



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—Monday, January 15, 1968

The 15th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 90-230, 90th Congress, first session, for the meeting of the second session of the 90th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The Senate was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Lord and Master of us all, whate'er our name or sign, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded—in Thee we trust. In Thee is our sure confidence that the way of the Republic is down no fatal slope but up to freer sun and air.

Thou has taught us to love truth, and goodness, and beauty.

May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice and from all the ugly sins of disposition that doth so easily beset us.

Lift us above the mud and scum of mere things to the holiness of Thy beauty so that the common tasks and the trivial round may be edged with crimson and gold.

Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things that matter most—the golden currency of faith, and hope, and love.

We ask it in the name of the One whose life is the light of men. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 1 Leg.]

Aiken	Gruening	Monroney
Allott	Hansen	Morse
Baker	Harris	Morton
Bennett	Hart	Mundt
Boggs	Hartke	Muskie
Brewster	Hatfield	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Pell
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Percy
Carlson	Holland	Prouty
Case	Hollings	Proxmire
Church	Hruska	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Ellender	Long, La.	Spong
Fannin	Mansfield	Symington
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond
Griffin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from

Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Alaska.—E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Paul J. Fannin.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—Thomas H. Kuchel and George Murphy.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and Peter H. Dominick.

Connecticut.—Thomas J. Dodd and Abraham A. Ribicoff.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye.

Idaho.—Frank Church and Len B. Jordan.

Illinois.—Everett M. Dirksen and Charles H. Percy.

Indiana.—Vance Hartke and Birch E. Bayh.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Jack Miller.

Kansas.—Frank Carlson and James B. Pearson.

Kentucky.—John Sherman Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—Daniel B. Brewster and Joseph D. Tydings.

Massachusetts.—Edward M. Kennedy and Edward W. Brooke.

Michigan.—Philip A. Hart and Robert P. Griffin.

Minnesota.—Eugene J. McCarthy and Walter F. Mondale.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Stuart Symington and Edward V. Long.

Montana.—Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire.—Norris Cotton and Thomas J. McIntyre.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Clinton P. Anderson and Joseph M. Montoya.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Robert F. Kennedy.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio.—Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young.

Oklahoma.—A. S. Mike Monroney and Fred R. Harris.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Mark O. Hatfield.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott.

Rhode Island.—John O. Pastore and Claiborne Pell.

South Carolina.—Strom Thurmond and Ernest F. Hollings.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and George S. McGovern.

Tennessee.—Albert Gore and Howard H. Baker, Jr.

Texas.—Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—Harry F. Byrd, Jr., and William B. Spong, Jr.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—William Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson.

Wyoming.—Gale W. McGee and Clifford P. Hansen.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 203), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have two or three parliamentary inquiries. First, is there anything in the Senate rulebook that prohibits a Senator from making a speech on the opening day of a session if, in his judgment, it is his duty to do so, and the issue he considers of such importance that the attention of the Senate and of the Nation should be called to it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows of no such rule that would deny a Senator that opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is there any rule in the Senate rulebook that requires the Senate, on the opening day of a session, to adjourn without consideration of speeches, resolutions, or petitions that a Senator may deem it his duty, as a Senator representing his State, to present on the floor of the Senate on the opening day of a session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes that there is no such formal rule, but there is long-established historical precedent.

Mr. MORSE. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Vice President that there are no exceptions to that precedent in the history of the Senate on the opening day of a session of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair could not inform the Senator at this moment because he has not had an opportunity to examine the record; but tradition and precedent are well established.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to advise the Vice President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, if I am given the opportunity to discuss it, that I have on the top of my desk at this moment a whole series of precedents which show that business was transacted on the opening days of many sessions of the Senate.

My final parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: Is there any rule in the Senate rulebook that prohibits the Senate on the first day of a session to receive a petition of grievance under the first amendment of the Constitution, which reads:

Congress 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 for a redress of grievances.

My parliamentary inquiry is: Is there any rule in the Senate rulebook that prohibits the Senate from receiving, under the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States, a petition of grievance from responsible citizens of the United States who wish to petition their Government on the opening day of a session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows of no such rule, which would surely violate the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair for his unfailing courtesy and consideration—the majority leader as well. I hope that a reasonable amount of time will be given at this session today for the Senator

from Oregon and others to discuss briefly a petition which we think should be filed with the Senate today, which involves, of course, at a time of war, a precious constitutional right that should be preserved without the Senate's adjourning and postponing the consideration of such petition to a later date.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with long-established custom, principle, and practice, it is my intention, as majority leader, not as a Senator from the State of Montana, to move shortly that the Senate stand in adjournment until 8 o'clock on Wednesday evening next.

I have had some conversations with various Senators relative to their desire to have a petition read to the Senate today.

I appreciate the courtesy which they showed in telling me of what they intended to do.

I explained to them, or at least I tried to, that I had been asked by many other Senators whether there was to be any business today, and I had told them all that under custom and procedures, there would be no business, there would be no morning hours, and there would be no introduction of bills because that was the custom, based on practice and precedent. It was a custom which gave to the President of the United States a courtesy, and it was a custom which was predicated on the idea that no business of any sort should be transacted until after the delivery of the President's state of the Union message.

It is my understanding that only on one occasion was this practice abrogated and that was when Congress received notice that the President of the United States would not be in the position to deliver his state of the Union message until 2 weeks after Congress convened.

Now, Mr. President, what I am about to do places me in a very unfortunate position—a position which I deplore; a position which I am not enamored of; but I believe it is a position which I cannot avoid, and therefore will not avoid. But before I make the motion, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] that, as far as the majority leader is concerned—and the Senator from Montana—he would be most happy to see to it that, as the first order of business Thursday, after the President had spoken on Wednesday, he would be given the right and privilege, if he so desired it, to read the petition which he now has in his hand, I believe, and which he would like to present to the Senate. That is all I have to say, but I do intend to make the motion.

I will yield for a question, if I may.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I would like to thank the majority leader for his unfailing courtesy and his kindness in discussing the matter with me. He has stated the facts exactly as they are, that I would like to present a petition on behalf of the Honorable Jeannette Rankin, a distinguished former Member of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana yielded for a question.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to ask the majority leader whether it would be possible to introduce in the Record the

petition before Thursday, or whether it is his wish that I wait to the day agreed upon and that I do it on Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator would allow me, I would hope he would accede to my suggestion that it would be the first order of business in the morning hour on Thursday next.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator. While I do not agree that the precedents require that no business be transacted—the senior Senator from Oregon has a list of those precedents, which he has allowed me to see—in view of the statement of the majority leader and his statement that he will allow this petition to be presented as the first order of business on Thursday, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I deeply appreciate the consideration shown by the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I express nothing but the deepest respect and admiration for my majority leader. It always pains me to be in disagreement with him. I am in complete disagreement with the observation he has made. That is why I have this question to ask him: Is the Senator from Montana of the opinion that the only exception to the precedent he has discussed was on the occasion when the President had announced that his state of the Union message would not be ready for 2 weeks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In general, yes, although I think the question of rule XXII may have come up on several occasions, and that might be considered an exception.

