get sufficient rest?	7,198	*6,557	641	*91.1	8.9
(e) Were there other patients in your room?	6,995	6,288	707	89.9	10.1
(1) If "Yes," did they disturb you?	6,288	453	*5,835	7.2	*92.8
5. About your visitors—					
(a) Were you satisfied with visiting hours?	7,222	*7,088	134	*98.1	1.9
(b) Did your visitors receive courteous treatment from hospital personnel?	7,144	*6,960	154	*97.8	2.2
6. Were hospital rules and schedules adequately explained to you	7,260	*6,860	400	*94.5	5.5
7. Were tests and treatments explained to you so that you understood what was happening?	7,218	*6,541	677	*90.6	9.4
8. Before being discharged, were you instructed how to care for yourself at home?	7,241	*6,538	703	*90.3	9.7
9. Do you feel the nurses were—					
(a) Skilled in giving you personal care?	7,235	*7,133	102	*98.6	1.4
(b) Interested in you as a person?	6,847	*6,477	370	*94.5	5.4
(c) Prompt in doing things for you?	6,935	*6,626	309	*95.5	4.5
10. Did you have as much nursing care as needed?	7,234	*7,019	215	*97.0	3.0
11. Did the following give you friendly efficient service—					
(a) Doctors?	7,231	*6,974	257	*96.4	3.6
(b) Dentists?	6,123	*5,794	329	*94.6	5.4
(c) Technicians who drew blood?	7,135	*7,063	72	*99.0	1.0
(d) Technicians who took X-rays?	7,112	*7,020	92	*98.7	1.3
(e) Nursing attendants?	7,115	*6,938	177	*97.5	2.5
12. Housekeeping:					
(a) Was room cleaned daily?	7,285	*7,043	242	*96.7	3.3
(b) Were cleaning persons considerate of you?	7,214	*7,085	129	*98.2	1.8
(c) Was a good cleaning job done?	7,180	*6,849	331	*96.5	4.6
13. In regard to food and considering whether or not you were on special diet—					
(a) Were the servings adequate?	7,219	*6,964	255	*96.5	3.5
(b) Was the hot portion of the meal served hot?	7,102	*6,428	674	*90.5	9.5
(c) Were the meals attractively served?	7,193	*6,943	250	*96.5	3.5
(d) Did you like the coffee?	6,747	*5,939	808	*88.0	12.0
14. In general, do you feel you had good hospital care?	7,172	*7,007	165	*97.7	2.3
15. Did you receive surgery?	7,207	3,091	4,116	42.9	57.1

Veterans' views on medical care in VA hospitals

Total answers to all questions:
- Number of favorable answers — 222,495
- Number of unfavorable answers — 11,473
- Percent favorable answers — 95.1

Physician care questions 2, 7, 8, 11(*a*):
- Number of favorable answers — 27,012
- Number of unfavorable answers — 1,884
- Percent favorable answers — 93.5

Nursing care questions 9(*a*) to 9(*c*), 10:
- Number of favorable answers — 27,255
- Number of unfavorable answers — 996
- Percent favorable answers — 96.5

Dietetic service questions 13(*a*) to 13(*d*):
- Number of favorable answers — 26,274
- Number of unfavorable answers — 1,987
- Percent favorable answers — 93.0

Housekeeping questions 3(*a*) to 3(*e*), 12(*a*) to 12(*c*), 4(*b*):
- Number of favorable answers — 62,387
- Number of unfavorable answers — 2,208
- Percent favorable answers — 96.6

General hospital management questions 4(*a*), 4(*c*), 4(*d*), 4(*e*)(1), 5(*a*), (5*b*), 6, and 14:
- Number of favorable answers — 52,752
- Number of unfavorable answers — 3,728
- Percent favorable answers — 93.4

Percent of favorable responses to VA hospital care received by combination groups, comparison between 1966 and 1967 surveys

General hospitals	All questions		Physician care		Nursing care		Dietetics		Housekeeping		Hospital management		General attitude	
	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966
Total	95.1	95.0	93.5	92.9	96.5	96.3	92.0	93.4	96.6	96.5	93.4	93.5	97.7	97.6
Albany, N.Y.	91.5	94.3	87.5	89.4	91.8	96.8	86.9	89.9	94.5	96.2	89.1	94.2	93.8	98.2
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	95.2	95.8	94.6	93.5	98.2	98.5	93.0	94.2	96.9	97.4	92.2	94.1	98.8	98.5
Alexandria, La.	97.5	96.6	98.8	94.4	98.4	97.3	92.3	91.7	99.1	99.4	96.3	96.0	100.0	100.0
Altoona, Pa.	94.7	92.6	94.9	90.4	96.0	96.2	93.5	84.6	95.7	94.3	92.4	92.6	97.7	91.2
Amarillo, Tex.	93.8	92.9	89.8	89.7	95.7	91.4	92.7	89.7	96.2	95.5	90.1	90.9	92.9	93.3
Ann Arbor, Mich.	94.8	94.4	96.1	94.9	96.9	95.2	93.5	92.3	95.0	94.7	91.4	92.8	96.8	100.0
Atlanta, Ga.	96.9	96.7	97.6	97.6	98.4	97.6	97.2	96.7	97.2	95.9	93.9	95.4	98.4	100.0
Augusta, Ga.	93.4	97.5	89.6	97.7	97.3	96.6	96.6	95.3	94.7	99.0	89.3	96.0	89.7	100.0
Baltimore, Md.	95.6	(1)	93.8	(1)	98.9	(1)	92.0	(1)	97.7	(1)	94.1	(1)	97.7	(1)
Batavia, N.Y.	96.8	95.1	100.0	93.2	99.2	97.4	88.7	90.4	97.9	97.4	97.1	92.6	100.0	100.0
Bath, N.Y.	96.9	95.0	97.3	95.7	100.0	97.1	91.5	90.8	97.2	95.8	96.1	93.4	100.0	100.0
Bay Pines, Fla.	94.4	92.4	93.9	87.0	94.8	94.7	94.4	93.1	94.5	93.6	92.8	90.1	97.3	100.0
Beckley, W.Va.	96.2	96.7	90.9	89.3	96.6	98.5	97.7	100.0	96.9	98.8	96.5	96.6	95.5	91.9
Big Spring, Tex.	95.5	91.4	85.3	79.7	94.5	91.0	95.7	95.1	99.0	95.1	96.3	89.1	95.2	84.8
Biloxi, Miss.	93.1	96.7	91.3	95.9	90.7	97.1	88.5	95.9	96.8	99.2	90.4	93.9	97.4	97.7
Birmingham, Ala.	95.0	94.3	95.9	94.7	94.4	94.7	95.7	92.6	96.7	94.0	91.2	93.0	97.9	96.0
Boise, Idaho	97.2	98.0	95.9	97.6	98.7	99.4	95.8	96.9	99.0	99.2	94.6	96.2	100.0	98.8
Bonham, Tex.	98.7	99.2	99.3	99.4	100.0	100.0	97.2	98.7	99.7	99.7	96.7	98.3	100.0	100.0
Boston, Mass.	95.0	96.0	97.2	96.0	97.1	95.3	89.4	94.6	94.9	98.4	94.3	93.1	98.3	100.0
Bronx, N.Y.	90.8	93.0	88.1	94.3	95.1	95.8	85.0	85.5	91.1	95.3	90.5	91.7	96.3	98.3
Brooklyn, N.Y.	94.1	93.1	93.4	88.4	96.1	94.9	85.3	87.6	97.3	97.0	92.3	91.4	100.0	97.2
Buffalo, N.Y.	93.1	92.3	88.5	89.7	92.3	93.5	92.1	90.8	94.9	93.2	92.3	90.3	96.2	96.1
Butler, Pa.	94.7	97.0	91.0	96.3	95.4	97.8	95.5	93.2	96.4	98.4	92.7	96.0	100.0	97.1
Castle Point, N.Y.	95.3	97.9	96.8	96.7	97.6	99.2	91.9	96.8	97.5	99.6	91.5	95.6	100.0	100.0
Charleston, SC.	97.3	(2)	96.0	(2)	98.7	(2)	94.3	(2)	99.0	(2)	96.1	(2)	100.0	(2)
Cheyenne, Wyo.	96.8	97.9	91.0	94.4	99.5	99.5	93.7	97.8	99.3	99.8	95.6	96.1	100.0	100.0
Chicago, Ill. (West Side)	94.0	95.2	92.2	92.9	95.9	96.6	90.5	93.4	94.1	98.9	93.9	90.7	98.4	96.5
Chicago, Ill. (research)	94.3	96.9	94.2	96.4	94.8	98.8	91.2	95.3	94.5	98.2	93.8	95.1	98.1	100.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	96.4	93.4	97.0	88.9	94.7	93.8	94.2	91.0	98.4	96.6	93.3	91.2	100.0	95.3
Clarksburg, W. Va.	97.3	94.2	96.8	93.9	98.9	93.3	96.3	93.4	98.9	96.7	94.5	91.9	100.0	93.3
Cleveland, Ohio	93.8	95.8	92.6	95.5	90.8	97.7	89.9	94.1	95.7	98.0	93.7	93.4	97.1	97.8
Columbia, S.C.	94.4	94.3	88.5	91.7	95.3	94.4	96.3	95.3	95.7	96.3	92.8	91.6	98.0	93.3
Coral Gables, Fla.	(2)	91.8	(2)	89.5	(2)	92.1	(2)	93.3	(2)	92.3	(2)	89.0	(2)	97.5
Dallas, Tex.	95.0	94.6	94.5	92.6	96.8	96.3	94.0	96.7	95.8	93.6	93.3	93.9	96.9	97.8
Dayton, Ohio	93.7	88.7	91.5	85.0	95.5	87.5	91.1	90.5	97.5	89.3	89.1	87.5	94.3	94.4
Dearborn, Mich.	78.7	91.4	81.2	88.2	78.8	92.7	80.5	91.1	72.0	91.5	79.6	89.9	82.9	92.2
Denver, Colo.	93.4	94.0	93.8	92.2	93.8	94.0	89.9	94.4	95.8	94.6	92.1	94.2	94.0	97.6
Des Moines, Iowa	96.1	97.6	93.1	96.0	98.6	98.1	96.1	97.4	98.8	98.9	92.8	96.4	98.6	100.0
Dublin, Ga.	96.8	97.7	94.3	94.8	99.0	99.0	95.9	97.1	98.7	99.8	95.7	96.5	98.8	100.0
Durham, N.C.	95.0	94.9	96.7	91.0	95.9	96.6	91.6	92.5	97.1	98.1	91.5	93.1	98.6	95.6
East Orange, N.J.	93.9	94.7	91.3	93.6	95.7	96.3	85.2	90.8	96.4	97.4	93.0	92.1	93.5	98.1
Erie, Pa.	97.7	96.1	98.3	94.3	100.0	97.5	98.2	94.9	98.4	97.3	94.1	94.1	100.0	97.9
Fargo, N. Dak.	97.0	96.9	93.0	94.1	98.5	97.3	97.4	97.9	98.6	98.4	95.4	95.4	100.0	100.0
Fayetteville, Ark.	97.2	96.4	93.0	94.1	97.8	96.8	98.6	94.4	98.7	98.5	96.2	95.2	97.9	97.5
Fayetteville, N.C.	96.4	95.9	91.7	95.2	99.1	98.0	96.3	93.5	97.9	97.9	94.8	93.9	96.7	98.7
Fort Harrison, Mont.	96.2	94.7	92.6	91.3	97.1	95.0	92.4	90.8	98.2	97.7	95.3	93.0	97.7	98.2
Fort Howard, Md.	96.9	96.6	95.8	94.5	99.1	99.2	95.7	95.9	97.3	97.5	95.7	96.0	93.3	100.0
Fort Wayne, Ind.	96.4	97.1	96.4	95.7	96.3	98.9	93.0	98.9	97.7	99.0	95.7	93.5	98.6	100.0
Fresno, Calif.	96.8	96.4	98.5	96.1	99.2	97.9	94.4	95.1	97.2	97.9	94.7	94.8	100.0	98.8
Grand Island, Nebr.	97.6	97.5	98.8	94.7	97.5	99.3	96.6	96.4	98.0	98.8	96.7	96.5	100.0	98.6
Grand Junction, Colo.	94.6	96.3	93.9	94.4	96.5	96.2	91.2	95.7	94.9	97.7	93.4	95.5	97.8	96.3
Hines, Ill.	87.6	89.4	85.9	87.0	87.2	87.9	85.8	87.4	89.1	91.3	85.9	89.0	87.1	90.4
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	98.8	97.2	97.5	96.5	100.0	98.2	97.4	94.7	99.4	100.0	98.1	94.2	100.0	100.0
Houston, Tex.	9.03	94.6	83.9	92.0	89.8	94.1	89.1	91.8	95.4	97.8	87.5	92.9	91.0	94.7
Huntington, W. Va.	93.4	92.8	86.9	91.8	96.1	95.1	92.1	92.5	96.8	95.9	90.9	86.9	93.5	87.5
Indianapolis, Ind.	95.9	92.1	94.7	86.4	97.9	94.7	93.6	92.5	97.1	94.6	94.2	89.8	98.4	98.0
Iowa City, Iowa	95.8	96.6	92.7	96.5	97.2	98.7	94.6	95.5	98.2	97.2	93.3	95.5	98.7	100.0
Iron Mountain, Mich.	96.3	96.7	95.6	95.5	97.4	98.2	94.4	96.7	96.9	97.8	94.8	95.1	98.6	100.0
Jackson, Miss.	95.4	96.3	93.1	94.7	98.4	97.3	92.0	93.3	97.8	98.8	93.7	94.7	100.0	96.5
Kansas City, Mo.	92.0	94.5	88.5	92.6	89.9	94.9	92.8	91.2	94.1	96.1	90.7	93.7	93.7	98.6
Kecoughtan, Va.	96.8	94.6	96.7	92.9	98.2	95.2	97.2	93.9	96.5	94.1	95.7	94.0	97.8	97.7
Kerrville, Tex.	96.3	94.8	93.9	93.2	96.6	97.8	95.4	94.1	98.5	94.6	94.2	94.6	97.6	98.6
Lake City, Fla.	95.6	97.6	94.9	95.3	96.5	99.0	91.7	96.1	98.0	98.6	93.8	97.1	97.3	100.0
Lincoln, Nebr.	97.0	96.2	95.8	92.9	98.9	99.3	95.1	98.3	97.9	96.4	95.5	93.9	100.0	100.0
Little Rock, Ark.	96.2	96.5	93.8	93.6	98.8	98.9	95.3	96.0	97.7	98.1	93.6	94.8	96.9	100.0
Livermore, Calif.	96.1	94.6	95.7	95.2	100.0	96.9	92.3	89.1	96.1	95.6	94.6	94.1	98.5	98.8
Long Beach, Calif.	92.6	92.6	91.8	89.7	94.0	95.9	88.4	89.5	92.2	92.8	92.6	92.7	98.1	98.0
Los Angeles, Calif.	92.6	81.2	92.1	85.2	93.8	90.8	86.4	71.6	95.6	84.0	90.3	78.3	100.0	92.3
Louisville, Ky.	95.7	96.4	93.8	96.4	96.2	97.1	96.3	95.4	97.7	98.4	92.8	94.2	98.7	96.7
Madison, Wis.	96.2	96.5	94.8	96.3	97.5	97.4	93.8	95.3	97.7	97.4	95.3	94.9	98.9	99.0
Manchester, N.H.	96.8	96.8	97.3	99.2	98.6	96.8	93.6	93.6	92.2	97.9	94.7	95.2	100.0	98.4
Marion, Ill.	97.1	95.1	95.9	91.1	98.9	99.9	97.3	93.1	97.5	95.2	96.0	94.6	98.5	95.8
Marlin, Tex.	97.3	97.2	95.8	92.8	96.5	98.8	97.7	98.0	99.1	98.9	95.1	95.3	98.5	98.9
Martinez, Calif.	96.3	94.9	94.1	96.2	97.8	96.2	91.9	88.0	97.7	97.0	96.7	93.1	99.0	98.6
Martinsburg, W.Va.	95.9	97.0	92.8	92.1	100.0	98.8	96.6	97.2	98.1	99.3	92.8	95.8	98.1	100.0
Memphis, Tenn.	97.0	96.4	97.3	93.3	98.4	98.0	95.6	97.9	96.9	97.1	95.8	94.8	100.0	98.4
Miles, Mont.	97.9	98.2	99.4	98.8	100.0	100.0	95.9	97.7	98.0	97.4	96.0	98.8	100.0	100.0
Minneapolis, Minn.	95.0	95.3	91.6	94.3	99.1	95.9	95.9	96.5	96.9	97.6	91.5	91.0	97.5	98.7
Montgomery, Ala.	96.1	96.6	94.0	96.7	95.8	97.2	95.0	95.0	98.6	98.2	94.0	94.3	97.4	100.0
Mountain Home, Tenn.	94.4	95.7	89.5	91.1	95.2	95.5	96.9	97.6	97.1	98.5	92.9	92.7	94.9	96.2
Muskogee, Okla.	92.9	93.8	81.7	86.5	94.8	96.3	88.1	88.3	97.1	95.6	92.7	96.1	94.4	94.7
Nashville, Tenn.	96.7	95.3	96.2	92.3	98.2	95.4	94.3	95.1	97.1	96.6	95.6	94.4	98.6	98.6
Newington, Conn.	93.4	93.4	98.3	94.8	96.5	95.3	86.2	89.9	94.0	95.0	89.7	90.4	100.0	97.4
New Orleans, La.	93.2	92.6	92.8	88.0	93.2	95.0	88.6	90.9	95.2	93.6	91.2	91.1	93.2	97.8
New York, N.Y.	(3)	87.2	(3)	85.6	(3)	89.9	(3)	83.1	(3)	87.7	(3)	86.2	(3)	93.0
Oklahoma City, Okla.	94.1	95.2	93.1	92.6	94.2	97.3	92.3	92.5	95.8	96.7	91.9	93.7	96.3	97.3
Omaha, Nebr.	95.6	95.9	94.1	92.0	96.6	97.0	95.8	95.2	97.3	98.3	93.0	93.4	97.2	97.4
Oteen, N.C.	95.3	95.4	96.0	93.0	97.6	98.3	93.8	93.5	95.8	97.0	93.6	93.9	98.6	99.0
Palo Alto, Calif.	92.4	94.0	90.1	94.8	96.1	97.5	89.7	91.4	93.9	95.0	90.9	90.6	97.6	98.6
Philadelphia, Pa.	97.0	96.0	96.7	94.2	98.5	93.8	93.4	96.5	97.5	98.1	96.8	94.9	100.0	100.0
Phoenix, Ariz.	91.8	85.8	89.5	87.4	92.8	91.3	85.3	73.8	94.0	85.3	90.6	85.2	97.8	90.7
Pittsburgh, Pa.	93.9	94.3	92.5	90.5	93.2	92.3	87.3	93.5	96.1	95.1	93.4	94.9	96.3	94.9
Poplar Bluff, Mo.	95.7	95.6	89.9	86.3	97.5	96.4	96.2	97.6	96.9	98.6	95.3	95.3	97.3	94.9
Portland, Oreg.	95.6	94.3	93.0	91.5	95.7	96.9	91.9	91.2	97.3	96.3	95.1	92.5	100.0	98.2
Providence, R.I.	95.3	94.2	92.5	91.8	98.0	93.8	90.6	91.1	97.2	95.9	94.3	94.0	98.7	97.5
Reno, Nev.	95.8	97.7	96.3	92.0	98.8	100.0	95.0	95.6	97.5	99.4	91.5	97.8	100.0	100.0
Richmond, Va.	94.1	93.7	93.6	96.2	93.9	91.7	89.2	89.5	97.3	94.1	91.9	93.2	95.3	97.4
Saginaw, Mich.	96.8	96.8	94.6	92.0	97.8	97.9	97.3	99.0	98.6	98.4	94.8	95.4	97.9	98.0
Salt Lake City, Utah	93.0	95.9	90.4	92.2	96.4	97.4	88.7	93.4	94.1	97.5	92.0	95.4	96.9	99.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Percent of favorable responses to VA hospital care received by combination groups, comparison between 1966 and 1967 surveys—Continued