Mr. MORSE. Please be assured I do not wish to debate the point at this time, but I have my own position to protect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I want the RECORD to show that I completely disagree with the Senator from Montana. I shall, when we reconvene, take the floor to present the precedents in complete rebuttal of what the distinguished Senator from Montana has said. In the overwhelming majority of times on the opening day of a new session there has been adjournment, but there have been many times when circumstances caused the Senate not to adjourn on that day until it transacted a variety of Senate business. I happen to think that history will record that today is such a day, in the midst of a war, when we cannot justify an adjournment. The petition of several thousand women, many of them mothers representing the Rankin Brigade, should be received in the Senate, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and discussed by those of us who wish to discuss it.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 8 P.M. WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 8 o'clock in the evening on Wednesday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns after the completion of the President's state of the Union message on Wednesday it meet at 12 noon on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GRUENING ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the deliverance of the prayer by the Chaplain and the completion of the reading of the Journal on Thursday next, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I notice that the unfinished business which was carried over is H.R. 2516, an act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, which was apparently laid down on December 15 past. May I ask the Senator from Montana as to what time of the day that was made the unfinished business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was in the afternoon, after we completed, I believe, the bill on elementary-secondary education.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator consult with the Senator from North Carolina or any of those who had a particular interest in that matter prior to motioning up that legislation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I did not. There was no indication on the calendar that any Senator wanted to be notified on either side of the aisle. I did discuss the matter with the distinguished minority leader, and it was agreeable with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the type of legislation about which there is usually some notice given to those who have an especial interest in it before it is motioned up and made the unfinished business. We had a great deal of controversy late in the last session as the Senate passed a bill that was the unfinished business, which was under the control of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], because he apparently had not notified Senators or had a quorum call for that purpose. Frankly, I can see very little difference in laying down a matter of this kind without notifying those opposed to it and the action in passing the social security bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot let that remark by the senior Senator from Georgia go unchallenged. I will point out to him that I did consult, in referring it to the Judiciary Committee, with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. He was very agreeable.

He knew about it when the bill was reported out. One of those most interested in this bill is the distinguished minority leader. I did talk with him. I am not certain about this, but I thought the distinguished Senator from North Carolina was on the floor or was in the Chamber that afternoon. But I do want to assure the distinguished Senator from Georgia that there was nothing underhanded about bringing this measure up. There was plenty of notice given. It had been on the calendar at least for a month, if not two. Insofar as possible on the last day, the Senator from North Carolina was notified about this coming up. Certainly the Senator from Georgia knows me well enough to know that nothing of that kind was intended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was surprised that the Senator had not notified the Senator from North Carolina. I know I had no notice. I do not know whether other Senators had been notified who were opposed to the legislation or who had a particular interest in it. I do not mean any reflection on the Senator from Montana. No reflection was intended. He and the Senator from Louisiana proceeded in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have just been notified that the senior Senator from North Carolina was on the floor when it was called up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, if he knew the bill was laid down, I am completely in error. As I recall, some Senators were on the floor who were opposed to the social security conference report at the time it was agreed to; but because no special notice had been given, that order was rescinded and the bill was reconsidered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, since the social security conference report was mentioned, I looked up the last day's RECORD, after the Senator from Louisiana had gone to his State to fulfill some commitments he had made months in advance. I would like the RECORD to show that the Senator from Louisiana had no notice whatever that any commitment had been made to anyone that we would suggest the absence of a quorum or that we would delay matters waiting for someone to speak. I noticed some talk that at least one Senator felt he had told someone who was acting in my stead the prior evening that he wanted to speak on the bill the following day. I had no knowledge that anyone had made any commitment to anyone.

When the bill came up, Senator LAUSCHE took all the time in putting the question that any Presiding Officer had taken. He first asked, "Does the Senate care to consider the conference report?" We voted on that. He said, "The question is on the conference report." He took a very long and dignified delay. He said, "Well, all those in favor say 'yea.' All those opposed say 'no.'" He said, "The 'yeas' appear to have it." After about 10 seconds, he said, "The 'yeas' have it." At that time the routine motion was made to reconsider and to lay on the table.

Now, if someone had made a commitment—and I asked the majority leader whether anyone had—I had no knowledge of it whatever.

I recognize the right of any Senator to talk on any subject as long as he wishes, no matter how much it may irritate his colleagues. Having done it myself, I cheerfully concede that privilege to others. But I simply say that so far as I know, no commitment was made, and the majority leader told us no commitment had been made on his behalf. As far as anyone discussing the bill was concerned, the RECORD should also show that unanimous consent was given that the matter be reconsidered and again laid before the Senate; but if anyone had intended to engage in a filibuster, he had lost that right by not being present.

If such a commitment, that the Senate not vote on the matter which had been laid before it, had been given, I would have respected it.

But that matter was the pending business when the Senate adjourned at 6 o'clock the previous evening; and when morning business was concluded, that was the pending business. There was at least one Senator opposed to the conference report present; and as I say, if any Senator had requested the Senator from Louisiana, who favored the conference report, for an opportunity to speak against it, or to delay matters until those who wanted to fight it could organize their opposition and prepare their speeches against it, I would have cooperated. I simply say no such commitment was ever given, and that I do not feel obliged to comply with commitments I have never made, nor to fulfill commitments I have not made to anyone. I do not feel that I broke any commitments whatever. If I did, I shall be happy to hear about it.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 8 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. The yeas and nays have been requested; there is obviously a sufficient second, the yeas and nays

are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire

[Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are detailed on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 2 Leg.]		
YEAS—53		
Alken	Griffin	McGee
Allott	Hansen	Monroney
Baker	Harris	Morton
Bennett	Hart	Mundt
Boggs	Hartke	Muskie
Brewster	Hatfield	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Percy
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Carlson	Holland	Proxmire
Case	Hollings	Randolph
Church	Hruska	Russell
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Dirksen	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Symington
Ellender	Long, La.	Thurmond
Fannin	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McClellan	
	NAYS—3	
Gruening	Morse	Nelson
	NOT VOTING—44	
Anderson	Inouye	Murphy
Bartlett	Jackson	Pastore
Bayh	Javits	Pearson
Bible	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Brooke	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Burdick	Lausche	Spong
Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Stennis
Clark	McCarthy	Talmadge
Cotton	McGovern	Tower
Dominick	McIntyre	Tydings
Eastland	Metcalfe	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fong	Mondale	Yarborough
Gore	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Hill	Moss	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 17, 1968, at 8 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 15, 1968

This being the day fixed by Public Law 230, 90th Congress, enacted pursuant to the 20th amendment of the Constitution, for the meeting of the second session of the 90th Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives of the 90th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

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

Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord your God is with you wherever you go. Joshua 1: 9.

O God, our Father, our help in ages past and our hope for years to come, our help and our hope in this present hour—in all reverence of mind and with true humility of spirit we lift our hearts unto Thee seeking strength and wisdom from Thy never-failing and ever-faithful presence.

In this hour, as we turn another page in the glorious history of our growing

country, may we be strengthened with might by Thy spirit that we may meet these demanding days with creative courage and become more than a match for the mood of these troubled times.

Bless Thou our President, our Speaker, our Representatives, those employed by our Government, and all those in the Armed Forces of our country. Grant that together we may enter this new year with deeper faith, broader sympathy, higher vision, and with greater love.

Keep ever before us the endless splendor of a world cleared of poverty,

cleansed of prejudice, and concerned with peace between men and nations. May we so live our lives, so lead our people, so guide our Nation that we may build on earth a better and a brighter brotherhood, in the spirit of Him who taught us to pray:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications, which were read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1967.
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Herewith please find copy of my resignation submitted to the Secretary of State, State of New York, as required by law, effective January 1, 1968.

It has been my privilege to have been able to serve with you these many years under your great leadership. I will always remember your wise counsel and guidance, as well as, the many courtesies extended to me. I will treasure forever your friendship and that of our colleagues with whom I have served.

With warmest personal regards and very best wishes, I am,
Most sincerely,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Enclosure.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 19, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to clarify the effective date of my resignation from the House of Representatives. It is intended that my resignation be effective as of midnight, December 31, 1967, since my new post as Justice of the New York State Supreme Court begins on January 1, 1968.

With warm personal regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1967.

HON. JOHN P. LOMENZO,
Secretary of State,
State of New York,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Pursuant to the requirements of law, I hereby give you notice that I am resigning as a Member of the United States House of Representatives for the 13th District of New York effective the first day of January 1968 on which date, I will assume the office of Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York to which position I was elected on November 7, 1967.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 1, 1968.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Attached is a copy of a letter this day forwarded to Honorable Paul B. Johnson, Governor of the State of Mississippi, tendering my resignation as a Member of the United States House of Representatives effective on my taking the oath of office as Governor of Mississippi on January 16, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress believing it to be the greatest deliberative body on earth. After twenty-one years, I will leave the Congress even more secure in that belief. I cherish the many friendships I have made here; and I take this means through you to express profound appreciation to my colleagues for their friendships and courtesies throughout the years.

My service in this body has brought satisfaction in accomplishment, disappointment in defeat, heartache in frustration, and joy in triumph. In all, Mr. Speaker, these have been the most interesting and rewarding years of my life. I will always be thankful for the privilege of having been a part of this great institution.

As I leave the Congress to assume a public position of greater responsibility, I seek the prayers and good will of you and my colleagues as we strive in common purpose to build a greater and finer Republic.

With sincere best wishes, I am,

Respectfully,

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 1, 1968.

HON. PAUL B. JOHNSON,
Governor,
State of Mississippi,
Jackson, Miss.

DEAR GOVERNOR JOHNSON: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Third District of Mississippi, to become effective on January 16, 1968, on my taking the oath of office as Governor of the State of Mississippi.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abblitt	Bevill	Buchanan
Adair	Blester	Burke, Fla.
Adams	Bingham	Burke, Mass.
Addabbo	Blackburn	Burleson
Albert	Bianton	Burton, Calif.
Anderson,	Boggs	Burton, Utah
Tenn.	Boland	Bush
Arends	Bolling	Cabell
Ashbrook	Bow	Cahill
Ashley	Brademas	Carter
Aspinall	Brasco	Celler
Ayres	Brinkley	Clark
Baring	Brooks	Clausen,
Bates	Broomfield	Don H.
Battin	Brotzman	Clawson, Del
Bell	Brown, Calif.	Cleveland
Bennett	Brown, Mich.	Cohelan
Berry	Broyhill, Va.	Coillier

Conte	Joelson	Pucinski
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Purcell
Cunningham	Johnson, Pa.	Quie
Curtis	Jonas	Rallsback
Daddario	Jones, Mo.	Rarick
Daniels	Jones, N.C.	Rees
Davis, Wis.	Karsten	Reid, Ill.
Dawson	Karth	Reid, N.Y.
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Reinecke
Denney	Kazen	Reuss
Dent	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Derwinski	Kelly	Riegler
Devine	King, N.Y.	Roberts
Dickinson	Kirwan	Robison
Donohue	Kleppe	Rogers, Colo.
Dorn	Kornegay	Rogers, Fla.
Dow	Kuykendall	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Kyl	Rosenthal
Duncan	Kyros	Rostenkowski
Edwards, Ala.	Laird	Roth
Edwards, La.	Landrum	Roudebush
Esch	Langen	Roush
Eshleman	Latta	Roybal
Evins, Tenn.	Lennon	Rumsfeld
Fallon	Lipscomb	Ryan
Farbstein	Lloyd	Satterfield
Fascell	Long, La.	Saylor
Findley	Long, Md.	Scherle
Fino	Lukens	Schweiker
Flood	McClory	Schwengel
Flynt	McCloskey	Scott
Ford, Gerald R.	McCulloch	Selden
Ford,	McDade	Shibley
William D.	McDonald,	Shriver
Fountain	Mich.	Sikes
Fulton, Pa.	McMillan	Skubitz
Fulton, Tenn.	Madden	Slack
Fuqua	Mahon	Smith, Calif.
Gallagher	Mailliard	Smith, N.Y.
Gardner	Marsh	Snyder
Gathings	Mathias, Calif.	Steed
Gettys	Mathias, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
Giaino	Matsunaga	Stephens
Gibbons	Meskill	Stratton
Gilbert	Miller, Calif.	Taft
Gonzalez	Miller, Ohio	Taylor
Goodell	Mills	Teague, Tex.
Goodling	Minshall	Tenzer
Gray	Mize	Thompson, N.J.
Gross	Monagan	Thomson, Wis.
Gude	Moore	Tuck
Gurney	Morgan	Udall
Haley	Morse, Mass.	Ullman
Hall	Morton	Utt
Halleck	Mosher	Van Deerlin
Hamilton	Moss	Vanik
Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.	Vigorito
schmidt	Myers	Waggonner
Hanley	Natcher	Waldie
Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi	Walker
Hardy	Nelsen	Wampler
Harrison	Nichols	Watkins
Harvey	O'Hara, Ill.	Watson
Hathaway	O'Hara, Mich.	Watts
Hawkins	Olsen	Whalen
Hays	O'Neill, Mass.	Whitener
Hechler, W. Va.	Passman	Widnall
Heckler, Mass.	Patman	Williams, Pa.
Helstoski	Patten	Willis
Henderson	Pelly	Wilson, Bob
Herlong	Perkins	Winn
Holland	Pettis	Wright
Howard	Philbin	Wyatt
Hull	Pickle	Wylder
Hunt	Pike	Wyllie
Hutchinson	Pirnie	Wyman
Ichord	Poage	Young
Irwin	Poff	Zablocki
Jacobs	Pool	Zion
Jarman	Price, Tex.	Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 288 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential resolution (H. Res. 1012) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1012

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the

part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1013) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1013

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1014) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1014

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., December 16, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on December 15, 1967, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following messages:

That the Senate passed S. 1228, entitled "An Act to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia";

That the Senate passed S. 1507, entitled "An Act to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations"; and

That the Senate passed S. 1637, entitled "An Act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 with respect to certain

provisions applicable to condemnation proceedings."

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

FREEDOM'S FRAMEWORK

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a poem.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a literary work of very timely interest. The great abundance of words that have been written about the Vietnam conflict may very well set some kind of journalistic record. On occasion, there are writing efforts that catch the eye and the mind of the reader. Such is the poem, "Freedom's Framework," written by Lt. Col. J. L. Zorack, a native of Colorado, and now of the U.S. Marine Corps. Colonel Zorack is a veteran of World War II, the Korean service and is the recipient of the Bronze Star for his combat activity in Vietnam. I recommend to my colleagues the thoughts of this professional military man about the people of the Vietnamese village of Sam Hai:

FREEDOM'S FRAMEWORK

(By Lt. Col. J. L. Zorack, U.S. Marine Corps)
In Vietnam, on the Son Tra Bong river,
Is Sam Hai . . . a free hamlet, a bastion,
bulwark

Where free Vietnamese freely pursue,
The daily business of living as they like,
Through choice.
Where friendship has replaced fear.

In Sam Hai
People were once fearful
And the price of rice was high;
The price of life . . . cheap.
And living meant giving . . .
Crops, rice, labor . . . lives.
And there was no choice.

No choice of freedom;
No freedom of choice.
No opportunity to voice, to say
Which was the right or the wrong way
. . . of living.