General hospitals	All questions		Physician care		Nursing care		Dietetics		Housekeeping		Hospital management		General attitude	
	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966
San Fernando, Calif.	95.9	94.2	94.3	91.7	97.8	97.3	95.3	90.4	98.0	97.5	92.8	90.9	100.0	97.7
San Francisco, Calif.	89.1	94.0	88.0	96.2	90.2	96.6	89.6	92.3	87.5	93.6	88.5	91.8	97.4	96.6
San Juan, P.R.	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Seattle, Wash.	95.8	93.6	96.4	90.2	96.4	92.8	90.2	87.7	98.4	97.3	94.4	92.6	100.0	97.5
Shreveport, La.	95.9	93.1	93.5	87.4	97.6	93.3	96.4	94.7	96.3	96.0	94.1	91.2	97.6	97.1
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	96.2	96.8	90.5	94.0	98.0	99.1	97.7	96.1	97.3	98.6	95.8	94.5	98.7	100.0
Spokane, Wash.	95.3	95.3	97.2	90.5	95.7	97.8	95.3	93.4	96.3	96.8	92.2	94.4	97.1	96.7
St. Louis, Mo.	93.3	91.6	89.9	89.5	94.3	91.5	93.1	90.9	94.5	93.5	91.7	89.8	96.3	98.7
Syracuse, N.Y.	94.2	93.3	93.3	92.7	96.6	95.8	91.4	89.8	96.4	93.0	92.3	93.8	97.3	97.8
Temple, Tex.	93.2	96.7	94.1	93.9	96.3	97.2	88.9	94.8	93.0	98.9	92.0	96.1	96.3	98.4
Tucson, Ariz.	95.1	95.7	96.2	95.8	94.5	97.3	94.2	90.7	94.7	96.6	94.3	94.7	98.4	100.0
Vancouver, Wash.	95.8	95.3	96.5	93.8	99.7	97.5	93.2	95.5	96.5	94.6	92.7	94.4	99.0	100.0
Wadsworth, Kans.	95.7	97.2	92.2	97.0	97.9	100.0	94.2	96.2	98.1	97.3	93.5	95.1	95.7	100.0
Walla Walla, Wash.	96.9	95.5	91.1	87.7	98.2	97.9	98.2	95.1	99.2	97.2	94.3	96.2	92.3	97.2
Washington, D.C.	96.6	92.2	96.9	92.2	97.6	92.4	92.3	93.2	98.9	92.7	94.5	90.1	100.0	93.4
West Haven, Conn.	93.8	93.4	94.7	93.7	95.1	92.5	89.8	89.4	96.5	96.7	89.7	90.9	100.0	97.9
West Roxbury, Mass.	93.9	92.5	96.8	94.4	96.6	94.6	84.4	90.2	96.1	93.0	91.6	89.6	97.7	93.7
Whipple, Ariz.	97.1	95.0	95.3	91.5	96.3	97.0	98.4	96.5	98.1	95.4	95.7	93.5	97.9	98.2
White River Junction, Vt.	96.5	96.7	97.0	95.5	97.5	99.4	95.8	94.0	96.2	97.7	95.1	95.9	100.0	98.8
Wichita, Kans.	92.7	94.2	91.4	95.6	94.5	95.5	88.9	89.7	93.9	95.6	90.7	93.4	100.0	98.9
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	96.6	95.8	96.1	94.2	96.7	96.3	95.9	94.1	97.0	97.1	95.5	95.2	98.5	97.5
Wilmington, Del.	95.4	96.7	93.0	95.2	96.8	96.7	93.0	95.0	97.4	97.3	94.1	96.7	98.6	98.4
Wood, Wis.	95.9	92.4	96.2	87.1	97.7	94.1	90.3	91.5	98.0	94.5	94.1	89.9	100.0	96.2

[1] Did not report. A tuberculosis hospital in January 1966.
[2] Not open in January 1966.
[3] Number of veterans responding are too few for a valid percent.

OUR CURRENT TAX POLICIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to my colleagues in the Congress the remarks made by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Tax Institute of New England, concerning current developments in tax policy. The text of the remarks are as follows:

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TAX POLICY

(Remarks by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Tax Institute of New England, John Hancock Hall, Boston, Mass., April 29, 1967)

The topic of Current Developments in Tax Policy is best approached by placing present tax policies in the broader perspective of recent history and future prospects. In this way we can see how our current tax policies fit into a longer range program and a way of thinking about the uses of tax policy. For it is the attitude regarding the uses of tax policy that marks the main theme of tax policy in the present and preceding Administrations.

The main economic goal of these two Administrations has been the high level utilization of our real resources within a framework of reasonable price stability—that is, to achieve a growth in real Gross National Product that matches our potential, with unemployment pushed to as low a level as we can through appropriate fiscal and monetary policies, supplemented by special training and related programs. Also, it has been an important aim to maintain an appropriate balance of payments position, so that accomplishment of our domestic objectives will not be hindered by international financial concerns.

The *consistent* theme of tax policy through seven years has been to use tax policy in an affirmative manner to achieve this economic goal. It will be the consistent theme in the years ahead. The manner in which tax policy is so used—the substantive programs which reflect this use—has changed and necessarily will constantly change, as the economic conditions in which the goal is being pursued themselves change. For the goal is never won forever—there is no permanent trophy to be carried home for success in one year or three years. Instead, the coming of each New Year relentlessly challenges us to seek continued advancement toward our goal. We are involved in a perpetual obstacle race, with new obstacles constantly being introduced and old obstacles rearranged to appear different. Insights once obtained must constantly be re-examined and new insights sought if we are successfully to negotiate each new set of obstacles.

In the first years of this decade the main obstacles to be overcome were a growth rate lagging far behind our potential, a discouraging pattern of recessions followed by recoveries that quickly faltered into new recessions, and a consequent high unemployment rate. Tax policy in this setting was aimed at spurring investment, thereby generating a higher productive capacity and more jobs. The substantive tax program involved the adoption of an investment credit to correct a tax structure imbalance that appeared to hamper our obtaining the needed investment level. This credit was supplemented by administrative measures removing restrictive factors in the application of tax depreciation rules.

These 1962 measures were then followed by the massive tax reduction of the 1964 Act, designed to produce a strong consumer demand and the markets needed to encourage our producers to push their investment plans. The reduction in tax rates also acted to improve incentives to invest by strengthening the rate of return and cash flows.

This 1964 tax reduction was the first to recognize the power of our tax structure to generate such a strong revenue intake in periods of rising economic activity that the intake soon exerted a drag on that very activity and made continuous forward progress impossible. The 1964 tax reduction also freed us from the shackles of a rigid budget balance posture and enabled fiscal policy to provide a response that would reflect economic conditions rather than mathematically suit a figure resulting from the additions of many disparate items of expenditure and receipt in our budget. The need to strengthen consumer demand was again reflected in 1965 in the Excise Tax Act of that year, in which that need became the opportunity for a major reform of a crazy-quilt excise tax structure.

These programs met with success—a strong business expansion, rising incomes and profits, a falling unemployment rate, a GNP capable of sustaining broad social programs. But then in the latter part of 1965 the obstacles changed—the demands of the Vietnam conflict showed us once again that no economic forecasting is safe against the intrusion of external events we cannot control. A high pace of Government military expenditures demanded that a policy of fiscal stimulus be switched to a program of fiscal restraint, but without clear signs to chart the size or timing of that restraint.

Tax policy was therefore shifted from stimulus to restraint, which called for increasing revenue collections to dampen an inflationary potential. This need became the opportunity to achieve desirable improvements in our current collection procedures. The substantive programs of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 reflected this dual target—graduated withholding, a speed-up in the transition to current payment by corporations, and current payment of the self-employment Social Security tax. This was accompanied by administrative programs in both 1966 and this year speeding up the deposit of withheld taxes and excise taxes. And there is still room for further improvement, as reflected in the President's current recommendations regarding the corporate estimated tax.

As the year 1966 progressed, with a high level of economic activity insured through strong private investment, strong consumer demand and rising Governmental military expenditures, fiscal policy had to cope with emerging price instability and serious imbalances in the business expansion. Moreover, the tasks of fiscal policy were conjoined by the difficulties being experienced in charting the proper course for monetary policy. These obstacles culminated in September, 1966, in a threatening financial situation, as interest rates rose alarmingly, the money supply contracted, and business investment still proceeded at an unsustainable level.

Suspension of the investment credit was the tax policy response chosen, and another step in tax flexibility was taken. But it was taken with an awareness that the particular step was not without the problems of the two transitions in the step involved—the transition from allowance of the credit to suspension and the transition from suspension to restoration. This step was therefore accompanied by a frank recognition that only the usual events of last September—a serious financial situation, an unsustainable business investment boom, and wartime expenditures—would call for this particular response of tax flexibility. It was accompanied by strong expenditure tightening.

The immediate goals sought were obtained—the financial tension subsided, the investment pace began to be more manageable, and monetary policy could begin to ease and adjust the imbalances, as in housing, that had accompanied its tightening.

We thus come to the year 1967 and a new set of obstacles, even more challenging. The imbalances of 1966 are giving way to an economic advance that will show a more even front, as business investment moderates its prior pace and housing starts to catch up. This moderation in business investment signaled the end of the need for the suspension of the investment credit, perhaps a bit earlier than had been foreseen. The President accordingly recommended restoration of the credit, with this step thus completing the application of tax flexibility initiated last September. The differing views on the terms of the restoration underscore the belief expressed last year that only that combination of unique circumstances would call for this form of tax flexibility.

The economic radars that scanned the horizon in January forecast for the immediate months a pause in the economy, as the components of the advancing economic front regrouped and balanced their relationships. An important factor in this pause has been the downward adjustment in inventory accumulation. Other factors are the moderation in the growth in plant and equipment investment and the low level of housing activity which reflected the past period of tight money. Those radars that scanned further ahead forecast that the economic front would later gather momentum from a variety of sources—increased Social Security expenditures, the pace of Government expenditures, resumed strength in housing, the end of the inventory adjustment, and a pick-up in consumer spending. In the absence of tax action, the Federal budget would move more strongly into deficit and fiscal policy would become highly stimulative. Instability in the form of inflationary pressures would again threaten. It would be desirable to meet that obstacle through tax policy rather than through a resumption of monetary tightening lest we become locked into a level of high interest rates.

This forecast in January thus called for over-all tax restraint, in contrast to the specialized restraint in the business sector that was needed last September. The hearings and discussions of last year on the techniques of tax flexibility, notably before the Fiscal Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee—hearings that had been urged by the Administration—indicated that the most appropriate application of tax flexibility for this purpose was a surcharge of individual and corporate income tax liabilities. The President in January recommended this course. For Budget and revenue estimating purposes a precise starting date was needed and July 1 was chosen. But tax flexibility and rational economic policy obviously do not always demand rigid adherence to dates based on prior economic forecasts. The task is to match policy as closely as possible to current forecasts as these forecasts sharpen and change—not to rigidly match action to a previously set timetable that was itself only a forecast based on earlier and therefore less reliable data.

The economic radars still indicate that in the months ahead the predicted momentum will gather. While the radars are still not equipped to pinpoint the exact month of change, this summer is still the governing forecast. The important point, however, is to recognize that as forecasts sharpen and more clearly foretell the change, we should not be misled by looking backwards or even around us at the figures that reflect the pause we are now moving through. Instead, we must concentrate on what is forecast for the period ahead. We must be willing to act on what that forecast implies, not because it is infallible but because it is far better than the unfounded assumption that the present condition will continue simply because it is the present. We can be willing to act on the forecast because the tax change that is being recommended—a temporary income tax surcharge—is an adjustment that after its adoption can be readily removed earlier than the targeted date for its termination if the economic radars then begin to forecast different and unexpected signals.

We must remember that the aim is not always to see that forecasts are borne out. Rather, it is to so alter economic conditions that forecasts of undesirable instability ahead, either of an inflationary nature or a downward trend, will not turn out that way and that the forecasted instability will instead be replaced by a more desirable economic situation. The surcharge thus rests on a forecast of too exuberant an economy in the latter part of the year and an intention to prevent that forecast from becoming actuality. The recommendation of the surcharge was a frank statement of Government opinion and policy—what it expects will happen without policy action and how it plans to solve the problem. If the problem starts to shape up differently, then of course a different solution will be called for—but as of now that is not what our current knowledge tells us.

The use of tax policy is thus at present an exercise in tax flexibility—as we attempt to keep our high level economy as close to optimum operating conditions as we can in the face of inevitable instabilities flowing from the Vietnam hostilities. Necessarily tax flexibility means tax change, to keep the economy on a proper course. Rigidity in tax policy is an impossible course—the Policy that brought success in one year can bring great difficulties the next year. We must seek tax adjustments responsive to predicated economic conditions, and attempt to structure them so that the change is accompanied by the least strain on taxpayers and tax administration in applying and accommodating to those changes. Change is necessary because rigidity is disaster, but change should not itself cause needless instabilities.

When Vietnam hostilities end, a new set of conditions will appear and the use of tax policy will in turn have a different content. A most likely use is that of tax reduction, as the revenue structure will presumably have to adapt to lower military expenditures. The nature of the adaptation—how much reduction, in what mix of temporary and permanent change, in what mix of rate change and structural alteration—necessarily must await the events that condition the tax response.

Let me turn now to another goal and another use of tax policy. Whatever the ever-changing character of the economic role of tax policy, we are always involved in the raising of revenues to pay for Government expenditures as well as to fulfill the revenue raising targets that the economic role sets. Tax policy is charged with the task of raising those revenues with fairness, with the least interference in the efficient utilization of our resources, and with the lowest possible level of difficulty in compliance and administration. It is this use of tax policy with which tax reform is concerned.

The achievement of this goal of tax policy is one of constant efforts at improvement—past decisions turn out to have been misguided or no longer sensible under changed circumstances; a new pattern of economic and social conditions forces tax thinking into new areas; new compliance techniques make certain steps feasible for the first time; perennially intractable problems may yield to new solutions; a better understanding is gained of the effects of taxation in a particular area. The needs for improvement are endless and the response must be continuous over many areas. This use of tax policy in this decade has proceeded steadily, through a variety of measures aimed at improving the tax structure—the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964, the Excise Act of 1965, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. Along with these major legislative measures have been many major administrative measures in Regulations and rulings—consolidated returns, the international tax area, unrelated business income, for example—and many minor legislative measures.

But the effort must remain continuous. We are all aware of the many possible areas of inquiry. We will have different sets of priorities and different approaches and different emphases—but we are all seeking change in our tax structure rather than embalmment. The Treasury has often mentioned some of its current concerns—industrial revenue bonds, multiple corporations, private pension plans and foundations, to name a few. It has called attention to the fact that the estate and gift taxes represent the only part of our Federal tax structure that has remained unexamined by the Congress over a long period. The recent parallel studies by the Brookings Institution on the economic side and the American Law Institute on the legal side clearly indicate that there are promising paths to improvement of these taxes.

An area of reform now before the Congress concerns the President's recommendations for revision of the income tax treatment of the elderly. The existing income tax benefits extended to the elderly cost about $2.3 billion annually in tax revenues. The Administration's proposals for revision of these tax rules would not alter this revenue cost. The proposals aim only to redirect this relief, in a uniform manner, to benefit those elderly most in need of it and at the same time to simplify the structure of the tax rules applicable to the elderly. But these proposals appear to be surrounded by a fog of confusion and misrepresentation.

Some critics portray in detail the suggested elimination of the present $600 added exemption and the retirement income credit. But they do not mention the substitution under the proposals of a simple blanket special exemption of $2,300 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple where both are over age 65. Other critics state that Social Security benefits will be subject to tax, and add that this is unfair because the beneficiaries will have made payment of Social Security taxes before retirement. But they do not mention that the costs of those taxes will be taken into account through the blanket exemption, which in no event would be reduced below one-third of the benefits included in income. Nor do the critics point out that about two-thirds of the elderly now subject to income tax will receive a tax reduction under the proposals—almost all married couples below $11,600 and single persons below $5,800.

There are about 20 million persons over the age of 65. Of these, about 4 million now pay income tax or join in the filing of a return on which income tax is paid. The President's proposals will not change the tax-free status of the almost 16 million elderly who now pay no tax. Of the remaining group of elderly, about 2.8 million will have tax reductions. Thus, for the great majority of the elderly—over 18.5 million persons, more than 94 percent of the total—the recommendations will not change their position of being free of income tax burdens, or they will result in a tax reduction.

The tax liabilities for the remaining group of elderly will be increased and thereby brought more in line with the tax liabilities of those taxpayers under age 65 with similar amounts of income. This also has been criticized. But in criticizing the increases that are involved for the wealthier elderly, the

critics do not indicate why a person with $20,000 or $50,000, or $100,000 of income, even though elderly, needs the special tax benefits that Congress granted because of the special financial problems associated with age. The financial problems of most of the elderly come down essentially—as do all financial problems—to a lack of income. But—where the income levels are in these higher ranges—there is no justification to apply a lower tax on a $20,000 or $50,000 income when received by a person over age 65 than when received by a person under that age. To keep the matter in perspective, an income of $20,000 a year is over twice the average family income in the United States. In addition, many of the needs that a younger family faces have already been met by the family over 65—the house and furniture are paid for, and the like.