Now . . .
There's a smile, more than once in a while.
There's a greeting, "Cho ong" (Hello)
Children say, "Gimme gum, G.I." . . .
No longer hide under rice mats, and cry.

And why?

Because we held out a helping hand;
Because all people,
. . . however rich or poor,
. . . whatever color, creed,
. . . however humble, proud,
Constitute freedom's framework.
Help a man, and make a friend.
Help freedom's fight and
We expand freedom's fraternity.
Help today and
They're your safeguard tomorrow.

For defending America's freedom
. . . is having a heart for people.

It's a navy corpsman holding "sickcall" in
a hamlet;

It's a soldier, sailor, marine, civilian
. . . building homes for the homeless,
. . . giving hope to the hopeless,
Building confidence.
Building friendship.
It's many free people freely giving.

For giving a hand,
Expands freedom's framework,
And freedom grows,
Wherever defense of it goes.

Sometimes one can't see,
"What's in it for me?"
In the often tangled scheme of war,
Politics, living, suffering, dying.
It isn't easy to see . . . the end of the rainbow.

Like a good wine, expanding freedom
Is a slow process,
Like growing, mellowing.
Full of growing pains . . . dying pains.

And why?

Where's the reward?

Where's the jackpot?

Where's the payoff?

The payoff? Our way of life!
For helping people fortifies liberty.
Defending freedom defends our freedom of
choice,

. . . to dance the Watusi, or the waltz;
. . . to demonstrate, belittle, berate;
. . . to march to a Selma, or a Bogalooosa;
. . . to go to Los Angeles, New York, St.
Paul;

. . . to vote, to pray, to strike, to be free
To choose!

The reward? A stronger framework,
For our free way of living.

It's not easy to see, perceive,
That helping people in places like Sam Hai,
Helps America, helps you and I
. . . but it's a fact.

For there's a line of communication,
Undercurrent of understanding
Between people helping people,
Between clasped hands,
In a glance, smile, greeting, meeting.
For freedom forms common bonds.

Between a soldier and a child saying,
"Gimme gum, G.I."
Between a corpsman and a girl,
Who cries, and is cared for.
Between people fighting for freedom.
Between people helping people.

Because their choice is freedom.
Because theirs is a common cause.
. . . and in that common cause lies an un-
common strength;
. . . and that strength is freedom's frame-
work.

TRUST TERRITORY TRIP

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have asked for official leave of absence until January 29 for seven members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who are performing very arduous duties at the request of their chairman.

These Members are studying the problems and needs of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific and of Guam in connection with legislation that is before the committee. This is probably the most difficult and laborious work which any Member of Congress could be called upon to perform. However, it is absolutely necessary that we visit this area if the Congress and the committee are to meet their responsibilities in con-

nection with the administration of this area by the United States. Only those who have made this trip throughout the farflung islands of the Pacific can understand the hardships and possible sickness to which they subject themselves and the difficulties in adapting to the changes in water, food, and so forth.

I want my colleagues to know that, in my opinion, those Members who are making this trip are providing a great service, not only to the Congress and the committee but to the districts they represent and to the Nation generally.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and colleague, the ranking member of my committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in asking for official leave of absence for the seven members who are performing an outstanding service for the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as well as the House of Representatives, and are making a tremendous personal sacrifice in undertaking this trip.

Having personally taken this trip, it is hard, physically exhausting, and in many ways frustrating. However, it is also rewarding in that you can properly evaluate legislation concerning the trust territory.

I deeply regret that some members of the press who have no knowledge of this trip or its purposes have classified it as junketeering in the South Pacific.

FEDERAL JUDGES APPEAR TO DISREGARD THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are starting on a new year. I am not here to view with alarm, but I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House to an incident which occurred during the holidays that I think many of you will be particularly interested in. That is that a special panel of Federal judges in the State of Missouri have thrown out or ruled unconstitutional a redistricting by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri despite the fact that this redistricting complied with what most of us believe conformed to the constitution of the State of Missouri and the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Missouri, in that those 10 districts varied less than 5 percent from the average population; were compact and contiguous and the legislative plan was adopted after lengthy deliberation.

Now the thing I am calling to the attention of this House is this, that during the 19 years I have been here I have witnessed a usurpation of power by the judicial branch of our Government. Unless this House takes some affirmative and positive action, we are going to see a

continuation and expansion of the courts usurping the powers that rightly belong to the Congress, and to the legislative bodies of the several states.

I hope that this opinion of these three Federal judges will be appealed to the Supreme Court as I believe will be, and I am hopeful, although very doubtful, that we will get equitable relief there.

I can speak about this objectively because more than a year ago I announced that I was not going to be a candidate for the Democratic nomination to the Congress of the United States from the 10th Congressional District of Missouri in the next election.

I do hope that the Members of this House will recognize the imminent danger and will immediately start to take some affirmative action to stop this usurpation of power by the Federal courts of this Nation. Under my unanimous request I am including herewith a copy of an editorial from the January 6-7 issue of the *St. Louis Globe Democrat*:

FEDERAL JUDGES' POWER GRAB

Two federal judges have threatened to redraw Missouri's congressional districts if the Missouri Legislature fails to come up with a new redistricting plan these judges consider satisfactory.

As far as can be determined there is no constitutional authority which gives the right to federal judges to draw congressional district boundaries, even on a temporary basis.

The Constitution in Article I, Section 4 says: "The times and places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the Legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to places of choosing Senators."

There is nothing in the United States Constitution that even suggests the judicial branch of the government can, under any circumstances, assume the right specifically reserved for state legislatures.

But federal judges are threatening to usurp this right. They have drawn up congressional redistricting plans in at least three states, yet to date have cited no constitutional authority for doing so.

They simply assert they have the right and proceed to draft what they term "temporary" redistricting plans.

The 1966 case of the Maryland Citizens Committee for Fair Congressional Redistricting vs. Tawes is a good illustration. In this case a three-judge federal court threw out the Maryland Legislature's congressional redistricting plan on the same basis that the federal court in Kansas City nullified Missouri's third attempt at congressional redistricting—that the districts were not as equal in population as they should have been.

The Maryland federal district court then went ahead to draw its own redistricting map for Maryland.

In its opinion it said: "We do not doubt the power of the court under these circumstances to adopt a redistricting plan to remain in force until the General Assembly adopts its own constitutionally valid plan."

What a contradiction this is!

The federal judges assert they don't doubt their power to redistrict Maryland. But in the same breath say that their plan will remain in force only until the Maryland General Assembly adopts its "own constitutionally valid plan."

They do not cite any constitutional authority for their "temporary" appropriation of legislative power so clearly given to state legislatures.

It is one thing for the Supreme Court to

nullify a state's reapportionment plan on the basis that it does not, in the court's opinion, make the vote of one man as nearly equal to another's as possible.

But it is something vastly different when federal judges arrogate to themselves the right to redistrict states on the specious grounds that the judiciary must do it if the legislative branch fails to properly perform the job.

Missouri is face to face with this issue.

United States District Judges John W. Oliver and William R. Collinson of Kansas City, in making their majority ruling invalidating Missouri's congressional districting plan, said: "In the event it should be necessary for this court to exercise that power (to draw a new congressional redistricting plan), we shall follow procedures similar to those that were followed by other three-judge federal courts that have drawn congressional districts."

To reinforce this threat, the two judges drew up three congressional district plans which they gratuitously offered as possible satisfactory solutions.

But again Judge Oliver and Judge Collinson cited no constitutional provision that would give them the authority to redistrict Missouri.

A new redistricting bill has been drawn up for presentation to the special session of the Missouri Legislature. It already has stirred a hornet's nest of opposition. Since emergency passage requires a two-thirds vote, the chance of gaining approval is slim.