Editorials and similar comment critical of the taxation of Social Security benefits may well have given those now receiving those benefits the impression that their well-being is threatened. But the real facts are completely the other way around. Under the proposed changes annual tax reductions of approximately $220 million dollars would go to the taxpaying elderly below $10,000, and the overwhelming number of Social Security recipients are below that level.

Nor do the real facts end here. The proposed special exemption ($2,300 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple) take fully into account the present levels of Social Security benefits. But this does not mean that future Social Security benefit increases will automatically be taxed to all recipients. The regular income tax exemptions and deductions, which are allowable in addition to the special exemption, will together with the special exemption shelter from income tax payment future Social Security benefit increases for all who have only this source of funds and, indeed, for most other recipients.

For example, the maximum Social Security benefit payable to a married couple under present law is about $2,500 per year. This would rise to about $2,700 under the President's Social Security proposals. But this is not even half the amount of income necessary before any income tax would be due under the proposed changes, since the couple would not owe tax until their income exceeded $5,800 a year. In other words, for a married couple living only on Social Security benefits, the maximum benefit level would have to more than double before the income tax would become a factor. If they are now receiving average Social Security benefits (about $1,500 per year), their benefits would have to more than triple before they would owe any tax. Viewed in another way, it is only the addition of non-Social Security income tax that could cause a tax to occur and here the leeway is also significant. Even if Social Security benefits were to reach $3,000, there would still be a $2,800 leeway to absorb pension or other income before the recipients became taxpayers.

In sum, for the overwhelming number of Social Security recipients, the proposal will have no effect on their Social Security benefits or will actually result in a tax reduction. This will also be true well into the future. There are 14 million Social Security recipients. About 12.6 million are now free of income tax, and would remain so. Only about 1.4 million are taxpayers now. Half of these would receive tax reductions under the proposal. The rest—700,000 out of 14 million recipients—would have increases, but to do so they must have an income of over about $6,000 if single and about $12,000 if married. And for many these increases would be *offset* by the increases proposed in Social Security benefits.

It is therefore a pretty safe assumption—keeping in mind the kinds of people who are prone to be concerned about anything touching their Social Security benefits—that the letters any newspaper, any organization, or any Congressmen may be receiving from Social Security recipients who have become concerned by what they read or hear about these proposals can be answered simply and clearly: "If you are not paying an income tax today, you will still continue to be free of tax—if you are paying a tax, you will receive a tax reduction."

To continue with our discussion of general tax reform, the President in his Economic Report has stated that he will submit a tax reform message later this year. He has delineated several useful principles to apply at this time to tax reform proposals—they should be considered apart from significant rate changes or temporary tax increases or decreases, such as the six percent surcharge, and they should not occasion a significant net gain or loss in revenue. While the various components would thus involve revenue-raising or revenue-losing measures, over-all they would balance out with no significant net change.

We may, of course, as respects this use of tax policy, look ahead even beyond this reform message to notice that many significant policy areas will be under study, in Government and in private research. We must learn more about the relationship of the income tax system to those persons who lie outside that system, and this involves the interrelationships between our Social Security system, our welfare system and the proposals for negative income taxes and income guarantees. The President has stated he will appoint a Commission to study much of this ground. We must also make sure that the benefits of economic growth spread to all and that all may share in them, or the affluence we seek for our people will become social injustice. We must strive to protect against any unfairnesses that may result from the necessary uses of tax flexibility, the necessary adjustments in monetary policy, and the necessary reliance on macroeconomic measures. We must not allow our tax system and its uses for economic policy to be regarded as involving only sterile counters remote from the human beings whose lives they affect. The measures to accomplish all of this will not, of course, lie entirely within the tax system. But those who work with tax policy must aid in joining tax policy with other economic and social measures to achieve these desired objectives.

I have been considering the uses of tax policy. These uses, as you can see, are many and varied, and perhaps to some may even appear too ambitious or wide-ranging in what is sought to be accomplished. But let me hasten to assure you that they are indeed modest alongside the claims that some have made for the use of tax policy.

There are those who urge tax policy as the solution for almost all of our social ills and problems. If you object to polluted air or polluted water, then a tax incentive will clean it right up. If a college education appears too costly to a family, then a tax credit will open the college doors. If our business firms are not training enough workers, then a tax incentive will set them to improving worker skills. If private enterprise and city officials will not eradicate our slums, then a tax incentive will remove this urban blight. If businesses won't locate in depressed areas, then a tax incentive will show them the way. If electric companies will not place their transmission lines underground, then a tax incentive will turn the soil. If urban transportation is too slow and too antiquated, then a tax incentive will make it fast and attractive. Indeed, all you need to learn what is wrong with America is to read the tax bills in Congress—wherever you see a tax proposal, that is where the action is.

Now, as Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, I am not at all sure why I should object to these suggestions that the tax system can cure all our problems. For clearly I could well become an economic czar were Congress to agree to this course. I, and my small staff, could control all our new social programs and the other Departments, such as Labor, HEW and HUD, would have so little to do they could be merged into one small Department and thereby simplify Government. All this almost seems to be how the world would look to a Treasury Department official on an LSD trip.

But I do not use LSD and I have the cautious feeling our social problems can not be so simple that a tax device—indeed the same tax device—will solve all of them. I suspect that there are better ways to clean our rivers and skies, to eradicate our urban ills, to give a college education to all who are qualified. Those ways will require loan guarantees, credit programs, direct subsidies and other Federal expenditure programs, and our facing up squarely to the costs involved.

A major appeal of the tax device is that it hides the budgetary cost and, of course, this appeal is strong from the standpoint of the private interests affected. But this should not deter us from the rational calculations and analyses which must be made to weigh the benefits of alternative expenditure programs. The sheer weight of the various demands being placed upon Government makes it urgent we obtain the utmost efficiency in the use of public funds, and that we fully recognize the amount of funds allocated to each demand. That efficiency and recognition cannot be obtained by hiding the costs in the intricacies of our tax system. Nor could that tax system survive the cumulative weakening of its strength and its fairness that would be involved in this massive use of tax incentives.

We must therefore be alert to the nonuses as well as the uses of tax policy. Nor is this sentry duty assigned solely to Government officials. Those who work daily with the tax system—those lawyers and accountants and scholars who know the strengths and the weaknesses of that system—must also stand their watch. For it is you who counsel daily with a far wider audience of businesses and individuals than the words of Washington can reach. Those businesses and individuals have a vital stake in how our tax system is shaped. Yours, then, is a vital role in explaining the issues surrounding tax policy, in clarifying the choices. No one can ask for blanket agreement and conformity on the choices to be made. But we can hope for an understanding of the concerns that must be weighed in reaching those choices. And it is to this task that your talents can bring accomplishment.

A YEAR TOWARD TOMORROW—VISTA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, VISTA, as we know, stands for "Volunteers in Service to America." It is the volunteer corps within the Office of Economic Opportunity which serves our less fortunate Americans in their struggle against the misery of poverty.

I recently had the opportunity, together with other Members of the Congress and administration, to attend a showing of a VISTA recruitment film here in Washington. The film is called "A Year Toward Tomorrow"; it is not

an ordinary film and will not soon be forgotten by those who see it. A well-deserved tribute was paid to this film by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. At their 39th annual academy awards ceremony they presented the coveted "Oscar" to Mr. Edmund A. Levy who directed the film for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Mr. Paul Newman, the actor, narrated this outstanding 28-minute production, generously donating his service to OEO for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, "A Year Toward Tomorrow" tells realistically and in down-to-earth fashion a story of the struggle, heartbreak, and success that VISTA volunteers experience in their work with the Nation's poor.

One of the VISTA volunteers shown in the film is Eric Metzner, a Navy veteran, who joined VISTA for a year of work in Atlanta, Ga. Working with low-income families in a tenement section of the city, Eric met with frustration and failure as he began his effort to improve the living conditions in the community in which he now lived and worked. By earning the confidence and trust of his neighbors, however, Eric soon was able to assist with the organization of a tenant's association which, with his guidance, embarked upon a successful campaign of improving the surroundings of the neighborhood.

This VISTA film also describes the work that volunteers are doing on Indian reservations and the difficulties they have overcome in gaining acceptance among these first Americans. Two courageous young girls, from comfortable backgrounds, exchanged a life of relative ease for the difficult and demanding tasks of serving as VISTA volunteers among the Indian population. They met with initial failure and frustration, but with perseverance were able eventually to establish a kindergarten class for the children of the reservation and to bring to the Indian women new skills in cooking, sewing, and health care.

"A Year Toward Tomorrow" provides us a glimpse into the dedicated and compassionate work that VISTA volunteers are providing in the Nation's struggle against poverty. One of the fundamental reasons VISTA is successful in its part of the OEO campaign is well illustrated by this film: We are shown volunteers who serve while living and working among the poor. They become part of the community, accepting its challenges, understanding its needs, and participating fully in its efforts to secure community progress and self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, over 6,500 men and women of all ages and backgrounds have served and are serving in the VISTA program. In the OEO campaign for a fuller life for America's poor, "A Year Toward Tomorrow" traces the good work of three of these volunteers, but it illustrates the idealistic and common sense approach that is typical of all VISTA workers. This film is a masterful and moving documentary of the vital spirit of voluntary service that is an important part of our history. VISTA, as one of the important ways in which American volunteer service is being expressed today, deserves our congratulations and continued full support. Its work, as the film so well describes, is effective and inspiring.

WHOSE CREDIBILITY GAP?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished superintendent of the Pittsburgh schools, Dr. S. P. Marland, has recently telegraphed me the reasons for his strong opposition to the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Dr. Marland's telegram quite accurately points out that the Quie substitute will not provide general aid, but rather a general shell which will simply serve to conceal the aid it takes away from those who need it most. I think Dr. Marland's telegram shows that the Quie proposal does not provide general assistance for the problems of the schools, but merely offers a general anesthetic which will temporarily take our minds off the problem.

Under unanimous consent I place Dr. Marland's telegram at this point in my remarks:

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
April 28, 1967.

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The proposed changes in the distribution of Federal funds for elementary and secondary education would critically damage big city Federal programs in education. Barely started over the past 18 months, categorical programs aimed squarely at the children of poverty have brought a beginning of hope to the poor and the minorities heavily populating the cities. The suggested partial removal of categorical restraints, and reversion of control and procedure to State authorities would defeat any chance of inner-city recovery, or of significant help for rural poverty. State systems of fund distribution historically and quite universally discriminate against cities. Notwithstanding the desirability of long term goals or general aid, the present level of funding even at full authorization, is insufficient to meet the essential costs of categorical compensatory education as per title I. Any effort toward general aid should be in addition to, repeat—in addition to, the present categorical support, not instead of. When Federal funds are available at some future date in quantities sufficient to justify noncategorical distribution, over and above present categorical needs, we would strongly encourage such aid.

Urge you to give strong support to present ESEA program, funding title I at full authorization and spurn blandishments that speak seductively of general aid that indeed is not general aid, but a thin layering of token monies to be so widely diffused as to have little significance in American education. State formulaes for distribution vary so widely as to give no assurance that funds would be used where needed, or for innovation in increased services. Absorption of Federal funds by States to meet present mandated State support programs has occurred in the past and could recur. General aid and present level of funding would simply result in higher expenditures for the status quo.

Dr. S. P. MARLAND, Jr.,
Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools.

Our Republican friends have been asserting, with increasing shrillness lately, Mr. Speaker, that the President, the Office of Education, the Democratic members of the Education and Labor Committee, and the private school administrators have all been "misrepresenting," or, more charitably "misunderstanding" the Quie amendment. I hope they do not strain our credulity further by asserting that professional public educators, like Dr. Marland, whose interests are solely in the development of the best formula for Federal assistance in the pressing problem of education, "do not understand" what their own needs are.

While we are on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by a joint statement recently issued on the Quie substitutes by the gentleman from Minnesota and his leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD FORD]. The burden of this statement was to the effect that the supporters of the committee's bill are all twisting the facts. As an "example" of this, the statement contained the following remarkable paragraph:

The President has falsely asserted that Republicans "trot out a new version" of their school aid substitute every day. The truth is we have made slight additions to calm the fears of private school leaders—groundless fears stirred up by the Administration through a scare campaign based on false statements.

Translating this into plain talk, our friends seem to have said that "we have not changed our bill, and when we did, it was only to meet the objections of private school leaders—but the objections were not based on facts, anyway, so we changed it anyway, but we did not have to, but." Now, whose credibility were you talking about, gentlemen?

FATAL IGNORANCE OF HO CHI MINH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Press recently ran an editorial entitled "Fatal Ignorance of Ho Chi Minh," which, I believe, deserves to be spread upon the record. The Press editorial, citing a speech by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], makes the point that Ho Chi Minh is on dangerous ground if he assumes that the existence of dissent in this country, and argument over the course of the war, means that the American people are on the verge of upsetting their country's course.

This country has always been hospitable to the free mind. We have always leaned over backward, as well we should,

to let everyone have his say about whatever great endeavor the Nation was engaged in at the time. This has been a healthy exercise in the development of our Nation's greatest strength. I hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that we continue our faith in the positive value of letting people say things most of us do not agree with.

But our national penchant for free speech has constantly confused and misled rulers of countries where they do not enjoy this right. Hitler never believed the American people could unite against him because all he could see was the loud argument between the "hawks" and "doves" of 1939 and 1940. Even after he had declared war on the United States, he made the fatal mistake of assuming that because we lacked the artificial "unity" of a dictatorship that we should not, therefore, fight with the unforced unity Americans showed from Kasserine Pass to the Elbe. If Ho Chi Minh is making this same mistake, he is due for the same surprise.

As the Press editorial states, "Americans don't like this war." Americans have never liked any war—a fact for which we should thank God daily. But free men, who have and need no one to tell them what to say or think or write, can win wars in spite of internal criticism, while followers of rigid ideologies, who remain deeply dedicated so long as their world remains in accord with their theories, find themselves confused and disheartened whenever the discontent of their own people finally finds expression. Freedom is the natural condition of man. Those who repress freedom, those who themselves feel a need to stamp out its manifestations, can never understand that a free country like ours can withstand all kinds of internal dissent without weakening in its resolve.

For the sake of the peace which we all seek, for the sake of the Vietnamese people, north and south, against whom Americans bear no grudge, someone should have a long talk with Ho Chi Minh and explain this to him. What may sound to Ho Chi Minh like a nation cracking under the tensions of war, is merely the customary sound of a noisy, independent, and free people, whose freedom is the measure of their strength. In the words of the editorial:

Ho Chi Minh ignores this fact to his own peril.

The editorial follows:

FATAL IGNORANCE OF HO CHI MINH

In his letter to President Johnson, North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh displayed his ignorance of the temper of this country.

He wrote that his country's "cause" evoked sympathy and support from "broad sections of the American people."

The facts are otherwise.

Americans don't like this war. They gripe at the draft and the taxes. They weep for the dead and the wounded. They sorrow for the Vietnamese who are casualties of the conflict. They abhor the destruction of homes and fields and forests. They yearn for peace.

But, being in the war, the vast majority of Americans are ready, willing and able to continue until there is victory or an honorable peace assuring the protection of the freedoms of South Vietnam, and putting an end to one more aggression.

There is, of course, opposition to the President's policies. Some very loud-mouthed opposition.

But what Ho and those like him ignore is that in total this opposition is small and in Congress relatively impotent.

"There is no question whatsoever that they (the enemy) misinterpret the weight of the opposition to the Government's policy," Defense Secretary Robert McNamara lately told a House committee. Ho's letter makes that apparent.

Rep. George Mahon, Texas Democrat, was speaking the real view of Americans when, before that same House committee, he said:

"In my opinion, the American people generally feel more is involved than the independence of the people of South Vietnam. They feel they are engaged in a war and are making these sacrifices in money and blood in order to build the kind of world that will make the people of the U.S. more secure in their pursuit of freedom and happiness."

Ho Chi Minh ignores this fact to his own peril.

PRIORITY OF FUNDS FOR THE EDUCATION OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the need for rapidly improving the education of children at the lower end of the economic scale is so great that our first concern should be to allocate our resources so we can be certain that they are used in areas where there are large concentrations of such children. If we really believe this, then it certainly follows that the main test of a distribution formula should be the extent to which it meets this need.

So far, the only formula we have seen that makes a serious attempt to meet the test of putting money where the low-income children are is the one provided in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Probably one of its most unique and useful characteristics is that it distributes the funds according to the relative concentration of such children—whether it be a northern city or a southern rural area.

Although useful for many purposes, distribution formulas based mainly on per capita income, as is the Quie substitute, cannot meet this test for the simple reason that they are based on averages and, consequently, do not take into account the fact that areas with the same per capita income can vary greatly in the concentration of low-income children. In this instance, the old axiom that many things can be hidden in averages certainly becomes an all-important point in assessing the utility of the Quie per capita income distribution scheme.

My conviction that the present title I formula is the best available for improving the education of our most disadvantaged children is not lessened by my awareness that we still have problems in this area. We know that it would be better to have more current census data and that we may need to make some adjustments in our distribution system. We are trying to solve such problems as soon as possible. However, I completely reject the notion that we should solve these problems by destroying the most effective tool we have ever had for channeling funds directly to areas where concentrations of disadvantaged children reside.

EXEMPTIONS FROM COMBAT ASSIGNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9636, which I believe urgently meets the demands of compassion and human suffering, while recognizing the needs of our military forces in the field of combat. So often in my service as a Member of this august body, I have received letters requesting assistance in securing exemption for sons and fathers who are in combat zones in Vietnam, where already one son has been killed in action. While I view all war as tragic for the families whose loved ones are killed or maimed, even more tragic is the suffering of those who, having already lost a loved one, are yet being asked to sacrifice the life of another. This I believe is far more than the exigencies of the moment require in the interest of our national security. I have therefore proposed H.R. 9636 which will remove from the soldier himself the need to make a request for an exemption when a father, brother, or sister has already been killed in action or died in the line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces in a combat zone. After such a loss of an immediate family member, the surviving brothers, sisters, or father will be as a matter of regular course transferred out of the combat zone. The present rules and policy of the Defense Department already require that such a family member be relieved of combat duty for a period of 6 months. Thus his release is already part of the procedure recognized as proper by the Defense Department. No disruption of regular procedure would be required by my bill; however, the release would be permanent rather than temporary.