The most likely prospect is that the two federal judges in Kansas City will usurp the Legislature's power and draw Missouri's congressional districts—unless they are prevented.

Redistricting is one of the most important powers a state possesses. To permit federal judges to take it away even temporarily is inexcusable. If they can appropriate it temporarily, what is to stop them from taking it permanently?

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 p.m., January 17, 1968, to a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 606) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 606

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 17, 1968, at 9 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Brooks). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO RECESS ON JANUARY 17, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 17, 1968, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand the distinguished majority leader that it is the intent of the unanimous-consent request that the recess be for the sole purpose of reconvening to hear the President's address on the state of the Union?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. It is the customary resolution adopted for that purpose.

Mr. HALL. Insofar as the majority leader can perceive, there will be no additional recesses or calling back for other purposes than that which the gentleman has stated?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot imagine it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. NAVY AND MARDI GRAS DISCRIMINATION

Mr. RYAN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I was appalled to read that the U.S. Navy was cooperating with certain functions associated with the New Orleans Mardi Gras which discriminate against Negroes, Jews, and Americans of Italian descent. According to the story in the New York Post of January 9, a naval public information officer in New Orleans confirmed that the naval command in the Eighth District routinely cooperated with these events by giving tickets to sailors with the prescribed ethnic backgrounds and issuing instructions that tickets were not to be traded.

Upon learning of this, I sent a telegram to Secretary of the Navy Paul Ignatius demanding that this official sanction for private discrimination cease. I include at this point in the RECORD my telegram and the reply of the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

Hon. PAUL IGNATIUS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.:

I am outraged at the Navy's cooperation with discriminatory practices in Mardi Gras. Questionable whether the Navy should assist this event in the first place, but official sanction of discrimination is deplorable.

Ask your assurances that the Navy demand equal treatment of all personnel before it considers assisting the Mardi Gras.

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RYAN: Your concern with the newspaper reports of alleged discriminatory practices being approved in connection with the New Orleans Mardi Gras is understandable. There is no excuse for discrimination in our Armed Forces, nor will there be any tolerance of any such practice in connection with official naval participation in public events. Current Department of Defense and Navy directives clearly stipulate military participation in any public event is authorized only if admission, seating, and all other accommodations and facilities connected with the event or activity are available to all, without regard to Race, creed, color, or national origin.

Official military participation in the Mardi Gras is limited to the parade, which is a civic function at which there is no segregation. Further, the Navy does not participate officially in any private events, such as Krewe parties, connected with the Mardi Gras, which are not open to all.

In the past, the Navy has provided private organizations lists of officers who might be invited to private events. These lists are provided without regard to race, creed or national origin.

The Commandant of the 8th Naval District has been directed to insure that his command does not provide prospective guest lists to organizations which practice racial, religious, or national origin discrimination in the issuance of invitations.

Sincerely,

PAUL R. IGNATIUS,
Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly, this revelation embarrassed high officials of the Navy, whose official policy is to promote equal treatment. What is significant and alarming is that at the lower levels official cooperation with a kind of private apartheid was taken for granted. Let us hope that the service which was the last to admit Negroes as officers will make certain that nondiscriminatory policies established in Washington will be carried out at all levels.

REPEAL OF REGRESSIVE WELFARE AMENDMENTS IN SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last December 15, in the closing days of the last session, Congress approved the Social Security Amendments of 1967, which included certain restrictive and regressive welfare amendments, the consequences of which will be extremely serious for

America's needy, especially deprived children and those in ill health. Today I have introduced legislation to repeal those restrictive features.

My bill would remove the freeze on aid to families with dependent children—AFDC. It would strike out the new formula for title XIX, which is disrupting New York's medicaid program; finally, it would remove the provision establishing a compulsory work training program for welfare recipients.

Our social and economic policies are insufficient to deal with the legacy of discrimination, the rural migration to the cities, poverty among the aged, the challenge of automation, and scores of related problems. As a result, welfare costs have steadily risen. In the absence of bold and imaginative efforts to solve the causes of poverty, welfare costs will continue to rise, unless we are willing to see people starve. It is no solution to take out the failure to deal with these problems on impoverished families, dependent children, and people who cannot afford medical care.

The percentage freeze on AFDC payments is particularly unwise because it penalizes States which are the net recipients of rural migrants and it punishes children whose sole crime is to have been born of indigent or separated parents.

The compulsory work training program will also be injurious to children; it does not even exempt mothers of pre-school-age children. Although work training may be desirable in principle, it should not be coercive. The provisions of the new law are so authoritarian and arbitrary that the plan should be scrapped until an acceptable one can be worked out.

The new medicaid formula limits Federal matching funds to States which establish an income ceiling for patients equal to 150 percent of the State's income standard for welfare payments. This will punish States which have established progressive programs by forcing them to incur added expense or to exclude millions of families from medicaid programs. It has been estimated by Governor Rockefeller that under the new medicaid formula New York State and its local governments will lose \$43 million in Federal funds the first fiscal year and \$61.7 million the second year.

Mr. Speaker, these provisions should be promptly repealed, and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to consider my bill as soon as possible.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of all the Members of the House, I am submitting for the RECORD, at this time, H.R. 6649, the Export-Import Bank extension bill along with amendments agreed to by the Banking and Currency Committee after the bill was reported.

The bill was originally reported on May 11, 1967, but, as many Members know, after H.R. 6649 was reported several issues arose which your committee did not originally consider. Therefore, supplementary hearings were held in July and September of 1967 concerning the credit sale of military hardware and services to other countries and the effect of certain Senate amendments adopted on the Senate floor which dealt with Eximbank participation in the financing of exports to Communist countries.

After these supplementary hearings were concluded the committee adopted certain proposed amendments to H.R. 6649 which took into consideration the testimony gathered at these hearings. Since H.R. 6649 along with these committee amendments will be considered in the near future, detailed discussion of this bill along with the committee amendments can be left to debate on the bill. The amendments, in the nature of a substitute, are being submitted at this time so that all Members may have the benefit of the full text of the bill with committee amendments before the House takes up H.R. 6649.

Finally, let me add that the Committee on Rules has granted a 2-hour open rule under which it will be in order for the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to be considered as an original bill. Under the rule the bill and committee amendment in the nature of a substitute will be open for amendment under the 5-minute rule and when reported to the House any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 6649 is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended—

(a) By changing "Export-Import Bank of Washington," wherever that name refers to the legal entity created by the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to "Export-Import Bank of the United States."

(b) By inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)" in section 2(b) of that Act, and by adding the following at the end of section 2(b):

"(2) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product by a national or agency of any nation

"(A) which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with armed forces of the United States; or

"(B) which furnishes by direct governmental action (not including chartering, licensing, or sales by non-wholly-owned business enterprises) goods, supplies, military assistance, or advisers to a nation described in subparagraph (A); nor shall the Bank guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase by any nation (or national or agency thereof) of any product which is to be used principally by or in a nation described in subparagraph (A) or (B); except that if the appropriate Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives have reported to their respective houses their determination that any transaction would be in the national interest, then after 30 days after the filing of the last of such reports,

the prohibitions of this paragraph shall not apply to that transaction.