My bill, H.R. 9636, would also prevent the simultaneous assignment of more than one member of a family to a combat zone, except if the other member volunteers for such service. The current rules of the Department of Defense provide for such an exemption which applies only upon an affirmative request. My bill would remove the requirement of a formal request and in order for the second member to be assigned to a combat zone, he must volunteer.

I urge my colleagues in this House to consider H.R. 9636 carefully, and I hope after careful study and consideration that many of you will join me in urging its swift enactment into law.

VETERANS DISABILITY COMPENSATION BENEFITS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advise the House of a bill, H.R. 9637, which I have introduced regarding the payment of veterans disability compensation benefits. It has come to my attention that in a number of instances veterans who have sustained service-connected injuries which are today compensable were under previous laws not eligible. The change in the law making a previously denied claim now compensable is not often brought to the immediate attention of the veteran. Where these changes in the law have been made, the Congress has placed the burden upon the veteran to make a timely reclaim. His compensation rights, however, do not vest until the date of the reapplication. Thus if he waited 5 years before refiling, he has through no fault of his own lost 5 years of compensation benefits. While I am thoroughly aware of the rule of law which says that ignorance of the law is never an excuse, I earnestly believe that in this instance the burden of loss upon the veteran is far too great. H.R. 9637 does not seek to benefit the veteran who has never sought his rights to compensation. It seeks only to help those who have acted in good faith upon their belief that their claims were compensable, but who were turned down, not because the disability was not service connected, but solely because the statute did not render authority to pay for other reasons. If this statutory requirement is later amended or modified, and a heretofore denied claim is now compensable for the sole reason that the law has been changed, then I feel that the veteran ought to be allowed to come in at any time thereafter and his claim ought to be payable to him beginning from the date of the change in the law. This is all that my bill, H.R. 9637, does.

I urge my colleagues to study this bill carefully, and in doing so I know that you will have to agree with me. Justice and equity require such legislation, given these special circumstances.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN DAY CARE CENTERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers. My bill would provide funds for supplementing educational programs for preschool children who spend the day in child care centers, many of which now furnish primarily only custodial care. The enhancement, expansion, and enrichment of educational programs in these child centers is urgently needed to supplement what we have started in other Federal programs such as Headstart. Most of these preschool children being cared for in day care centers do not qualify for Federal programs currently in operation because their parents' income is greater than criteria established for these programs.

The Congress has recognized the needs of preschool youngsters; it endorsed the concept of early childhood education when it allowed funds for this purpose under the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. More and more we are being shown that the learning process begins earlier than at age 6, and that greater benefits for these preschool children must be provided.

We took cognizance of the younger child when we authorized funds for Operation Headstart under the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. We are presently seeking expansion of these opportunities for some 3 million children in the preschool years whose family incomes are under $3,000. But we need to further extend this excellent effort to thousands of other children who need enrichment. These additional services can be readily provided them because they are already in attendance at these centers.

President Johnson recognized the importance of early childhood education when he called for increased day care services including training for new careers in child care and the establishment of parent-child centers in his message of February 8 to Congress on children and youth. A child's future is shaped by his early experiences and we must not overlook these young children already in centers. Provision must be made for more than physicial care; the 3- or 4-year-old needs and thirsts for expertly directed primary educational experiences to motivate and inspire his young mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that there is a tremendous need for funds so that these child care centers can upgrade, supplement, and increase the educational impact of their day care programs. At present there are day care facilities for about 310,000 pre-school-age children. In 1965, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there were an estimated 7,334 licensed day care centers in the United States. According to March 1965 statistics released by the U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, there were nearly 26 million working mothers in the United States. Two million of these mothers had children under 3 years of age; 1.7 million had children between 3 and 5. These children number 2 million under age 3; 2.5 million between 3 and 5 years of age. The number of working mothers has increased more than sixfold since 1940 and is expected to continue to rise. There were then 1.5 million mothers working and this has more than doubled since 1950, when 4.6 million mothers were working. These mothers represented almost two-fifths of all working women in March 1965, compared to a tenth in 1940 and a fourth in 1950.

The employment of mothers will also continue to rise. With respect to mothers of preschool children, for example, the Department of Labor has projected an increase of about 55 percent between 1960 and 1970 in the number of mothers 20 to 44 years of age who will work.

The fact that these statistics clearly show that the vast majority of children of preschool age cannot be reached immediately by this bill makes even more urgent the need for Congress, recognizing the importance of early education, to provide funds to supplement the educational services of existing centers now caring for 300,000 of these children, a figure which is expected to increase as more working mothers enter our labor force. Financial support by the Federal Government for these child centers will serve to encourage the States to wage an aggressive program to assure the children of working parents greater opportunity for the stimulus to learning these centers can provide. These child day care centers can be developed into centers of learning which will begin to provide important educational experiences for these children and which will have a vital influence upon their development.

My bill which is titled "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act" would authorize for fiscal year 1968 and each succeeding fiscal year, $300,000,000 to make grants available to the States. States participating in the program will designate a State agency broadly representative of these public and private child care centers and submit to the Commissioner of Education a State plan for participation. Priorities shall be given to centers with children in greatest need of such programs and which best demonstrate that they can achieve the objectives of this act, while still leaving maximum flexibility for the development of State plans and standards. These centers and groups to qualify must first be approved by State licensing agencies for safety and sanitary conditions and the projects they submit to the Commissioner must be approved by the designated State agency created under this act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to urge its enactment in the present session of Congress for the thousands of youngsters this bill will help.

The full text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9720

A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes the value of early childhood educational programs. Millions of pre-school-age children whose parents work have no opportunity for this kind of experience. Congress believes that these preschool education programs should be extended to the Nation's child care cen-

ters by providing supplementary education services.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $300,000,000 to make grants under this Act.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES

SEC. 4. From the sums appropriated for a fiscal year to make grants under this Act, each State shall be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers, in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all the States, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 5 Any State which wishes to participate in the grant program under this Act shall designate or establish for that purpose a State agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups, and submit to the Commissioner through such agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State commission") a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it will be administered by the State commission,

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 6, objective standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants and the amounts thereof,

(3) provides for approving and recommending to the Commissioner the day care centers which shall receive grants, and the amounts thereof, solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods,

(4) provides for affording to every applicant for a grant an opportunity for a hearing before the State commission as to its action under paragraph (3) with respect to such applicant, and

(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this Act.

BASIC CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PRIORITIES

SEC. 6. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants, and the amount thereof, shall be subject. Such basic criteria shall be such as will (1) give a preference to day care centers where the Federal grant will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children most in need thereof, and (2) best tend to achieve the objectives of this Act while leaving opportunity for flexibility in the development of State plan standards and methods which will best accommodate the varied needs of the several States.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Child day care centers which wish to obtain grants under this Act shall submit applications therefor at such times, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application for a grant under this Act if—

(1) the grant will be used only to provide supplementary educational services and education equipment for day care centers;

(2) the State or the political subdivision in which the day care center is located enforces standards for the operation of day care centers which give assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that such centers will be operated in a manner which will not be unsafe, unsanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the children there, and the applicant meets such standards;

(3) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; and

(4) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, that sufficient funds are available in the State's allotment to make the grant.

AMOUNT OF GRANT—PAYMENT

SEC. 8. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this Act, the Commissioner shall reserve from the appropriate allotment the amount of such grant. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with provisions of section 5, or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 10. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 5 or with his final action under section 9(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified finding of fact shall likewise be conslusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "supplementary educational services an education equipment" means services (and related equipment) which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists and other child development specialists, as well as the use of books and audio-visual material and equipment.

(2) The term "child day care center" means a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution which provides, at one or more centralized locations, for the care, guidance, and supervision of children during the day if (A) the daily period of care, guidance, and supervision is at least eight hours for a majority of the children involved, and (B) a majority of the children involved are aged 3 to 5, inclusive.

(3) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(4) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 12. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

COLLEGE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the critical college housing situation which I believe requires the review and attention of the Congress lest our efforts to expand higher education opportunities will be a promise to young America which cannot be fulfilled, because of the lack of living accommodations on our college campuses.

In 1950, under the able leadership of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Congress authorized a Government program of direct loans at a 3-percent interest rate, with an annual authorization of $300 million for college dormitory construction. This assistance has enabled our Nation's institutions of higher learning to mount a program of dormitory construction since 1950 totaling $2.875 billion.

However, today, accelerated college enrollments over the past decade have expanded the need far beyond what can be loaned under present authority. The backlog of requests for college housing loans became so formidable, in fact, that the administration had to declare a moratorium on applications back in January of 1966, with $760 million worth of unfulfilled requests on hand. If the moratorium had not been declared and applications were still accepted, the backlog today might well be in excess of $2 billion.

While the Federal loan program has contributed to the financing of some 600,000 housing units since 1950, a survey report prepared for the American Council on Education last year projected a need for an additional 1.5 billion accommodations over the next decade, which with a conservative estimate of $5,000 per unit, will call for minimum expenditures of $10 billion in the decade ahead, for new college housing.

I am certain that many Members of Congress have had this problem brought

to their attention during recent months, and it has become obvious that the present program, unless greatly expanded, will not suffice to provide more than a fraction of the accommodations as college admissions mount year after year.

This problem has reached staggering proportions in Hawaii. The University of Hawaii now has an enrollment of just under 15,000 students with only 1,200 dormitory accommodations available, 600 of which are assigned to East-West Center students, leaving only 600 rooms for the regular college enrollment. With an anticipated enrollment of 25,000 in the very near future, we are faced with a problem of great magnitude. Some 2,100 students applied for the 684 spaces currently available in the 1966–67 school year, and even with present plans for the immediate construction of an additional 1,140 rooms, by 1968 less than 10 percent of the university's student enrollment will have campus housing.

Many students live in Honolulu and can commute, but public transit is a problem on Oahu as in most other communities, and more importantly students miss out on a very significant facet of a well-rounded education if they are forced to leave the campus environment every day because there is no dormitory to house them. Too many of these young people have had to move into substandard off-campus housing, and the consequent dislocation of their lives cannot be doubted to have adverse effects on their academic progress. As in other institutions, we are faced with overcrowding of present facilities, and the practice of squeezing three or more students into quarters designed for two cannot be considered adequate to their needs.

In addition, we are in the early stages of an ambitious program of developing a community college system, and if these are to accommodate other than students in the immediate environs of the school, some housing will have to be planned. A new 4-year institution, Hawaii Loa College, expects to open its doors to its first freshman class this fall, and has had an application for Federal housing funds pending for more than a year now. And a recent study done by a New York consulting firm on future educational needs in Hawaii calls for yet another 4-year State college that would be capable of handling 5,000 undergraduates by 1975.

I have had this problem under consultation for some time now, and have met with officials of the University of Hawaii and mainland colleges, Department of Housing and Urban Development experts, and representatives of major educational associations in an attempt to work out a solution. The result was the introduction of my college housing bill, H.R. 8647, on April 17, 1967, which I ask my colleagues who share with me in this concern to cosponsor.

H.R. 8647 is designed to supplement the existing loan program and provide the needed housing at a cost within the reach of students and their families without imposing a serious burden on the Federal budget. It would be done through private financing, with the Government providing only that margin of assistance necessary to give colleges the benefit of the same 3-percent financing available under the existing loan program.

The approach in my bill is very simple: The university would finance the housing by selling serial bonds to private investors at the market rate of interest.

Under a contract previously entered into, HUD would make an annual payment of the difference between the actual debt service and the debt service at a 3-percent interest rate. Before HUD could enter into any such contract it would have to obtain approval from the Appropriations Committee. The 3-percent direct loan authorization in existing law would remain available to be used in cases where the private market required an inordinately high interest rate, with discretion left to the Secretary to determine the dividing line.

Under H.R. 8647, $10 million would be made available to institutions for this interest subsidy for each of the next 2 fiscal years. The impact on the Federal budget in any year under the supplemental interest payment approach would be very small. For example, assuming an average private market interest rate of 5½ percent for public and private universities together, an annual supplement of less than $10 million would achieve the effect of 3-percent interest for $300 million of college housing financing.

I am pleased to note that the initial reaction of educators has been favorable to the principle embodied in my bill. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, termed my bill a constructive approach to the problem. I am also in receipt of a copy of the letter forwarded to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on housing by the Association of State Colleges and Universities, an organization comprised of 213 institutions of higher learning and seven statewide systems of State colleges in 41 States and Guam. In this letter the chairman of the association's legislative committee, President Earle T. Hawkins of Towson State College in Maryland, asks that "the Federal Government assist higher education in generating a capital funding source of at least $1 billion each year for the next 10 years for single and married student housing at an interest cost of not more than 3 percent and for debt terms of not more than 50 years." The letter, which was written on the same day that I introduced my bill, also called for an interest subsidy plan at a cost of no more than 3 percent to the institution, or an alternative program of capital grants that would have the effect of reducing the interest cost on construction of housing to at least a 3-percent level for the term of the debt.

I am further advised that the Investment Bankers Association of America has also gone on record in favor of programing Federal subsidies to higher education. The association points out that the Federal interest rate of 3 percent is more attractive than current private market rates, and thereby has created an artificial condition which hampers rather than encourages decisive solutions to the growing problem of providing sufficient college housing. This same association suggests direct Federal subsidies by three possible approaches, one of which is a direct reflection of the provisions of my bill, to wit, a variable interest grant to absorb interest costs over a prescribed rate. The Investment Bankers conclude that "maximum construction of new college academic buildings and dormitories depends upon utilizing the private market to its full potential, and then supplementing it when necessary with a Federal Government loan program."

This is precisely the approach I concluded would be the most feasible in the drafting of H.R. 8647.

I am pleased also to have the endorsement of my own University of Hawaii, which like other educational institutions is most concerned over the effect on its budget of a proposed Federal interest rate higher than the present 3 percent. The vice president for business affairs at the university, Mr. Richard Takasaki, terms my bill a "most practical approach for assisting students with this pressing problem." Mr. Takasaki endorses the use of private market financing with the Federal Government subsidizing interest costs in excess of 3 percent, and expressed to me the concern of the university over the President's proposal to increase the interest rate from 3 percent to somewhere in the neighborhood of 3⅝ percent.

I am encouraged by the initial reaction to believe that we do have with this legislation a feasible and workable plan whose early inception at such a minimal cost to the Government can do so much to relieve the present worsening situation in construction of new college housing accommodations. I sincerely hope that this Congress will see fit to give its careful consideration to H.R.8647 as a positive approach that will draw the approval of educators and the business community in unison, while meeting an overlooked need in making a well-rounded education available to the hundreds of thousands of students who will be swelling college enrollments in the years ahead.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 6232, the Higher Education Amendments of 1967, presently the subject of hearings in the Special Subcommittee on Education and most particularly to express my interest in title V of the bill relating to the education professions development.

In this 90th Congress, I have again sponsored a bill, H.R. 3372, which will establish a national sabbatical leave program for elementary and secondary teachers. In the 89th Congress the identical bill (H.R. 10622) was reported out of our Committee on Education and

Labor, but did not reach the House floor for consideration.

I am pleased to see that H.R. 6232 is addressing itself to the questions of improving the quality of American education by providing programs of enrichment for our elementary and secondary teachers, which is the principal concern of my bill H.R. 3372.

While it is well known that our country faces a serious shortage of teachers, and that this bill seeks to respond to this question, I feel that it is equally important that we strengthen it by specifically recognizing the special needs of teachers who are already teaching and who have not had an opportunity to leave work for an extended year's study in their field of teaching or to develop further skills in another field in which they may have found new interests.

I heartily endorse section 532(b)(1) of H.R. 6232 which specifically refers to various subject matters such as history, civics, reading, international affairs, and the arts and humanities, in addition to education-type courses, as those which might be included in programs that institutions could provide for teachers who are presently in the specific teaching field. Paragraph (2) refers to guidance, remedial speech and reading, child development, and educational media as other areas of study for the teacher. Reference is also made in other paragraphs to special programs for teachers of preschool children, of disadvantaged children, of handicapped children, as well as programs for administrators and other school personnel.

H.R. 6232 authorizes the Commissioner to include in the terms of the grant or contract with the institution of higher education, State or local educational agency, or other agencies, payments to persons participating in these training programs of such stipends, including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents, as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under other comparable Federal programs. This provision is absolutely necessary for the teacher to participate in these programs.

A recent study by the National Education Association showed that in urban districts selected for study only 19.4 percent offered their teachers sabbatical leaves with at least partial pay for professional study. The study also showed that the smaller the school district and the more limited its financial resources, the less likely it was that any provision for such a leave was available. The study also pointed out that only 4,229 teachers were on such leaves, averaging less than one teacher from the 4,697 school districts included in the study.

The complexity of our society and the rapid expansion of new knowledge and ideas are self-evident. Equally apparent is the fact that we are not helping our teachers keep up with the current explosion of concepts and ideas, if the vast majority are left to their own resources to maintain professional competence and expertise. We are penalizing our children if we do not provide our teachers with ample opportunities to return to institutions of higher learning without undue sacrifice to their families' well-being.

Summer institutes, inservice training programs, and other short-term programs, seminars, workshops and conferences are worthwhile but in my opinion cannot take the place of offering the teacher concentrated full-time academic study in his particular field of study or in a new area which is urgently needed in his school system. For this reason, I have asked the subcommittee to amend the language on page 61 of H.R. 6232 to make specific the authority that section 532 grants to teachers already in the system may be for yearlong academic programs at institutions of higher education.

While fully supporting the provisions of the bill which provide refresher courses, as well as the degree-program fellowships which are designed to attract qualified people into the teaching profession, I am most fearful that H.R. 6232 as drafted will not make possible the intensive study many of our nondegree teachers need to upgrade their qualifications. Nor will it allow such longer periods of study to experienced teachers. It cannot be assumed that these teachers are able to maintain professional competence only through attending evening institutes or summer courses.

Also in my bill H.R. 3372, I have made specific provision for yearlong study grants to teachers who are currently teaching but who do not have a baccalaureate degree. Current figures are not available; however, a 1955 report of the NEA showed that 34 percent of all elementary school teachers lacked a bachelor's degree and in 1960 a further study revealed that 25 percent of the elementary teachers had less than 4 years of undergraduate teacher preparation. In recognition of this problem I have urged the Education Subcommittee to write specific language in H.R. 6232 to provide special programs which will accelerate the completion of the basic academic studies necessary to bring these teachers' professional requirements up to standard. Such a move is as necessary as attracting new students into teaching careers.