"(3) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in an extension of credit in connection with any credit sale of defense articles and defense services to any country designated under section 4916 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as an economically less developed country for purposes of the tax imposed by section 4911 of that Code. The prohibitions set forth in this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any transaction the consummation of which the President determines would be in the national interest and reports such determination (within thirty days after making the same) to the Senate and House of Representatives. In making any such determination the President shall take into account, among other considerations, the national interest in avoiding arms races among countries not directly menaced by the Soviet Union or by Communist China; in avoiding arming military dictators who are denying social progress to their own peoples; and in avoiding expenditures by developing countries of scarce foreign exchange needed for peaceful economic progress.

"(4) In no event shall the Bank have outstanding at any time in excess of 7½ percent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of this Act for such guarantees, insurance credits or participation in credits with respect to exports of defense articles and services to countries which, in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Bank, are less developed."

(c) By changing in section 2(c) of that Act, "\$2,000,000,000" to read "\$3,500,000,000".

(d) By changing the last sentence in section 3(d) of that Act to read: "Members, not otherwise in the regular full-time employ of the United States, may be compensated at rates not exceeding the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332) for each day spent in travel or attendance at meetings of the Committee, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government service employed intermittently".

(e) By changing, in section 7 of that Act, "\$9,000,000,000" to read "\$13,500,000,000".

(f) By changing, in section 8 of that Act, "June 30, 1968" to read "June 30, 1973".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to change the name of the Bank, to extend for five years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, to restrict the financing by the Bank of certain transactions, and for other purposes."

LEE LOCKWOOD ADDRESSES DALLAS SCOTTISH RITE MASONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 16, Robert Lee Lockwood, the sovereign grand inspector general in Texas of the Scottish Rite Masons made an inspiring address which succinctly high-

lights some of the critical issues facing the Nation today.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to participate in the banquet of the Dallas Scottish Rite Masons at which Mr. Lockwood spoke, and I was greatly impressed by the tone and the dedication evidenced in this address. The timely words of warning about the need for the country to reaffirm its basic and fundamental values should be carefully noted by every Member of this House.

As Mr. Lockwood pointed out, the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite Masons favors two major objectives:

First. The American public school.

Second. The inculcation of patriotism, respect for law and order, and undying loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America.

In outlining these objectives, Mr. Lockwood said:

If the respect for law and order on the part of our citizens is to be maintained and if civil order is to be preserved, it is imperative that those who breach the law be punished as it is that the innocent be protected and it is equally essential that it be demonstrated that the law-abiding citizen will receive protection of the law from the lawless as it is that its guaranties will be afforded him who is accused of its breach.

Speaking to the need for early action, particularly on the part of public officials, the Texas leader of the Masons went on to say:

Let us as Scottish Rite Masons resolve tonight to reaffirm our faith in liberty under law and our American way of life. Let us not wait for someone else to do this for us. Let us not wait until the next election but act now to demand of our present elected representatives and our public officials now in office to set aside all excuses and delays and put first things first and act calmly and resolutely to restore sanity to America.

During the banquet at which Mr. Lockwood spoke, a number of Texas Masons were recognized. I, along with others from throughout the State, had the honor of being invested with the rank and decoration of Knight Commander of the Court of Honour. Others invested with this rank include:

Joel Allen Adcock, Midland; James Kyle Allen, Dallas; H. C. Ashley, Dallas; Charles Batchelor, Jr., Dallas; Theodore Prentis Beasley, Dallas; David Mariotte Bernardin, Richardson; James Doyle Berry, Dallas; James Ernest Bourland, Dallas; Robert Henry Bush, Ennis; Frank Howard Cathey, Jr., Dallas; Robert Frederick Cowan, Dallas; Arthur Craig, Mt. Pleasant; Melvin Croan, Dallas; Richard James Dixon, Dallas.

William Clarence Dowdy, McKinney; Ogle Lee Drain, Dallas; Horace Oran Duncan, Fort Worth; Hayden Macajah Edwards, Fort Worth; Frank Everts, Jr., Dallas; Don Wilson Fein, Irving; Norman Garvin Germany, Dallas; Owen Merle Giles, Dallas; Granville Nimmo Goldston, Dallas; William Crozier Gowan, Jr., Dallas; James Frederick Griffin, Dallas; Jewel Stalvey Hand, McKinney; Thomas Everett Hardaway, McKinney; Neil Alex Harris, Dallas.

Kenneth McKinley Hay, Dallas; Kenyon Hogg, Cleburne; Bernard Oscar Howle, Wichita Falls; Robert Higgins Hughes, Dallas; Thaddeaus Garthwait Hulse, Dallas; Samuel Edward Johnson III, Dallas; William Jefferson King, Dallas; Robert William Kornegay, Dallas; Ralph Stephen Krebs, Lubbock; Estes Eugene Laseman, Wichita Falls; J. C. Ledbetter, Garland; John Marvin Leonard, Fort Worth; Obie Paul Leonard, Fort Worth;

Charles Wilson Lindsey, Jr., Fort Worth; Claude Wilson Lyon, Dallas.

Harvey Benjamin McNeil, Midland; Lee Ander McShan, Jr., Dallas; Cecil Compton Mills, Dallas; Taylor Herbert Minga, Dallas; Charles James Mitchell, Dallas; Herman Grant Motley, Mineral Wells; Joseph Leonard Munn, Sr., Fort Worth; Edwin Caton Pannell, Fort Worth; Earle North Parker, Fort Worth; John William Wright Patman, Washington, D.C.; Glendon Pavatt, Texarkana; Charles Phillip Pitts, Dallas; Meyer Jake Rachofsky, Dallas; John Duke Reynolds, Dallas; Herbert Ray Roberts, McKinney.

Lewis Franklin Russell, Dallas; Ross Hadcock Scott, Dallas; Elmer Thomas Scruggs, Seymour; Harold Glenn Shank, Dallas; Marvin Bishop Simpson, Jr., Fort Worth; James Spencer Smith, Wichita Falls; Sam Morris Smith, Paris; Vernon Walter Smith, Dallas; William Edward Snow, Dallas; Nicholas Anthony Soter, Fort Worth; Harry Stenzler, Dallas; Charles Edgar Still, Stephenville; Louis Rumsey Strickland, Dallas; James Douglas Ward, Arlington; William Cooper Winter, Jr., Dallas; John Elwood Winters, Fort Worth; Nicholas Komminos Zellos, Dallas; William Truss Zimmerman, Burkburnett.

Also, 22 Masons who received the 33d degree were presented at the banquet. They were:

DALLAS SCOTTISH RITE BODIES—ELECTED OCTOBER 3, 1967

Martin Garrett Browne, Midland; Vincent E. J. Drain, Dallas; David Raleigh Graham, Dallas; Ralph Moody Hall, Rockwall; Perry Lafford Howell, Sr., Dallas; Harry Lionel Kaplan, Dallas; Joseph Foraker Leopold, Dallas; Billy Wayne Melton, Bowie; Wallace Albert Moritz, San Angelo; Johnny Edward Morris, Sherman; Virgil Matthew Payne, Jr., Dallas; Frank Bell Potter, Fort Worth; Charles Russell Smith, Dallas; Durwood Anderson Sutton, Grand Prairie; Charles Victor Thornton, Fort Worth; John Dupree Tomme, Jr., Fort Worth; Albert Vos, Dallas; Travis Terrell Wallace, Dallas; Frank Burns Weber, Dallas; James McCrory Willson, Jr., Floydada; Thomas Lloyd Yeargan, Dallas.

EL PASO SCOTTISH RITE BODIES—ELECTED OCTOBER 3, 1967

Preston Earnest Smith, Lubbock.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the text of Mr. Lockwood's remarks and commend them to my colleagues:

Inspector Shepherd, Governor Smith, ladies and my brethren of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite:

Tonight is the ninth banquet Marie and I have attended in Dallas to honor our new Knight Commanders of the Court of Honour and 33° Inspector Generals Honorary. We always enjoy the opportunity of being with our friends in the Valley of Dallas and this occasion has always been most outstanding.

I know each of you who has his wife or loved one with him tonight is pleased as am I to have my wife with me. It means much for our family to be informed of our activities. Marie has traveled with me throughout the world on Masonic trips. I wish I could express my appreciation for the encouragement and understanding she has given me down through our 32 years of active visiting. She has made possible for me to make whatever contribution I have been able to make to our great fraternal organization. She deserves any credit for this.

Every man here tonight is an honor man—a leader. All degrees, including honorary degrees, come to all by reason of one's character or reputation. Without any solicitation on your part, you have been singled out for your Masonic service and for your support of its principles and for your outstanding reputation as a man and citizen to receive the recognition you have received from your Supreme Council.

You are a credit among all. You hold the key to success, the confidence of your fellowmen. You hold positions of trust and responsibility. Each of you has brought honor and credit to our fraternity, to your families and to your friends. Because of your character, this world is better because you have lived. Men such as you are the reason Freemasonry holds the high position it now occupies here and throughout the world.

Our Statutes vests the Supreme Council with exclusive jurisdiction in the matter of awarding honors and strictly limit the number of members honored.

The Sovereign Grand Inspector General of the Supreme Council in each Orient makes nominations which are then given to the Supreme Council Committee on Nominations. This Committee carefully goes over these nominations and presents their report to the Supreme Council for its action in Executive Session.

There are many factors considered in making these nominations but these guidelines are generally used.

First and foremost, that the individual nominated must be an upright Christian gentleman with loyalty, devotion and service to Masonry and particularly to the Scottish Rite; pursuit of good citizenship; belief in and practice of great American fundamentals; an upright man with a good reputation for honesty and square dealing in business and personal affairs; service to his community and mankind in general; and that he support the American way of life and those things which Scottish Rite Masonry favors.

The honors of Scottish Rite Masonry are not intended to mark the end of a distinguished career. They serve to identify Scottish Rite Masons whose achievements may be expected to grow in importance not only to Freemasonry but to the general welfare of the community, state and nation. The men who have been honored are leaders who have been tried and found worthy of greater responsibilities for the benefit of themselves and for their fellowmen. They are marked men; marked so that the younger and less experienced among us shall unmistakably know whom to emulate.

As your chief and fellow-worker, I congratulate you upon this honor which the Supreme Council has seen fit to bestow upon you for your past labors and I welcome you to new labors and greater responsibilities as a man and as a Scottish Rite Mason. It is my sincere hope that you will be as outstanding in your success in the future as you have been in the past—there has never been a time in the history of our country when there was a greater need for men serving God, country, neighbors and themselves, with temperance, fortitude, prudence and justice and practicing brotherly love, relief and truth.

The New Age, which has been published since 1904, is the official publication of our Supreme Council. On the back page of this publication each month is printed the Scottish Rite Creed and those things which the Supreme Council favors. I quote in part:

The Supreme Council favors:

1. The American public school
2. The inculcation of patriotism, respect for law and order, and undying loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America.

We, as Scottish Rite Masons, must take the lead whenever any of these are challenged. Today we must speak out and condemn all forms of disrespect for law by individuals and groups and reaffirm our faith in the rule of law as the only alternative to a lawless society.

The causes, whether real or imaginary, of the civil disobedience which is shaking the very bedrock of our political and social structure are manifold. The foremost cause is a lack of respect for law and an utter disre-

gard for its proper enforcement in the minds of a growing number of citizens.

If the respect for law and order on the part of our citizens is to be maintained and if civil order is to be preserved, it is imperative that those who breach the law be punished as it is that the innocent be protected and it is equally essential that it be demonstrated that the law-abiding citizen will receive protection of the law from the lawless as it is that its guaranties will be afforded him who is accused of its breach.

On last Wednesday, our beloved Grand Lodge adopted a recommendation submitted by our then Grand Master, Dr. J. D. Tomme, Jr., which I now quote:

"In recent years, thinking people have become gravely concerned over the lack of respect for duly constituted authority and civil disobedience in this country. The problem has grown in magnitude and is not confined to any one age level, religious denomination or status. It threatens the very institutions which give strength to the American way of life.

"Masons are obligated to be law-abiding citizens. Further, it is the feeling of the officers of this Grand Lodge that Masons have the added responsibility of taking the initiative in a great moral crusade to strengthen the institutions which are a part of our national heritage.

"The need for respect for duly constituted authority has been given a great deal of thought by Right Worshipful J. Guy Smith, Deputy Grand Master. When he is elected Grand Master of Masons in Texas, this problem will be a major part of this program.

"It is our opinion that the problem deserves immediate attention and that Masons should be in the forefront of a campaign to strengthen the virtues of patriotism, Godliness and ethical, moral conduct. Masons should actively oppose the vices of evil, crime, immoral conduct and civil disobedience.

"This Grand Lodge upholds and supports free, locally-controlled public schools. In a similar manner, it is recommended that this Grand Lodge—under the supervision of the Grand Master, his Officers and the Committee on Public Education—devise and administer a long-range program aimed at helping to strengthen patriotism, Godliness, moral conduct and respect for duly constituted authority."

I say without fear of contradiction that every Scottish Rite Mason wholeheartedly supports this splendid recommendation and certainly stands ready at all times to do whatever he can in its support.

The seriousness of this situation is brought out by a statement made by a former member of the Supreme Court of the United States who is a member of these Scottish Rite Bodies, and I quote from the December 10th issue of the Dallas Morning News:

"Touching on the increase in crime in Washington, during a talk to newsmen attending a law-and-the-press course at SMU last week, retired Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark dropped this remark: 'I used to like to take walks at night in Washington. I don't anymore. I don't feel safe.'"

This condition, my brethren, must be corrected now.

No nation in history has survived if it has turned its back on the moral and spiritual values. We would do well to remember this basic historical fact, as well as that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and that we will be the "land of the free" only as long as we are the "home of the brave."

No people ever had a more goodly heritage than the American people. We would do well to return to the ancient landmarks of our heritage that are important, the things that are permanent and the things that are real. The reverence of God, the dignity of work, and the priceless heritage of freedom.

No people need be concerned if God is their King; if work is a part of their personalities

and characters; if deep down within the hearts of all there is a consuming passion for liberty, freedom of thought, and independence—and a willingness to pay the price therefor.

This is our heritage, founded upon a rock which no storm or wind can shake, and which no American should ever forget.

Masonry is a way of life, but we must wake up before it is too late. There must be drastic changes in our way of life, such as changes in our behavior patterns, changes in our thoughts, and changes in our moral values. The Communists say that America is in an advanced state of moral decline.

Let us decide now which road we are going to travel and that decision will be determined by how strong or how weak we Masons, collectively speaking, really are!

What can we do?

A Chaplain of the U.S. Senate once said: "I am only one; but I am one. I can't do everything, but I can do something. And what I can do, that I ought to do. And what I ought to do, by the grace of God, I shall do."

All true Americans have in time of war staunchly supported our armed forces. All Americans must now lend their active support to those who are charged with the task of waging the war on crime and lawlessness. Only if we support the policeman and the prosecutor and the courts can they protect our rights and freedoms to enjoy them.

Our forefathers have given us a heritage of three fundamental principles upon which to base our lives.

First, these people believed in God and served God.

Second, they believed in work.

Third, they believed in and loved liberty.