No matter how vigorously we work to achieve equal educational opportunity for our children, each class is only as good as its teacher. The Federal Government needs to make a firm commitment to our teachers by providing them with greater ease and access to the available knowledge and education in our universities. Finally I urge the provision of adequate funds for implementing these programs; this would be the surest guarantee of the highest quality education for our elementary and secondary school children.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of organizations and individuals who have written in support of my bill H.R. 3372, and also a list of the Members of Congress to date who have cosponsored my bill H.R. 3372:

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3372

ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of Teachers.
California Teachers Association.
Everett Federation of Teachers (Massachusetts).
Hawaii Education Association.
Hawaii State Board of Education.
Illinois Federation of Teachers.
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America.
Kauai Education Association (Hawaii).
Labor's Non-Partisan League.
Lanai Education Association (Hawaii).
Maine Teachers Association.
Minnesota Federation of Teachers.
National Education Association of the United States.
Nebraska State Education Association.
New Jersey Education Association.
North Dakota Education Association.
Ohio Education Association, Association of Classroom Teachers.
Oregon Education Association.
Overseas Education Association, Inc.
Rhode Island Federation of Teachers.
Texas State Teachers Association.
United Automobile Workers of America.
Washington Education Association.
Wisconsin Education Association.

INDIVIDUALS

Mr. Mark Cockrill, Maunaolu College, Maui, Hawaii.
Mr. Eugene C. Edgerly, Heidelberg American School.
Mr. Don B. Goodloe, The Washington Teachers' Union.
Mr. Don Kenyon, Covina High School, California.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. John H. Dent, identical bill introduced.
Hon. John G. Dow, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Ed Edmondson, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Don Edwards, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Donald M. Fraser.
Hon. Julia Butler Hansen.
Hon. Henry Helstoski, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Elmer Holland, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Hervey Machen, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Spark Matsunaga, identical bill introduced.
Hon. George P. Miller.
Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Joseph Resnick, identical bill introduced.
Hon. James Scheuer, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Lionel Van Deerlin.
Hon. E. S. Johnny Walker, identical bill introduced.

I urge the Members of this body to join me in seeking the inclusion of this program in the higher education amendments now under consideration.

OIL SHALE AND MINERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced a proposed set of rules and regulations by which he hopes to administer the de-

velopment of oil shale and other minerals on federally owned land in the Western United States.

I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to urge the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw his proposed regulations until Congress has had further opportunity to study them more thoroughly.

It is estimated that the volume of oil in shale lands runs to 2,000 billion barrels—five times the world's known reserves in the United States. The oil is estimated to be worth $5,000 billion at current market prices, which comes to about $25,000 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Since we are dealing here with the last great known reserve of oil and other natural resources still in the public domain, I believe we must be very careful to see that it is developed in such a manner as to assure the best use of the resources and the maximum possible return from them for public use.

Considering the primitive condition of the technology regarding the recovery of oil from shale, and particularly considering that 30 percent of the oil shale land already is in private ownership, I can see no need to rush.

It would be a tragic thing if this complicated situation were mishandled in such a way as to permit monopolization of this great untapped natural resource belonging to all the people of this Nation.

AMERICANIZATION DAY IN JERSEY CITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great days in my native Jersey City, is the annual Americanization Day celebration which is sponsored by the Clinton E. Fisk Post, 132, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This year I was invited to be the principal speaker at the 36th annual celebration which the Jersey Journal, a very outstanding newspaper and a reliable indicator of the public pulse in our community, described as the "greatest ever."

To observe this event, some very distinguished representatives of the Armed Forces honored our city with appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all Members of this honorable body to the remarks made at the Americanization Day ceremonies which were held at Pershing Field, Jersey City, on Sunday, April 30, 1967, and I would like to express my eternal gratitude to the officers and members of this great veterans' group for their continuing support of this event and to the city fathers of the city of Jersey City who labored with the members of the Fisk Post to make this once again a great day for Jersey City.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks made by Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commanding general of the 78th Division, USAR, the grand marshal for the 36th annual Americanization Day parade, Brig. Gen. Edward B. Thorpe, New Jersey National Guard, and Capt. C. J. Schulz, USNR. The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN G. CASSIDY, COMMANDING GENERAL, NEW JERSEY 78TH DIVISION (TRAINING), U.S. ARMY RESERVE, GRAND MARSHAL FOR THE 36TH ANNUAL JERSEY CITY AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE, APRIL 30, 1967

"Our Country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right. But our Country, right or wrong."

I have been bestowed a great honor in being Grand Marshal for this 36th annual Jersey City Americanization Day Parade. It is one of the proudest moments of life.

As our Country is faced with so many problems in the world and in protecting innocent, defenseless peoples from Communist aggression, displays of loyalty and Americanism as witnessed here today most assuredly prove to the minority who dissent with the policies of President Johnson and our Country that our Country is right and that our President is right.

There can be no other way—But the American way and President Johnson's policies must be carried out if peace is to reign throughout the world. The war in Vietnam is a war all of us would rather not be involved with—But we are.

We are involved for good reason. We are in Vietnam to stop Communist aggression before it reaches the shores of the United States. We must hold the line somewhere.

Today we have an excellent opportunity for all of us to register emphatic support of President Johnson in the Vietnam war and complete contempt for those who would hamper the war effort and prolong the bloodshed.

The turnout of tremendous magnitude today will be an expression of utter condemnation of those with subnormal minds who would resort to such despicable acts as burning the American Flag and destroying their draft cards, and heaping abuse on official Washington. These same characters, a discredit to any nation, would be among the first, when involved in trying circumstances who would wrap around themselves the Constitution and "Old Glory" and cry for protection of their rights as citizens. Unmindful, however, are these lawbreakers, peaceniks, Vietniks to the precept that citizenship carries responsibility.

Today we will have an opportunity to imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children—the so-called old fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our Country was founded.

It comes at a time when these very basics of American democracy are menaced by misguided groups who would desecrate the Flag and utter traitorous phrases against our President and a valiant, generous country's institutions.

Our prayer today is to keep the flag flying high, we can't wave it too much. Our hope is to find a way to reach the blackened hearts of the "niks" of all varieties without resorting to force and try to make them realize that in no country can they enjoy the privileges made available to them here. In no country outside the United States would their reprehensible acts be tolerated.

Organizations such as the V.F.W. and American Legion, encourage individual participations in programs such as will be conducted today and add a personal protest against the alien "isms" that are responsible for the present unrest and are threatening world peace. We must rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our forefathers conceived 191 years ago. Thank you.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. EDWARD B. THORPE, NEW JERSEY ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH AMERICANIZATION DAY CELEBRATION, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 30, 1967

I wish to congratulate the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the citizens of Jersey City and Hudson County.

This annual program is most outstanding. I don't believe it is equaled anywhere in the U.S.A. In fact, it should be duplicated in every hamlet and city in the country.

I have come to the conclusion that there are too many people in this country who have forgotten the meaning of loyalty. Several events have taken place recently that prompt me to make this statement.

First, the disclosure by "Ramparts Magazine" that our Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was assisting clean-cut students to attend international student conferences. The purpose of this assistance was to send these clean-cut Americans abroad to improve our posture . . . to let the world know that the majority of our students were not long-haired Lotharios. They were not sent to these conferences as agents of the CIA.

Then a couple of weeks ago we saw these bathless-bearded, Communists and fellow travelers burn draft cards and the United States flag. In my opinion, each and every one of the participants in the march and the speakers are treading on seditious ground.

I was raised and taught to respect, love and understand that the U.S.A. is the greatest country ever founded. Stephen Decatur said "My country, may she always be in the right: but our country, right or wrong." I say "Our President, right or wrong, is always right when dealing with foreign powers in the time of war.

I compare the position of President Johnson with that of General Washington. He was surrounded by the enemy in red coats and the Tories in civilian dress. He always had to be on his guard: During the Campaign of 1777 one night he had to give the order, "Place only Americans on guard tonight." At Brandywine, Germantown, Chester and in and around Philadelphia the loyalists, the Tories and their fellow travelers were so numerous he couldn't rely on the Intelligence passed on to him because of the loyalists and the fellow travelers who were masquerading as patriots. He had his problems with the Congress, too. They delayed authorizing him 150 lbs that he urgently required for maintaining his Intelligence system.

Today, our President has a war on his hands—the Communists and their fellow travelers have organized a spy and sabotage system that is giving comfort to the enemy.

The bathless, bearded ones and a few misguided clergy are attempting to undermine every decent and patriotic principle thousands of men have died for. We can't permit these unpatriotic individuals to sabotage our President, our country, and comfort the enemy.

To the young folk, and there are many of you present, I want you to remember the rights and privileges you enjoy haven't been acquired on a silver platter. They have been earned by sweat and blood. This freedom is only temporary and it has to be earned and protected from generation to generation.

In Vietnam, we are not fighting an unorganized group of starved peasants, using bows, arrows and slingshots that these flag and draft card burners would like you to believe. The Vietcong are using weapons equal to those used by our ground forces, and they have the advantage of using guerrilla warfare tactics in the jungle. In the cities they are using modern explosives to sabotage public and private property and kill innocent citizens. They also have in their pos-

session the most sophisticated weapons of our time. These weapons are supplied by the Soviet bloc nations, including Soviet Russia and Red China.

Our pilots state that the flak around the V.C. industrial and railroad installations is greater than anything they encountered during World War II. They are also using 140mm missiles against our airports and troops. This weapon is produced in the Soviet Union and shipped to N. Vietnam.

I quote part of an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune. This is a statement of Nicolai Lenin. Quote: "On basis of my observations gathered during my years of exile: The cultured class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and America and the idealistic bourgeoisie should be regarded as deafmutes and treated accordingly. They will grant us credits which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armament industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers."

If Kosygin and his perverted constituents were sincere about peace and easing tensions, they could tear down the Berlin Wall and allow free passage between East and West Berlin. This would be a practical effort towards peace.

Don't forget, Khrushchev stated "he would bury us" and this is their ultimate objective.

I have faith and trust in our President Johnson; I have faith in the loyal Americans. After listening to Congressman Daniels, I am assured that our representatives in Congress have had about enough of this minor minority group of fellow travelers and their bearded patsies. I am further assured that the Congress will support our President and our men in uniform during the present crisis.

Thank you for your attention and wholesome acceptance of these remarks.

REMARKS FOR AMERICANIZATION DAY CEREMONY BY CAPT. C. J. SCHULZ, USNR

It is gratifying to see such a large and enthusiastic turnout for a patriotic event such as this. The Navy has always enjoyed the wonderful support given it by the people of Jersey City and it is pleased with the support it continues to receive during the present world crisis.

There are currently about 150,000 Navy men and Marines in and off Vietnam engaged in military operations ranging from the flying of sophisticated supersonic aircraft to sailing and searching wooden hulled junks—their design as ancient as Asia itself.

The ships, aircraft and men are conducting the most intensive air and combat operations in naval history. Many carrier pilots have flown more than 200 combat missions in this war, twice as many as most pilots flew in World War II. Navy-Marine Corps amphibious assaults from the sea, by helicoptor and landing craft along with combined United States and South Vietnamese counter insurgency operations are preventing men and material from reaching the Viet Cong by sea.

The problem of keeping 50 combat ships operating and 500 aircraft flying is considerable. The Navy directed military sea transportation service is engaged in a massive sealift operation carrying men and supplies to Vietnam—over 98% of all supplies going to Vietnam are carried by ships over the longest supply route of any war in history. Primitive harbors have had to be made into efficient modern ports.

The Navy in Vietnam is not just men fighting enemy forces, it is also Navy men and Marines building homes for orphans and helping children. It is doctors treating civilians and teaching medical students. It is Seabees teaching new methods and new tools. Navy men are helping the South Vietnamese help themselves toward a better life.

These men are working 16- to 18-hour days without complaint. General Westmoreland said just a few days ago that certain so-called peace demonstrations in the U.S. are undoubtedly the cause of loss of life among the valiant men of all services in southeast Asia. We in the Navy like to think that a patriotic demonstration such as this, may in the long run shorten this war and save lives of our fighting men.

On behalf of all Navy men and especially of the thousands of present and former Navy men from Jersey City, I want to convey our appreciation for your support. The freedom that the world seeks has a tremendous cost. It is pleasing to us to know that the people of Jersey City know that freedom is not free.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, during October 1966, there was created a permanent Judicial Conference of the Americas composed of the Chief Justices of the Western Hemisphere nations and at the same time there was adopted a Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas. The Judicial Conference is a nonprofit international organization with permanent headquarters in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Its creation grew out from a combined regional meeting of the American Bar Association and the biennial conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in San Juan, P.R., May 22–29, 1966. More than 800 lawyers and judges from 19 nations, including 500 from the United States, attended the meeting.

The purpose of the Judicial Conference of the Americas is to strengthen the independence of the judiciary, sponsor forums, conduct research, provide consultations on problems related to the administration of justice, improve judicial procedures, and stimulate the adoption and implementation of standards that dignify the judicial function.

The Judicial Conference aims to provide the means of informational exchange between the member countries to enhance the judicial function and to establish judicial schools and sponsor the exchange of magistrates and jurists in furtherance of the principles sanctioned in the Declaration of San Juan.

The Declaration of San Juan calls upon all governments in this hemisphere to recognize the independence of the judiciary as essential to "the very existence of any society that respects the rule of law."

The recent trip of President Lyndon B. Johnson to Punta del Este, which gave additional impetus to the efforts to integrate South America economically, makes this an opportune time to call the attention of our colleagues to the "Charter of San Juan." Because for economic integration to be a success, it will also be necessary for the South American countries to unify their judicial rules. The "Charter of San Juan" is a significant step in this direction.

The meeting of the American Bar Association and the holding of the biennial conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in San Juan last May, the establishment of the permanent Judicial Conference of the Americas, and the adoption of the "Charter of San Juan" is further evidence of Puerto Rico's role as an essential link between North and South America. This link which has heretofore proved valuable for economic and political communication now takes on a new meaning with the judicial function.

The "Charter of San Juan" follows:

We, the undersigned, assembled in plenary session of the Second Judicial Conference of the Americas in the city of San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, hereby adopt the following Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas.

First: A nonprofit association named Judicial Conference of the Americas, Incorporated, is hereby created with a permanent nature and for an indefinite time, pursuant to legislation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and which in its international relations shall be known as Judicial Conference of the Americas.

Second: Its headquarters shall be in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, with the main office temporarily located at 19 Betances Street, Hato Rey, San Juan; and Mr. Luis Negrón Fernández is hereby designated, for purposes of its registration, provisional representative or agent in charge thereof, who shall later be substituted as the Board of Directors may determine through resolution of the Conference itself.

Third: The Conference shall meet in San Juan, Puerto Rico, every two years, and shall hold sessions with the absolute majority of its members, but it may meet in any other country and at such other time as the Conference itself may decide by two-thirds of the votes of the members present.

Fourth: It shall promote, execute and carry out the following objectives or purposes:

1. To sponsor forums, studies, research and consultations among the members of the judiciary of the countries of the Continent on problems related to the Administration of Justice, so as to strengthen its independence as an indispensable requirement for the prevalence of the Rule of Law; to improve and simplify all administrative and judicial procedures; and to stimulate the adoption and application of standards that dignify the judicial function.

2. To provide means of information to bring within the reach of the members of the judiciary of the Continent, texts, jurisprudence, studies, and research in the fields of law, judicial administration and court operation, and advise them of the achievements and measures adopted in different countries, within their respective systems, aimed at enhancing the judicial function.

3. To develop an educational program through the establishment of Judicial Schools and sponsor the exchange of magistrates and jurists of the different countries, with a view to the coalescence of the principles sanctioned in the *Declaration of San Juan*, which is attached herewith as part of this Constitutive Charter.

Fifth: The members of the Judicial Conference of the Americas shall be: (1) the chief justices of the Supreme Courts of Justice of the countries which were represented in the First Judicial Conference of the Americas, held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, from the twenty-fourth to the twenty-sixth of May, nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and

in this second conference; (2) the signers of the Declaration of San Juan and of this document, as long as they form part of their respective courts.

The chief justices of the Supreme Courts of Justice of other countries in America may be members of the Judicial Conference of the Americas when the Conference so decides in a plenary session, by two-thirds of the votes of the members present. The Chief Justices of the Supreme Courts who are members of the Conference may delegate their representation to another magistrate of their own court.

Sixth: The signers of the Declaration of San Juan and of this Constitutive Charter who cease to be members of their respective courts shall continue belonging to this association on an Adviser-Member capacity.

Seventh: This corporation shall not have the power to issue capital stock.

Eight: The names and addresses of the incorporators are:

Hon. Pacifício Ledezma, Sucre, Bolivia.

Hon. Osvaldo Illanes Benitez, Santiago, Chile.

Hon. Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Bogotá, Colombia.

Hon. Evelio Ramírez Chavarri, San José, Costa Rica.

Hon. José Vicente Vilanova, San Salvador, El Salvador.

Hon. Fabio Murillo Díaz, Tegucigalpa, Honduras.

Hon. Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Managua, Nicaragua.

Hon. Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Panama City, Panamá.

Hon. Luis Martínez Miltos Asunción, Paraguay.

Hon. Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Lima, Jeru.

Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Hon. Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.

Hon. Hamlet Reyes, Montevideo, Uruguay.

Hon. José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Caracas, Venezuela.

Ninth: The Judicial Conference of the Americans shall have a Board of Directors composed of a president, a vice-president, a secretary, and a treasurer, which Board, for its first term of office, is elected unanimously as follows:

Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, President.

Hon. Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Vice President.

Hon. José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Secretary.

Hon. Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Treasurer.

The Board shall adopt its resolutions by a majority of its members.

The Board shall have, furthermore, an assistant secretary and an assistant treasurer, having been unanimously elected as such the Hon. José Vicente Vilanova, assistant secretary, and Hon. Evelio Ramírez, assistant treasurer, who shall act as substitutes for the secretary and treasurer whenever these can not attend a meeting.

The members of the Board of Directors shall hold office for a term of two years and until their succesors are elected and qualify.

Given in San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, this twenty-eighth day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

Pacífico Ledezma, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Bolivia.

Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Chile.

Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Colombia.

Evelio Ramírez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Costa Rica.

José Vicente Vilanova, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of El Salvador.

Fabio Murillo Díaz, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Honduras.

Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Nicaragua.

Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Panama.

Luis Martínez Miltos, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Paraguay.

Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Peru.

Luis Negrón Fernández, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Dominican Republic.

Hamlet Reyes, Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice of Uruguay.

José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Venezuela.

JURAT

We, the Justices Pacífico Ledezma, Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Evelio Ramírez, José Vicente Vilanova, Fabio Murillo Díaz, Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Luis Martínez Miltos, Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Luis Negrón Fernández, Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Hamlet Reyes and José G. Sarmiento Núñez, being duly sworn, hereby depose: that we are of full age, married, except the one named above in third order, all lawyers, and residents, respectively, of Sucre, Bolivia; Santiago, Chile; Bogotá, Colombia; San José, Costa Rica; San Salvador, El Salvador; Tegucigalpa, Honduras; Managua, Nicaragua; Panama City, Panamá; Asunción, Paraguay; Lima, Perú; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; Montevideo, Uruguay, and Caracas, Venezuela, being the subscribing incorporators of the preceding Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas, ratifying our agreement with the same and acknowledging the truth of the facts herein stated, all of which are of our own and personal knowledge.

AFFIDAVIT NUMBER 8729

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Justices Pacífio Ledezma, Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Evelio Ramírez, José Vicente Vilanova, Fabio Murillo Díaz, Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Luis Martínez Miltos, Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Luis Negrón Fernández, Manuel R. Riuz Tejada, Hamlet Reyes and José G. Sarmiento Núñez, of the personal circumstances above stated, all of whom I personally know, this twenty-eighth day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-six, in San Juan de Puerto Rico. I attest.

FELIX OCHOTECO,
Notary.

POLISH CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D.C., PRESENTS POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Polish Club of Washington, D.C., Group 848 of the Polish National Alliance, presented a program commemorating the signing of the Polish Constitution in 1791 at the Franciscan Monastery in Washington, D.C. I wish to hereby submit excerpts of remarks made in my address commemorating this great event inaugurating this great milestone in Poland's long fight for freedom and self-government. The program was under the chairmanship of Tadeusz Drweski, president of the Polish Club of Washington.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN MADDEN

Mr. Chairman, I am, indeed, glad to participate in the ceremonies today commemorating the historic Constitution of the Polish nation which was signed in 1791 and inaugurated the beginning of what was then thought to be liberty, freedom and self-government for the people of Poland. The world did not know at that time that Poland would, in a short time, again be enslaved by powerful neighbor nations. During the intervening years up to the present day, the people of Poland have consistently fought for freedom and self-government. Over the generations the desire for liberty and freedom has never diminished in the minds and the hearts of Polish people whether they are living in the mother country or in other lands throughout the world.

Older people in the audience vividly remember the days after World War I when Woodrow Wilson was making his fight for the League of Nations. At that time Poland, for the first time in generations, was again given a free government and national identity. To my mind one of the darkest periods of world history was the unfortunate opposition and successful fight made by opponents of Wilson's League of Nations in the United States Senate during the early 1920's. When our nation refused to join other nations of the world in this great effort to insure world peace, many suspected then the League of Nations would fail. Had the Number One nation, the United States, participated, there is no doubt in my mind that the League of Nations would have succeeded to outlaw future international wars.

We must remember that in those days the international communist conspiracy had not been organized and the communist threat was merely in the minds of a few world insurrectionists and fanatics. Had we joined the League of Nations, Hitler, Mussolini and and Japanese war lords could not have constructed the gigantic war machines over the years during the late 20's and 1930's. This great opportunity for future world peace was destroyed by reason of party politics in the election of 1920. The Congress elected in that year rejected participation in an organization to protect the future peace of the world.

Poland again received independence and self-government after World War I and in the twenty years of the Polish Republic great progress in government organization was accomplished. No nation in the history of the world succeeded in such a short time in establishing national educational, industrial, financial programs, transportation, highways, and all the modern improvements and progress which many older nations had not established. The aggression of the Soviets and Hitler destroyed again the hopes of a free Polish nation in World War II.

The history of Poland is the history of a heroic people, a people who peacefully welded together into a nation singularly united in language and customs, an area stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north, across the verdant plains, to the Black Sea in the south.

The first Poles arrived in America at Jamestown in 1608. Polish generals were heroes of our own Revolution. Almost 900,000 Polish-Americans served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

And so it has gone, down through the centuries—in Poland or in the new homelands to which they went seeking refuge and freedom, the Polish people have never lost that indomitable spirit that has enabled them to give so much to human achievement.

The Polish Constitution, 176 years old May 3, 1967, is not merely a document in history's archives. It is a vital symbol of assurance that one day Poland will again stand in full freedom and independence. Here in this nation where we so fully reap the blessings of freedom, we must ever be prepared to support freedom.

It is in fitting discharge of that sacred responsibility that we dedicate this celebration of Polish Constitution Day to the abiding faith of the Polish people in the ultimate freedom of man.

THE VIETNAM WEEK DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a 55-page report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week"—April 8 to 15, 1967. The timeliness of this report is indisputable in that it informed the Members of Congress and the American people, a full 2 weeks in advance, of the now notorious April 15 demonstrations in New York and San Francisco.

The committee, which I have the honor to chair, had been monitoring the development of these demonstrations for several months, and the report, carefully compiled and thoroughly documented, proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that Communists were the prime movers behind them.

Today, as a followup to that report, I would like to bring to the attention of the House certain significant facts about the Vietnam Week demonstrations.

The first thing I would like to point out is that both Radio Hanoi and Radio Moscow publicized the April 15 demonstrations for days before they took place. In addition, organizers of Vietnam Week sent a telegram to the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, telling him of their plans to organize a "massive drive of the American people" in opposition to the U.S. Government's effort to halt his aggression against South Vietnam.

Pham Van Dong, the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, in his reply to the telegram, thanked the organizers of Vietnam Week for the "valuable support" they were giving to his country.

No one in this House, I am sure, and no one in this country will be surprised by this.

The Committee on Un-American Activities stated in its report that the global Communist propaganda apparatus would capitalize in every way possible on Vietnam Week and the April 15 demonstrations. It further stated that they would give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam, and that among non-Communists throughout the world, it would tend to create the false impression that a truly large segment of the American people oppose the war in Vietnam.

Communist Premier Pham Van Dong's telegram is partial evidence of the accuracy of this prediction. Its accuracy has also been corroborated by Radio Moscow, Radio Peking, Radio Hanoi, and the official propaganda agencies of other Communist capitals.

They filled the air waves with accounts, most of them highly exaggerated, of the April 15 demonstrations. Here are just a few examples:

Radio Hanoi:

The stirring demonstrations on 15 April showed the high indignation of broad masses of the American people at the wide differences between the words and deeds of Johnson . . .

Padding the attendance figures by a few hundred thousand, Hanoi continued:

500,000 Americans of all walks of life held high portraits of Ho Chi Minh and flags of the NFLSV . . .

It is important to note that these broadcasts were in English and can be easily picked up by our troops in Vietnam.

Hanoi went on:

Like a thunderbolt, the demonstrations once again exposed the unjust, barbarous, and inhuman character of the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, smashing the peace-negotiation fraud and all other intrigues of the Johnson clique against the American people and other peoples of the world . . .

Moscow Radio claimed it was "impossible to estimate precisely" the number of those who took part in the "historic" New York demonstration, but that "perhaps as many as a half a million" marched "for an end to the dirty war in Vietnam."

It is interesting to note that demonstrations against the U.S. role in Vietnam were also staged in other major cities of the world on the same day. They were, however, pitifully small. Police in Mexico City quickly broke up a small demonstration of a dozen antiwar agitators about a block from the U.S. Embassy. Only about 100 demonstrators turned out in Paris, carrying a statue of Thomas Paine and banners demanding U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam. In Amsterdam, only 700 agitators could be induced to demonstrate. Demonstrators in London lunged at Prime Minister Harold Wilson and denounced him as a puppet of the United States. Eight of them were jailed. Thirty London marchers tramped around the U.S. Embassy and shouted "Hands off Vietnam." Five thousand gathered in Vancouver, British Columbia, to hear the United States berated. In Tokyo, about 500 members of the Japanese "Peace for Vietnam Committee" marched through the Ginza area carrying signs demanding that the war be brought to an end.

Communist propagandists grossly exaggerated the number of persons who took part in all these demonstrations. Hanoi Radio reported, for example, that April 15 would go down in history as a day "of seething struggle of millions of people in the world against Johnson's war in Vietnam."

If your arithmetic is the same as mine, however, total worldwide participation in the April 15th anti-Vietnam war demonstrations was only about 200,000 people. This fact alone should give us all cause to do some thinking.

Is world opinion really against American policy in Vietnam as much as the Communists—and some of our ultra-liberal brethren—would have us believe? Apparently not. In fact, if the April 15 demonstrations are any criteria at all, just the opposite would appear to be true; namely, that the overwhelming majority of peoples throughout the world somehow see the situation in Vietnam as it truly exists.

Now, in contrast to the Communist propaganda claims, what are the facts about the April 15 demonstrations in this country?

We might as well face the truth that the Communists succeeded in one of their aims—that of staging the largest demonstrations that have ever been held in this country against the war in Vietnam.

The other side of the coin, however, is that they failed miserably in another respect. Their original plan and hope was to turn out 1,000,000 demonstrators—500,000 in New York City and the same number in San Francisco.

THE NEW YORK DEMONSTRATION

The Communist Party has claimed that more than a half million people took part in the New York demonstration. The Spring Mobilization Committee, the technical sponsor of the affair, has claimed that 300,000 to 400,000 persons paraded in New York and that there were 125,000 people in the United Nations Plaza rally which climaxed the march.

Dr. Martin Luther King, the featured speaker at the rally, has claimed that he spoke to 100,000 to 125,000 persons who were crowded into the U.N. Plaza and that 300,000 to 400,000 people turned out for the New York demonstration.

But the truth about the attendance at the New York demonstration is a far cry from these figures.

Mathematical computations made by the New York City Police Department, prove that it was a physical impossibility for more than 29,000 people to have been in the U.N. Plaza at the time of the rally. Official police estimates indicate that only 100,000 to 125,000 took part in the New York march.

Considering the fact that the New York metropolitan area alone has a population of almost 11,000,000, and the fact that demonstrators were imported for the New York rally from major population areas as far west as Minneapolis, the turnout was exceedingly small.

Communists of all varieties were prominent in the demonstration, although they by no means comprised a majority of the participants.

A contingent of the Moscow-controlled Communist Party, USA, marched openly behind a large red and white banner with the name of the party emblazoned on it. It was led by party boss Gus Hall, and included many top officials of Moscow's fifth column in the United States. The party has since gloated over the fact that it was able to demonstrate openly for the first time since 1949.

New York District Chairman Gil Green led the delegation in singing the traditional Communist revolutionary song, the "Internationale."

Hours before the parade started, the Communist Party had set up a table at the assembly point in Central Park for the purpose of distributing literature, including 20,000 copies of its official newspaper, The Worker. This issue of The

Worker, published just before the New York rally, gave complete information on assembly points for the march and the order of the march—so that every party member would know just where to go.

The Communist Party has issued a statement proclaiming "a sense of pride and joy" in the demonstrations and claiming that, through them:

> A great deal has been gained. . . . The opposition to the war . . . is more vocal than ever.

Gus Hall has boasted that the New York and San Francisco demonstrations were mass actions that had "few precedents in the history of the world progressive movement," and that they comprised "a qualitative leap" in the U.S. peace movement.

The Communist Party's youth group, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, also marched openly in the demonstration. Its units carried signs with slogans spelling out the party line. One read "Youth Unite—Resist the Draft."

The Socialist Workers Party—SWP—the Trotskyist Communist organization, also had a literature table set up at the parade assembly point in Central Park. The SWP claims that it had a "full gamut of radical literature" available for the demonstration and distributed most of it free; also, that it sold over 5,000 copies of its newspaper, the Militant, and about 1,200 copies of Young Socialist, the magazine of its youth section, the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA.

SWP contingents in the parade included delegations from Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Detroit, Boston, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis. Young Socialist Alliance contingents represented YSA chapters in Chicago, New York, Atlanta, Washington, D.C., Boston, and Minneapolis, and also various colleges and universities including Antioch College, University of Wisconsin, Queens College, Columbia University, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Other Communist groups which participated in the demonstration in New York were the Spartacist League—a Trotskyist offshoot—Youth Against War and Fascism, and the ultrarevolutionary Progressive Labor Party.

A group called the Ad Hoc Committee for a Revolutionary Contingent also took an active interest in the demonstration by stating that its members would be "marching in support of national liberation movements throughout the world." A leaflet distributed by the group openly called for the support of a Communist "victory" in Vietnam. Listed among those who endorsed this new organization were M. S. Arnoni, Maxwell Geismar, John Gerassi, Allen Krebs, Conrad Lynn, Russell Stetler, Paul Sweezy, Walter D. Teague III, the Spartacist League—New York District—Students for a Democratic Society—Free School of New York Chapter—and the U.S. Committee To Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

The U.S. Committee To Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam built a 30-foot cardboard tower in Central Park on which its members attached flags of the Communist Vietcong. Vietcong flags were displayed throughout the parade and demonstration.

The Black United Action Front which had distributed flyers promoting the April 15 march in New York, also took part in it. This flyer referred to President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara as "murderers."

"Wake up black people," the flyer urged and asked in reference to Watts and Vietnam, "What the hell are we doing there?" The Black United Action Front, formerly known as BAND—Blacks Against Negative Dying—is composed of elements of the Progressive Labor Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and black nationalist groups.

An interesting sidelight occurred on the day before the New York demonstration. Michael Laski, embittered Communist revolutionary and national secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Marxist-Leninist—stated in a press interview that the "revisionist Communist Party in connection with the Socialist Workers Party control and dominate this particular protest."

Laski's militant organization is ideologically opposed to the Communist Party, USA and the Socialist Workers Party because it feels that the CPUSA and the SWP are not true Marxist revolutionary organizations.

The Spring Mobilization Committee distributed a list of official slogans for use in making signs for the parade and rally. The Communist Party expressed pleasure that "more militant" slogans were not banned, as they had been in some past demonstrations.

Some of the approved slogans: "Stop the Bombing," "End the Draft—Let Young Men Live," "Children Are Not Born To Burn," "No Vietnamese Ever Called Me Nigger," "Free the Fort Hood Three," "Cease Fire Now—Negotiate With the NLF."

Many groups and individuals, ignoring the approval slogans, marched with placards bearing far more militant and extremist declarations, including "L.B.J.: The Penalty for Murder is Death," "L.B.J.: Go to Hell," "Pale Face President Speaks With Forked Tongue," "Hell No, We Won't Go," "Hey, L.B.J., How Many Kids Did You Kill Today?" Other slogans used were too obscene to repeat.

As has been widely reported in the press and commented on at length here on the floor of the House, an American flag was burned in Central Park by some of the demonstrators. Draft cards were also burned. Swastikas were placed over a reproduction of the American flag.

Speakers at the U.N. Plaza rally in New York City were:

Fritz Weaver, actor, who served as master of ceremonies.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, cochairman, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, pastor, Holy Rosary Parish, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mad Bear Anderson, American Indian.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Floyd McKissick, national director, Congress of Racial Equality.

Stokely Carmichael, chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Nick Egleson, president, Students for a Democratic Society.

Dave Dellinger, editor, Liberation magazine.

William F. Pepper, executive director, National Conference for New Politics.

Prof. Howard Zinn, professor of government, Boston University.

Cleveland Robinson, secretary-treasurer, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Workers Union, District 65, AFL-CIO; president, Negro American Labor Council.

Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, founder, Women Strike for Peace.

Rabbi Michael Robinson, New York City, chairman of the Jewish Peace Fellowship.

Linus Pauling.

Rev. James Bevel, national director, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Entertainment was provided by Pete Seeger, an identified member of the Communist Party, and also by folksingers Tom Paxton, Phil Ochs, Peter Paul and Mary, and the Freedom Singers.

A former official of the progressive Labor Party, Phillip Abbott Luce, witnessed the April 15 demonstration in New York and has written a detailed description of the event which he states was openly controlled by the Communists. Luce said in part:

> The marchers themselves were an odd lot. Communists, ultra-leftists, left liberals, sincere pacifists and hippies dominated the street. With that many people it was naturally impossible to note all the Communists, but I did see such people as Levi Laub, Jeff Gordon and Rick Rhoads from Progressive Labor. Laub was pushing a baby carriage full of copies of "Challenge," the P.L. newspaper . . . The protestors met in Central Park's Sheep Meadow before they were led down the parade route by the Communist Judas goats. Most of the demonstrators looked like characters out of the "Three Penny Opera" . . .

THE SAN FRANCISCO DEMONSTRATION

The "mobilization" of the Vietnam war protesters in San Francisco was an even greater failure than the New York demonstration, from the viewpoint of the number and the kind of people who took part in it. As previously indicated, the aim of the organizers was a turnout of 500,000 people. They were to pour into the San Francisco area from all States west of the Mississippi River.

Actually, only about 23,000 persons took part in the San Francisco march and only about 60,000 assembled in the city's Kezar Stadium for what was ballyhooed in advance to be a mammoth turnout of American citizens protesting against their Government. The marchers represented less than one-twentieth of those expected to attend the demonstration and, though they came from States all over the West, represented less than one five-hundredths of the population of Metropolitan San Francisco.

It is significant, too, that to get the above number of demonstrators, they had to rely heavily on the west coast beatnik element and the tambourine and bongo drum-playing "hippies" from San

Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district, the home of the so-called love generation.

Steve Murdock, columnist for the Communist Party's west coast newspaper, the People's World, had to confess after the demonstration that—

The people connected with the mobilization who threw around loose and enormous figures about the number of participants did their cause no service.

The slogans on the placards carried by the San Francisco marchers and those who took part in the rally made it clear that this was not an assembly of genuine, conscientious pacifists inspired by love of their fellow man. One sign read: "Where is Oswald now that we need him?" Another in an obvious reference to the vicious and disgraceful play, "MacBird," read: "Who killed Kennedy?"

Still another promoted the same theme as a placard in the New York demonstration which I have mentioned. A black Nazi swastika was superimposed on a cardboard replica of the American flag. The theme that the United States is a Nazi-like country has long been promoted by the Communist Party.

Stokely Carmichael, the radical leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, sent a telegram which was read to the gathering at the Kezar Stadium. In it, he accused the United States of genocide in Vietnam.

Miss Kipp Dawson, Trotskyist director of the West Coast Spring Mobilization Committee, referred in her speech to "one section of American youth who aren't with us in the stadium today."

They are—

She added—

the American youth who have been drafted to fight in Vietnam.

She then told her audience—

But because they are not with us today, we cannot assume—and indeed we must not assume—that they are against us.

She claimed that the men "who have to fight this war in Vietnam are getting sick of it."

I doubt that even her listeners believed these words. Just a few days ago, here in this House, General Westmoreland, who is certainly far more deserving of belief, informed the Congress and the Nation that the "gallant American fighting men in Vietnam understand the conflict and their complex roles as fighters and builders." Further, he added, "They believe in what they are doing."

Statistics recently released on the number of defectors from the Vietcong suggest, I would say, that if anyone fighting the war in Vietnam is getting sick of it, it is the Communist Vietcong, rather than our own troops. Eleven thousand Vietcong defected in 1965, 20,000 in 1966, and in the first 3 months of 1967 alone, nearly 11,000 more.

Miss Dawson, making use of a shopworn Communist slogan, referred to the U.S. effort in Vietnam as a "dirty war."

I agree with her. It is a dirty war, but not in the way she implied.

The Communist Vietcong, in a veritable reign of terror, have, as General Westmoreland pointed out, killed or kidnapped 53,000 teachers, clergymen, civil servants, and elected officials in South Vietnam during the last decade. They have, in addition, inflicted unspeakable atrocities on thousands upon thousands of the South Vietnamese people, including women and children.

Yes; it is a dirty war in Vietnam, but we can be proud of the fact that the dirt is not on our hands or those of our fighting men. The dirt, the filth, and the blood are on the hands of the Communists there—and it rubs off on the hands of all those in this country who demonstrate to aid those Communists.

Speakers who addressed the Kezar Stadium rally included:

Edward Keating, publisher of Ramparts magazine, rally chairman and west coast chairman, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Julian Bond, Georgia legislator.

Robert Vaughn, TV actor.

Paul Schrade, western regional director, United Automobile Workers, AFL-CIO.

Robert Scheer, managing editor, Ramparts magazine.

Mrs. Martin Luther King, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Rabbi Abraham Feinberg of Toronto, who recently made a trip to North Vietnam.

Eldridge Cleaver, Bay Area chairman, organization of Afro-American Unity.

Kipp Dawson, west coast executive director, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Elijah Turner, "peace" candidate for city council in Oakland, Calif.

David Harris, recent student body president, Stanford University.

Gerald Hill, president, California Democratic Council.

Mrs. Grace Nora Newman, sister of Dennis Mora—one of "Fort Hood Three" GI's who refused to fight in Vietnam—also a recent traveler to North Vietnam.

Charles Duarte, president, Local 6, International Longshoremens' and Warehousemens' Union.

John Burton, California State assemblyman.

Willie Brown, California State assemblyman.

Rev. Robert McAfee Brown, theologian, Stanford University.

Folksingers Judy Collins and Melvina Reynolds, an identified Communist Party member, provided entertainment.

STUDENT VIETNAM WEEK ACTIVITIES

When I revealed last January 28 that the Communists, through Vietnam Week, were instituting a crash program to sabotage U.S. policy in Vietnam and were going to rely heavily on American students for assistance, I expressed the conviction that, despite the Communists' efforts, the overwhelming majority of students in this country would demonstrate the good sense and loyalty they have consistently demonstrated in the past and would refuse to be taken in by the cynical manipulators of the Vietnam Week operation.

I am glad to say that I was correct in my judgment. It was originally hoped that one of the features of Vietnam Week would be a nationwide student strike against the war in Vietnam. That project had to be scuttled. It was then hoped by the Communists that they would at least be able to call student strikes on a half dozen or so key university campuses.

Actually, throughout all of Vietnam Week, there was not a student strike at a single college or university. Moreever, the whole student-campus aspect of Vietnam Week was an even greater flop than the New York and San Francisco demonstrations. Few of the student and campus activities originally conceived actually took place and of those that did, student support for them was negligible.

In conclusion, I would make the following observations about Vietnam Week.

Basically, it was a failure because it fell far short of the number of persons the Communist organizers had hoped to induce to demonstrate against our Government.

At the same time, it was a disturbing indication of the number of Communists, pro-Communists, and fellow travelers in this country and the extent to which they can induce significant numbers of Americans to do their will. There is reason for pause when Communist elements, whose operations have been revealed in advance, can still mobilize about 185,000 Americans for a demonstration that is designed to discredit this country and weaken one of the most important elements of its foreign policy.

The Communist effort, in Vietnam Week, to make the Vietnam war a racial issue was a failure. Despite the efforts of the Communists behind the operation, and the leadership and support of Martin Luther King and Mrs. King, Stokely Carmichael, Floyd McKissick, James Bevel, and others, Negro attendance—as was generally noted by the press—was proportionately very, very small; even negligible. Moreover, it was primarily composed of Black Nationalist and leftist elements who, today as always, represent a tiny minority of Negroes in this country.

It is my belief that the obvious lack of general Negro support for the Vietnam Week demonstrations raises serious questions about the alleged "leadership" of some of the persons I have named.

I am also convinced that the overall result of the Vietnam Week demonstrations has been a pro-American "backlash." The American people have never been impressed—they never will be—by Communists, fellow travelers, and a motley collection of unkempt hippies and beatniks, cowardly draft-card burners, treasonous flag burners, and the ilk that will unite with them.

The citizens of this country, regardless of race or nationality, have been revolted and disgusted by what took place during the Vietnam Week demonstrations, and by the misfits of our society who comprised the majority taking part in them.

The American people and peoples of the world have not been fooled. Secretary of State Dean Rusk himself has made a statement which, in conjunction with the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, has served to enlighten the American people about who is primarily responsible for these

demonstrations. In response to a question about them, Mr. Rusk stated on the April 16 "Meet the Press" TV program:

> I have no doubt at all that the Communist apparatus is very busy indeed in these operations all over the world and in our own country, but I do not mean to say by that that all those who have objections to the war in Vietnam are Communists. But the worldwide Communist movement is working very hard on this.

General Westmoreland has referred bluntly to the "unpatriotic acts here at home" which are paid for with American lives in Vietnam. In his address to the Congress, his views corresponded with the finding of the Committee on Un-American Activities that these demonstrations give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam. He stated:

> But I am mindful that the military war in South Vietnam is, from the enemy's point of view, only part of a protracted and carefully coordinated attack, waged in the international arena. Regrettably, I see signs of enemy success in that world arena which he cannot match on the battlefield. He does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our brave allies.

A BILL TO PERMIT OUR COUNTRY TO DEAL MORE INTELLIGENTLY WITH THE WORLDWIDE GROWTH OF POPULATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of years ago I suggested that if Mark Twain had the privileges of this floor it is probable he would say: "Population is something everybody does something about but nobody talks about." Today the population explosion is much more freely discussed and, hopefully, Congress will provide the leadership to increase our knowledge and concern with the consequences of overly rapid population growth.

Under our most recent rules, it is now possible for Members to join in cosponsorship of resolutions and bills. I am pleased that a number of my colleagues join with me in cosponsoring legislation to deal with the world population explosion. We thus join in the May 3 action taken by Senator GRUENING and 13 of his senatorial colleagues who introduced S. 1676, commonly referred to as the "population bill." I commend to you the detailed statement of introductory remarks, the background material provided by the Bureau of the Budget, the bill itself and the long list of distinguished experts who have testified at the various hearings on this topic. All of this information is a part of Senator GRUENING's statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3.

On April 1, 1965, I had the privilege of being the initial sponsor of similar legislation in the House. Today, I am pleased that 10 of my colleagues have joined with me in cosponsorship.

BACKGROUND FACTS

It took the earth millions of years to acquire, by the time of Christ, a population of one-fourth billion. It took until 1830 for the world's population to reach 1 billion. But in only 100 years we passed the 2 billion mark. In less than 35 years the population reached 3 billion. And, incredibly, the fourth billion will be here in but 15 more years.

If present rates are unchecked, it will take only a 35-year span to add the next billion to our present 3 billion. And it will take less than 35 years after that for the 6 billion to double to 12 billion. An increase of 1 billion—due by 1980—is equal to the total present population of all of North and South America plus all 55 nations in Europe.

Each year the United States adds more than 3 million to its population, enough to fill six brandnew cities the size of Arizona's largest city, Phoenix. Providing the additional schools, streets, sewers, post offices, and all the other facilities needed by modern society is a heavy and expensive burden.

By the year 2000 the United States will increase its population from 198 million to 340 million. Of these, 100 million will be children who need schools, playgrounds, library facilities, and so forth. And 30 million will be "senior citizens" with medical care and other problems which become acute as years advance.

Population growth, like compound interest, is self-accelerating; that is, the more people there are the greater the population growth, even though the rate of growth remains the same. When you are talking about billions of people the results of doubling are staggering.

Men and women everywhere are awakening to the possibilities of a decent life and are insisting on improvements in their standard of living. Yet the population explosion threatens to wipe out most of the benefits of economic growth—and our foreign aid program—in the underdeveloped parts of the world. For example, a key democratic nation in Asia, attempting to rise by its bootstraps several years ago, successfully completed a 5-year program by increasing its economic output 12 percent. During this same period the population of this Nation increased 15 percent and the net living standards are now worse than before.

WHY A POPULATION EXPLOSION NOW?

What caused population growth to reach such startling rates in this era? The answer is found in two words: medical science. Humans are not suddenly more fertile; our reproduction potential has not changed. In any given year the increase or decrease in population is simply the number of births minus the number of deaths.

In North America and Western Europe birth and death rates have declined more or less proportionately. But medical science has upset this pattern in the underdeveloped parts of the world. It has caused a precipitous decline in the death rates while birth rates have remained constant. The result is galloping population growth.

Never before in history has it been possible to introduce an extensive program of death control so quickly in any given area of the world. Armed with miracle drugs, insecticides, and extensive knowledge of sanitation and nutrition, scientists almost overnight can drastically curtail the rate of dying. Just since World War II, for example, death rates have been reduced more than one-third in such places as India and Malaya. In Ceylon the spraying of DDT reduced the death rate by 40 percent within a single year.

Birth rates are higher in the underdeveloped areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa—where two-thirds of all the world's people live. Where birth rates are high, there are high proportions of youth. As infant mortality has declined, family burdens have increased. And the children, when they become adults and parents, face the same prospect of endless toil just to acquire the barest of essentials.

POPULATION A NONPARTISAN ISSUE

While the wonders of medical science have brought on this problem, doctors are also concerned with its solution. We are now within sight of having, if indeed we do not already have, safe, reliable drugs and other medical means to make it possible for mankind, if it will, to regulate its growth. However, this is a matter for decision by individual citizens, community leaders, and people acting through their governments all over the world. Fortunately, the population problem is not a partisan political issue in this country.

Shortly before his death, President Kennedy said:

> We should know more and do more about the whole reproductive cycle, and this information should be available to the world.

Former President Eisenhower commented several years ago that—

> The time has come when we must take into account the effect of the population explosion on our mutual assistance system. Unless we do, it may smother the economic progress of many nations.

After his Asian tour of several years ago, Richard Nixon said he had observed poverty "worse than I have ever dreamed existed" and recommended that the United States give assistance to nations requesting help on population matters.

President Johnson, in his January 10, 1967, state of the Union address said:

> Next to the pursuit of peace, the really great challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. That race tonight is being lost. The time for rhetoric has clearly passed. The time for concerted action is here, and we must get on with the job.

This topic is, without doubt, one of those rare subjects upon which a great many leaders with widely differing political views wholeheartedly agree.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION

Central to any consideration of the population problem is the religious ques-

tion, and particularly the position of the Roman Catholic Church on birth control. It should be noted, however, that the church does not condemn birth control, but is concerned with the methods of control.

A national survey of several years ago found that at least 30 percent of Catholic couples use birth control methods condemned by the church. And a heavy majority of those polled hoped that their church would change its attitude toward birth control. It should be remembered that of the 11 countries of the world with the lowest birth rates five are predominantly Catholic: Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Luxembourg.

Pope Paul VI, in his encyclical "Populorum Progresso," released on March 28 of this year, indicated that government has the right to concern itself with birth control and that, officially, the government has a legitimate interest in the field. In this action, the head of the Catholic Church has taken a most important step forward in helping meet the population problems of the world. This legislation is in the spirit of Pope Paul's recognition of government responsibility and is a genuine step in the evaluation of moral and scientific aspects of control.

IT IS TIME TO ACT

When 6 or 8 billion people are shoved into the already overcrowded cities and slums of this planet, breathing polluted air and fighting for an insufficient supply of land, water, and other natural resources, then wars, revolutions and global strife are inevitable. And even if through science we manage to provide enough basic essentials for everyone we would likely do so only by sacrificing improvement of society's institutions for the sake of providing bare minimums. I believe wholeheartedly that the problems of overpopulation on this planet can be solved. But the time to begin was yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, although there is wide agreement that something should be done about the worldwide population explosion, few have objective data or complete information on which to base decisions. This legislation will provide the mechanisms within the executive branch to obtain information, share ideas, and determine appropriate actions. Basically, this legislation seeks to establish channels of communication and areas of responsibility for demographic studies and action.

One of the bill's most important features is the provision for a White House Conference on Population to be held in January of 1968. Basic to the success of a White House conference are the results and suggestions stemming from State-level conferences prior to the national meeting. The legislation provides for grants to States to assist in planning and conducting State conferences on population prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations to the White House conference.

For the reasons cited, Mr. Speaker, I now join with my distinguished colleagues in introducing this legislation designed to permit our country to deal more intelligently with the worldwide growth of population.

AUTHORIZATION OF NAVAL NUCLEAR-POWERED WARSHIPS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider the fiscal year 1968 Defense authorization bill tomorrow. I want to update my past reports to the Congress on the nuclear navy and I would like to again this year bring some facts concerning the authorization of nuclear propelled naval warships in the bill to the attention of my colleagues.

In my capacity as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have delved deeply into the factors involved in the value of nuclear propulsion for warships. As you all know, the Joint Committee has studied and analyzed the question of nuclear propulsion for submarines and surface warships for many years. This intensive review was required before the committee could recommend to Congress the research and development effort necessary to build a nuclear Navy "second to none."

Throughout the years our reviews indicated the research and development work was justified and throughout the years the Congress agreed with the Joint Committee's recommendations and annually authorized funds for this purpose. Time has proven the value of our actions. The United States is preeminent in the technology of nuclear propulsion for warships. The utilization of nuclear propulsion in all of our new submarines has given this country an unequaled defense force. Unfortunately thus far we have not taken the same advantage of our position of technological leadership by utilizing nuclear propulsion in our new surface warships. The bill we are to consider tomorrow takes some important steps in respect to nuclear propulsion for surface warships. I would like to review some of the facts concerning this item so that they will be fresh in our minds when we consider the Defense authorization bill tomorrow.

The Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1968 includes three nuclear attack submarines, and authorization for procurement of long leadtime items for one nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier requested by the Department of Defense. It also substitutes two nuclear-powered frigates in place of two nonnuclear-powered destroyers requested by the Department of Defense. Further, the authorization bill includes funds for performing the contract definition of a new class major fleet escort called the DXG; the Armed Services Committee report contains language which prohibits using any of these funds for the design of any major fleet escorts not powered with a naval nuclear propulsion plant—a step which I also endorse.

The aircraft carrier continues to be one of our prime naval attack weapons. It provides a movable platform from which to launch airplanes wherever they may be needed. It is a floating airbase complete with maintenance and repair facilities. It has proved to be a vital asset in support of our military activities in Vietnam. The tremendous problems and expense of building up land airbases in Vietnam continue to demonstrate the great advantages of the aircraft carrier concept.

However, to fully exploit the full potential of the carrier task group, everything possible must be done to minimize the logistic support required to sustain the ships in a combat environment. Elimination of the requirement for a continuous supply of propulsion fuel makes nuclear-powered ships valuable. This became abundantly clear to the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when we studied this problem in 1963 and prepared our report on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels. See the December 1963 Joint Committee report entitled "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels."

The Department of Defense has finally come to realize this, in the case of aircraft carriers—after Congress repeatedly pointed it out. They still have not recognized this important truth in the case of ships built to escort nuclear carriers.

We must be able to operate attack carrier task forces anywhere on short notice. Nuclear propulsion in our naval striking forces will greatly enhance our capability to operate our carrier task forces throughout the oceans of the world—without the entangling logistic support problems created by conventional fuel requirements and free from the constant changes in the worldwide political climate.

Our one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Enterprise*, which is now deployed for the second time to Vietnam, has set record after record since she joined the fleet 5 years ago. She has proven so effective in battle in Vietnam that the Secretary of Defense requested a new nuclear-powered attack carrier in last year's bill and has told Congress that he intends to ask for one more next year and another in a future year.

At least four major fleet escort ships—destroyers or frigates—are assigned to each aircraft carrier. These escorts are designed to operate either on independent missions against enemy targets or as part of a coordinated protective screen to destroy enemy aircraft, missiles, submarines, and surface ships that attack the force.

The two nuclear frigates which Congress has added to this bill will have the same general types of antiair and antisubmarine weapons systems as would the two nonnuclear destroyers proposed by the Department of Defense, but the nuclear frigates will be larger and will have considerably more military capability. Specifically, each nuclear frigate—in addition to being nuclear powered—compared to the destroyers—will have twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines; will have a helicopter landing area and facilities and accommodations for a screen commander which the destroyer would not have; will have

more complete naval tactical data system facilities; and will have provisions for twice the number of torpedo launchers.

All of these factors are covered in detail in the hearings and report of the House Armed Services Committee.

A nuclear propulsion plant similar to the two-reactor plant now in the nuclear frigates *Bainbridge* and *Truxtun* is suitable for installation in either a new destroyer or a new frigate.

The shipbuilding program proposed by the Department of Defense called for building conventionally powered escorts to accompany the new nuclear carriers. The House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have studied in depth the questions of nuclear power for escorts for the nuclear carriers; both committees have concluded that to build new conventionally powered escorts to accompany nuclear carriers would be a serious mistake. Further, both committees have concluded that each nuclear carrier should have a complete complement of nuclear powered escorts.

The House Armed Services Committee has the duty of making recommendations to the House of Representatives on defense matters. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use and control of atomic energy and making recommendations to both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act provides that the Department of Defense "shall keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed with respect to all matters within the Department of Defense relating to the development, utilization, or application of atomic energy."

In carrying out these responsibilities, the House Armed Service's Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have reviewed this matter continuously, thoroughly and, I believe, with great deliberation. Both committees requested the complete record of correspondence between the Navy and the Department of Defense on the question of building nuclear frigates. They also requested copies of all studies comparing nuclear and conventional surface warships conducted by the Navy and the Department of Defense.

These committees have carefully reviewed the documentation furnished by the Navy and the Department of Defense. They also received extensive testimony on the issues involved. Very shortly the Joint Committee's hearings earlier this year on nuclear propulsion will be published. These studies, reports, and testimony clearly show that the increased military effectiveness of nuclear powered warships—both aircraft carriers and escort ships—far outweighs the small increase in lifetime cost necessary to provide these ships with nuclear propulsion plants.

The facts behind the action recommended by the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to proceed now on a nuclear powered surface escort warship building program can be assessed by review of the following reports:

Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels, December 1963.

Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels, October 30, 31, and November 13, 1963.

Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on naval nuclear propulsion program, January 26, 1966.

House Armed Services Committee Report No. 1536, dated May 16, 1966, to accompany S. 2950, authorizing Defense procurement and research and development and military pay.

House Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture and H.R. 13456, Report No. 64.

House Appropriations Committee hearings on Department of Defense appropriation for 1967, part 6, pages 67–147.

House Armed Services Committee Report No. 221, dated May 2, 1967, to accompany H.R. 9240, authorizing Defense procurement and research and development.

House Armed Services Committee hearing on military posture and H.R. 9240, Report No. 8.

In addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is currently preparing for public release a report and record of executive hearings held this year on the naval nuclear propulsion program.

The case for nuclear-powered escort ships was summarized last year by the Chief of Naval Operations in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated April 14, 1966. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, Admiral McDonald's memorandum is published in its entirety on pages 8034 through 8063 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing report—No. 64—on military posture. Admiral McDonald's memorandum provides a detailed basis for the position that the increased military effectiveness of nuclear propulsion in carrier escorts fully justifies the small increase in lifetime cost of the ships and for concluding that construction of nuclear powered escort ships is in the best interest of this Nation.

The case for nuclear-powered escorts for our nuclear carriers and the importance of insuring that the new class of major fleet escorts called DXG is provided nuclear propulsion was summarized this year by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated February 3, 1967. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, Admiral Rickover's memorandum is published in its entirety on pages 1804 through 1848 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing report—No. 8—on military posture.

Admiral Rickover's memorandum makes it clear that each nuclear escort substituted for a conventional escort significantly improves the military effectiveness of the overall nuclear carrier task group. His report shows that the incremental gain in military effectiveness is larger as each nuclear escort is substituted, with the largest increment being added when the all-nuclear task group is achieved.

The Chief of Naval Operations has succinctly summarized the situation with the statement:

> Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam.

Congress has all the information necessary to make an assessment of whether a nuclear escort construction program is in the best interests of the United States.

As I have just pointed out, the issue of nuclear propulsion for surface warships has already been studied in great depth. The studies of this subject furnished Congress by the Department of Defense and the Navy when piled on top of each other make a stack several feet high. Most of the effort in these studies has been devoted to analyzing costs, rather than determining military effectiveness.

The time has come for us to stop these futile cost comparisons between nuclear and conventional surface warships. Let us get on with fulfilling our country's urgent need for nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet.

The danger of continuing to make extensive cost studies is that they divert attention from the real issues that nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load and return—all without logistic support. Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days. This requires a vulnerable, worldwide distribution system of tankers and storage facilities to provide fuel oil for conventional ships. Admiral McDonald's memorandum which I referred to earlier cites many examples from the history of modern war where major military defeats were brought about by the inability of military forces to maintain an adequate supply of propulsion fuel to the forces in combat. The U.S. decision to bomb the fuel oil storage facilities in North Vietnam has again emphasized to the whole world the importance and yet the extreme vulnerability of petroleum supplies in modern war.

I cannot understand the logic which admits the vulnerability of the enemy's fuel oil supplies but will not admit that our own fuel oil supplies are also vulnerable. Admiral McDonald's memorandum points out that—

> The vulnerability of our overseas logistic supply lines is greater today than at any time in the past and is continuing to increase for the following reasons:
>
> a. The increased threat of submarine attack because of the improvements in conventional submarines and the advent of nuclear powered submarines.
>
> b. The increased threat of air attack because of the increased range of aircraft and missiles and their improved means of detection.
>
> c. The amount of fuel which must be transported has increased because of the higher fuel consumption rate of post-World War II military units.
>
> d. Each tanker lost has a greater impact because of the substitution of a smaller fleet of larger tankers for the large fleet of small tankers used in World War II.
>
> As the number of nuclear submarines and air-striking capabilities of our potential

enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support when our supply lines to our combat forces are under attack gets worse. One principal reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce the logistic support required for our fighting forces.

Vietnam operations have shown that two-thirds of the fuel used by a conventional carrier task group—a carrier plus its escorts—is used just to keep the ships running. One-third is used for carrier propulsion, one-third is used for escort propulsion, and the other one-third is used for aircraft fuel. So, if the need for fuel for the escorts and the carrier itself can be eliminated by utilizing nuclear propulsion, only one-third the amount of fuel is needed. This simplifies the logistic problem tremendously.

In supporting this position the Chief of Naval Operations has stated:

The compelling reason for the Navy's strong recommendation for nuclear power in surface warships is based on the increased survivability and tactical flexibility which derive from freedom of dependence on propulsion fuel oil logistic support.

The dependence of U.S. air power on the fuel distribution system in the western Pacific is well known. The vulnerability of the system to attack, particularly the overland and terminal fuel distribution required for land-based air operations, is a matter of concern. While the Navy's underway replenishment groups are considered to be less vulnerable, they can also be brought under attack. Current utilization of *Enterprise* and *Bainbridge* is reducing our dependence on fuel oil and thus strengthening our total tactical air posture in Southeast Asia. The introduction of CVAN-68 and other nuclear powered warships could be of critical importance to the efficient projection of air power during the early 1970's. (See House Armed Services Committee Report 1536, p. 40, dated May 16, 1966.)

The scope and magnitude of the logistic effort to provide propulsion fuel for the fleet is often not fully appreciated. For example, the total amount of petroleum products the Navy alone is using each month in Southeast Asia today is as great as the maximum monthly rate the Japanese were able to import into their home islands in World War II, and nearly as great as the average monthly requirements for the U.S. carrier strike forces during the peak of naval operations in the Pacific during World War II.

Admiral McDonald has pointed out to Congress that one torpedo, fired by an unidentified submarine in Southeast Asia, could "radically change the entire concept of our operations" on both land and sea. See hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, January 26, 1966, page 62. As reported in the newspapers, Red China has about 30 submarines, and the Soviets now have over 400 submarines—of which about 45 are nuclear, which have unlimited attack range—and they are building more. Why would they build attack submarines unless they wanted the capability to sink our ships and cut off our supply routes? Do you realize that U.S. submarine forces with only 250 submarines nearly strangled the Japanese fuel oil pipeline during World War II.

It is vital that our Navy have the capability to detect, identify, and sink enemy submarines in time of hostility. In this connection it should be noted that only nuclear-powered escort ships can give unlimited chase to any nuclear-powered submarine without having to abandon the chase to refuel.

Each time a nuclear-powered warship is substituted for a conventionally powered warship in a carrier task force, the overall capabilities of the whole task force are improved. When a nuclear carrier is substituted for a conventional carrier, the range of a carrier task group with four conventional escorts is about doubled. When two of the escorts accompanying the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is almost doubled again. When all of the escorts with the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is essentially unlimited.

The nuclear aircraft carrier must, of course, be replenished with aviation fuel and ammunition. However, it must be remembered that when the escort ships are conventionally powered the nuclear carrier itself must carry the oil to supply them. When the carrier is able to have its own tanks devoted solely to aviation fuel, it can launch many more aircraft strikes than when much of its fuel tank space is devoted to carrying fuel oil for conventional escorts. When the new nuclear carrier has all-nuclear escorts, she will have almost twice the aviation fuel capability of the most modern conventional carrier.

The most recent Navy studies show that when the estimated lifetime construction and operating costs of a nuclear frigate or destroyer are compared to the comparable costs of a conventional ship with the same military features, the nuclear ship is less than 25 percent more expensive than its conventional counterpart. See House Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture, report No. 8, page 1845.

Since nuclear propulsion in the escort ships improves the military effectiveness of the task group as a whole, the increased cost of the task group as a whole is the cost which should be considered in determining the "cost effectiveness." Each escort for a nuclear carrier that is changed to nuclear propulsion adds about 1 percent to the overall lifetime cost of the nuclear carrier task group. Thus, making all four escorts nuclear would increase the lifetime cost of the entire group by only 4 percent. Surely the tremendous increase in effectiveness of the task group fully justifies this small increase in cost.

If the two conventional aircraft carriers and the nine conventional frigates authorized since 1960 had been provided with nuclear propulsion, the United States would now have in being or under construction three nuclear-powered carrier task groups instead of only one. These nuclear-powered task groups would have given the United States a much stronger Navy with which to face the uncertain and perilous future that lies ahead. Even with the nuclear frigate which was included by Congress in the fiscal year 1967 shipbuilding program, it will not be until our Nation's first nuclear powered aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, has been at sea for 10 years that this country will have its first all-nuclear carrier task group.

Our surface Navy is aging rapidly and is even now faced with widespread block obsolescence. Of the cruisers, destroyers, and frigates in the active fleet today, 81 percent are over 20 years old.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's there was a vigorous warship construction program. This was also the time that nuclear propelled surface warships were introduced in the fleet. However, since that time there has been a long hiatus in surface warship construction—nuclear and conventional. The only surface warship escort of destroyers size or larger in the approved shipbuilding programs of the last 5 years—fiscal years 1963–67—nuclear or conventional, is the nuclear frigate provided by Congress last year. It is clear that this hiatus cannot last much longer without the capability of the U.S. Navy sinking far below the needs of our national security.

In 1963, Secretary McNamara testified to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that "we will be building literally tens" of major surface warships, destroyer leaders and large destroyers, "during the remainder of this decade." See hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels, October 30, 31, and November 13, 1963, page 187. However, two conventional destroyers proposed by the Department of Defense again this year are the only major fleet escorts they have proposed in the last 6 years.

The U.S. Navy needs more surface warships and needs them with the unique capabilities provided by nuclear propulsion. Recognizing this, Congress has supported a major scientific and engineering effort to achieve this capability. We have been successful. Today, the U.S. Navy is preeminent in the field of nuclear propulsion. We must take advantage of this lead by building more ships which have the tremendous advantages nuclear propulsion can give them.

The cost effectiveness studies of nuclear versus conventional warships assume that we will have adequate advance overseas bases from which to operate our conventional ships. They assume we will have no trouble maintaining our logistic supply lines at sea and that fuel oil will be available whenever and wherever needed. They assume that our forces will not be subject to attack. They assume that we will not need sustained high speed endurance in our warships. They assume all these things, but the studies cannot insure that the assumptions will be correct. Once these assumptions are made, the possibility of situations arising where these assumptions are not valid is removed from consideration. Yet it is in just such situations where nuclear propulsion in our warships could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

During the 20- to 30-year lifetime of any warship, there will be many changes in the world situation. Since World War II, our three major enemies have become our friends and two of our previous major allies have become our antagonists. Bases in foreign countries upon which we must presently depend for

storage of fuel oil for our oil-fired warships may not be available when needed in future conflicts due to changes in the international situation. Further, as the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air strike capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support will increase. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support—support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

It is in the heat of battle that the superior mobility, flexibility, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled military advantage, an advantage which could be crucial to deciding the outcome.

The argument used by the Secretary of Defense against building nuclear powered escorts is the same argument used a decade ago by those in positions of authority who did not want to go to nuclear power in submarines because it cost more; by those in authority a half-century ago who did not want to convert from coal to oil for naval ships; and by those a century ago who did not want to shift from sail to steam. The argument against obtaining improved capability in warship propulsion because of its higher cost is just as fallacious today as it was a hundred years ago, 50 years ago, and 10 years ago.

The only argument the Defense Department makes against nuclear power for naval surface ships is that they are "too expensive." The argument can be made that all new weapons are "too expensive" when their costs are compared with the obsolete weapons they replace. Apparently when the Department of Defense decides it wants something, expense is never the criterion. When Congress wants it, it becomes "too expensive."

Aside from his vague statement about expense, no other reasoned or technical judgment has ever been given by the Department of Defense to justify its stand. Those who do recommend nuclear powered ships gave reasoned arguments—arguments which have never been specifically rebutted.

The impression given to the public is that the Defense Department has reached its conclusions based on scientific analysis. The Department of Defense has not given our committee this scientific analysis. We must therefore conclude that it will not stand the test of objective scrutiny.

I am puzzled and distressed by the reluctance of the Defense Department to accept nuclear propulsion in the new escorts being built to accompany the nuclear carriers.

Based on detailed study and appraisal of the military effectiveness and the cost of nuclear-powered and conventional warships and careful consideration and study of past and present experience of naval forces in combat, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st Century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security. (See House of Representatives Report No. 1536, Authorizing Defense Procurement and Research and Development, and Military Pay, May 16, 1966, p. 25.)

The United States is committed to a nuclear aircraft carrier building program. The issue before Congress is very simple: Shall we have all-nuclear carrier task forces?

The new Defense authorization bill answers that question with an unequivocal "go ahead."

Congress must take this step. The language in this bill that "the contracts for the construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest," makes it clear that it is the will of the people of this country voiced through their elected representatives in Congress that the two new nuclear frigates be constructed as a continuation of the nuclear escort building program started by Congress last year.

The determination of overall force levels and the precise number of new escort ships needed in the next several years will no doubt be the subject of continuing study by the Department of Defense. However, with the obvious problem of the obsolescence of the United States Navy staring us in the face and the exemplary performance of the nuclear carrier *Enterprise* and her nuclear escort ships *Bainbridge* and *Long Beach*—all now performing outstanding combat service off Vietnam—it is clear that construction of the two nuclear frigates contained in this bill is a minimum requirement and should proceed forthwith and not be delayed while more studies are made.

Your approval of the provisions of the Defense authorization bill to authorize three nuclear-powered attack submarines, to authorize long-lead-time items for a nuclear-powered attack carrier, and to authorize two nuclear-powered frigates—and your endorsement of the recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that all future major fleet escorts be nuclear powered—will go far toward determining the strength and flexibility of U.S. seapower for decades to come. Future generations of Americans will recognize that it was this Congress—the 90th Congress—that had the foresight, wisdom, and courage to take this initiative to strengthen the defense of our Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. KLUCZYNSKI, HOWARD, ZION, and MCDONALD of Michigan (at the request of Mr. FALLON), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SELDEN, for 60 minutes, on May 18.

Mr. HÉBERT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. RARICK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.

Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 443. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

729. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and

to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

730. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report on the first year's work of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–352; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

731. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of audit and inspection programs conducted by U.S. agencies in Vietnam during 1966, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, to clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations, and to limit the amount of attorney fees thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

734. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on forest and grass fires, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–769; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9711. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9712. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9713. A bill to amend section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the Attorney General to furnish a certificate of citizenship to a person holding certification of birth issued by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9714. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9715. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple in their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's of father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 9716. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 9717. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9718. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9720. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9721. A bill to require that a portion of Government parking facilities at national monuments and memorials and Government buildings be reserved for use by visitors confined to wheelchairs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9722. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9725. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself, Mr. SISK, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. MATHIAS of California):

H.R. 9726. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 9727. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9728. A bill relating to taxation by States of the incomes of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9729. A bill to amend section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to make it clear that the program of low-rent housing in private accommodations may not be restricted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to specified types of housing on the basis of vacancy rates in a community; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9730. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a taxpayer may become eligible for the existing exclusion from gross income of gain from the sale or exchange of his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 9732. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9733. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9734. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southeastern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9735. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southwestern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9736. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9738. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9739. A bill to liberalize the provisions of the retired servicemen's family protection plan under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9741. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 9742. A bill to designate certain real property of the Unied States in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service as the Eleanor Roosevelt Square; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9743. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9744. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for control of interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9746. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 9747. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9748. A bill for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9749. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 9750. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. Con. Res. 340. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to provide that an estimated cost figure be applied at the time a bill is introduced; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 467. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of part 2 of the hearings relating to "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inez Augusta Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9752. A bill for the relief of Douglas E. Kennedy and Alvin V. Burt, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9753. A bill for the relief of Aida Calacas Valenciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9754. A bill for the relief of Maria Sole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9755. A bill for the relief of Natale Cangialosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Maria Antonietta Storino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 9757. A bill for the relief of John W. Watson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9758. A bill for the relief of Claudio Amauri Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9759. A bill for the relief of John Lee Adams and the estates of his wife, Altheia J. Adams, and his sons, David John Adams and Mark Edward Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Kamal Husein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

73. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the distribution of U.S. Federal aid to education funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

74. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Charlotte Snell and others, of El Toro, Calif., relative to the giving of aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wyman C. Lowe, Atlanta, Ga., relative to the general election of November 8, 1966, in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia; to the Committee on House Administration.

76. Also, petition of Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Union, N.J., relative to its opposition to any tolls on that portion of the Garden State Parkway that runs through Union County; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mothers Crusade for Victory Over Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I witnessed a new invasion here in Washington, D.C.—a first, and perhaps just the start—mothers crusade for victory over communism.

Hundreds of nicely dressed and well-mannered mothers carrying American flags visited their National Capital protesting peaceably for victory over atheist communism.

These ladies were from almost every State in the United States and represented many national origins. Some mothers from captive nations under communism wore the native dress of their homeland. Many had sons in Vietnam—some were gold star mothers who have lost sons in battle.

One of the national shrines they visited was Arlington National Cemetery where the Honor Guard permitted a special prayer for those lost and the living.

Their question was: If we are fighting communism in South Vietnam, why not stop trading with Communist countries—why not fight communism here at home?

A wonderful group of sincere, concerned Americans lobbying in the true, God-given right of every mother for victory over tyranny, deceit, and oppression—victory over communism.

Railroad Passenger Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution calling for an investigation and study by the Department of Transportation into the passenger railroad service of the Nation. The resolution calls for the ICC to declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service as well as the Post Office Department to declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railroad postal contracts.

This resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, and I sincerely hope the House will see fit to take early action on the measure.

Passenger train cars and passenger rail miles have declined almost 50 percent in the last 15 years, and many of our smaller communities are being abandoned by the railroads. Recently in Nebraska, the Burlington Railroad requested discontinuance of two passenger trains in one community alone. I think the time has come to make a thorough investigation into the reasons for the discontinuance of such railroad service as well as the reason for the Post Office Department to cancel many of these rail contracts. I am hopeful that such a study will reveal the true ills of the matter and allow us to take appropriate action to remedy the critical condition of our national railroad passenger service.

Geographical Distribution of Research and Development Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am introducing an amendment to H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics I have seen