When we look back across the years and realize what our forefathers felt and did, there is no American who cannot say with a deep sense of pride, "Yes, we have a great heritage."

Today the world is in a state of change and flux. It is quite evident that civilization is balanced on the thin knife-edge of possible destruction. We, too, live in perilous times and our nation and the world is in grave danger. Of that, there can be no question. But, grave as the dangers may be that threaten us from *without*, they are minor compared to those that threaten us from *within*.—Apathy! Indifference! Complacency! These are the great American crimes. I do not underestimate the dangers from without, but I am convinced that no power from without can beat us. But we can beat ourselves.

Those who would champion a cause, regardless of how popular or unpopular, must not do so in an unlawful manner. The demonstrator who interferes with the conduct of government, or who, with menacing guns, invades the floors of our legislatures, cannot be tolerated. Neither can we tolerate the demonstrator who disrupts any peaceable assembled meeting.

Most of us favor the lawful parade. There are ample ways for the demonstrator to champion his cause without our having to tolerate unlawful sit-ins and sleep-ins.

The right to dissent does not include the right to defy; it does not include the right to undermine our national defense. Neither does it include the right to burn flags and draft cards, or to disrupt the operations of Selective Service.

In a republic, the right of dissent is important. But the rights on opposing sides of a viewpoint are equally important, and we depend on our lawmen to protect those equal rights for all.

Is there no common law on treason in both these struggles? Is there no penalty that can be invoked against those who give aid and comfort to the enemy, whether that enemy is in our streets or overseas?

We cannot and will not give up or retreat

in this war against crime any more than in the war against the Communists in Vietnam.

At the same time, enforcement cannot go it alone, because crime is not merely a police problem. Crime is a social problem, and as such it must be the concern and responsibility of the entire community—yes, a responsibility for every American.

Briefly, a few of our alarming problems:

The beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

The mobs of scabby faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the "new wave" of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

The civil rights groups which are showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

Those who are trying to sell the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the "have-nots" achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

I am more afraid of the Americans than I am of the Russians.

I am afraid of Americans who have become victims of apathy, indifference and complacency.

I am afraid of Americans who are apathetic to the tender loving care with which, so it seems, the red, the pink, the traitor and other subversive elements are treated by our courts.

I am afraid of Americans who have become so hardened to all types of crime, including murder, that the chief offense is no longer the criminal act itself but in having been found out.

I am afraid of Americans who are indifferent to the use of the ballot—who don't vote on Election Day on the theory that one vote more or less won't count.

Even though some of us recognize that our country is headed in the wrong direction, we are living in a dream world waiting for someone else to do what is necessary to get America headed in the right direction again. Too many seemingly don't want to become involved or else they justify their action by saying: "It can't happen here", or "Times are changing; you've got to expect things like that", or they say, "That's the government's problem; I'm not going to worry about it".

America is decaying from within. Immorality is flourishing; juvenile delinquency is on the rise and disregard for law and order have been given a cloak of respectability.

Let us as Scottish Rite Masons resolve tonight to reaffirm our faith in liberty under law and our American way of life. Let us not wait for someone else to do this for us. Let us not wait until the next election but act now to demand of our present elected representatives and our public officials now in office to set aside all excuses and delays and put first things first and act calmly and resolutely to restore sanity to America.

I close by quoting in part from William Tyler Page:

"I believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

ONLY RESEARCH CAN CONQUER DISEASE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Huggins, Nobel laureate, says that only research can conquer disease. A recent address by Charles B. Huggins, M.D., before the Chicago Sunday Evening Club, is as follows:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Living Philosophy" was the title of a talk given recently by Charles B. Huggins, MD, before the Chicago Sunday Evening Club. Dr. Huggins, a Nobel laureate is William B. Ogden Distinguished Service Professor and director of the Ben May Laboratory for Cancer Research at the U. of Chicago. The text of his address follows:)

With a good philosophy for living, conscience rests quiet, the soul is still and one achieves contentment. Equanimity is the greatest blessing that can come to man. It comes when one places family foremost in his thoughts with his work a close second. Other considerations are trivial. One constantly strives to remove himself from the center of the universe and to become the servant of man.

In America one lives in a demiparadise. Food is abundant and varied. Shelter and warmth are easily accessible. Work is available to all who want it and are well enough to partake in the joy of labor.

The doctor is blessed above all men in his right and privilege to care for sick folks. The physician is the secular priest. He seeks the opportunity to serve, to minister unto the sick and the discouraged. Like Science, Medicine knows no boundaries and it excludes no one.

Happy is the man who has the privilege to engage in medical research. Fortunate beyond all words is the boy or girl who is looking forward to a career of discovery in experimental medicine.

I must say a few words about experimental medicine, which is my life. It is the study of disease in living creatures. Medical research enshrines the prayers and the needs of sick people. Disease, hopeless at the present time, can be conquered but only through research. In these days the arts are tawdry and in blight; architecture and sculpture, painting and the composition of music are shoddy. But Science flourishes as never before. Science is the art of our century.

Every year comes cures of the most devastating and vexatious diseases. Consider penicillin, vitamins, hormones, sulfa drugs—all are products of the mind and heart and hand of lab workers who enjoy the privilege of work seven days each week. Our lab is our church. In medical research one labors to solve problems to help the sick. And when discoveries are made they are our legacy to the race, to all regardless of domicile or politics, to last *ad aeternum*.

Medical research is altruistic. It donates. It is life. It is opposite in spirit to war which drops bombs on people who disagree with us. War demoralizes and destroys. War accomplishes nothing constructive. War is death.

Medical research is expensive but cheaper than bombs.

Medical research is less costly than soaking a hamlet with gasoline and igniting the homes of people. The torch kindles hate and enmity which will persist 100 years to haunt our children and our children's children.

Experimental medicine enhances the image of our beautiful country which we love.

ILLINOIS MEDICAL COLLEGES ADMIT 583 STUDENTS ANNUALLY, FAR TOO FEW

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

my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, feeling strongly as I do that one of the great and pressing needs of our country and the world is a large increase in the number of practicing physicians, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the board of governors of the Institute of Medicine of Chicago and an editorial from the institute's publication of July 1967. I am sure my colleagues, concerned by the critical shortage of physicians, will find the letter and the editorial of keen and challenging interest.

The letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: The Board of Governors of the Institute of Medicine of Chicago and its Committee on Professional Education believe it timely and germane for you who represent the people of Illinois at the State and National level to be appraised of the position of the Institute of Medicine on a matter affecting the future health care of all citizens.

The Committee on Medical Education, chaired by Robert G. Page, M.D., Associate Dean, Division of Biological Sciences, University of Chicago, and composed of the Deans, Assistant Deans of all five medical schools in Chicago, and twenty-six faculty members, many of them heads of departments, from the five schools, gave long and careful consideration to the problem.

The Institute of Medicine was founded 53 years ago by the then leaders of Medicine in Chicago. Its membership today continues to represent a cross section of outstanding physicians in the various specialties of medicine and prominent faculty members of the several medical schools. It is within this framework that the enclosed Editorial, which appeared in Volume 26, Number 10, of the official publication of the Institute, is respectfully called to your attention.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT G. PAGE, M.D.,

Chairman, Committee on Professional Education.

PAUL S. RHODES, M.D.,

Chairman, Board of Governors.

WALTER S. PRIEST, M.D.,

Executive Director.

Following is the editorial from the July 1967 proceedings of the Institute of Medicine of Chicago:

The Institute of Medicine of Chicago, which has as its ultimate object the provision of comprehensive health care of highest quality to the citizens of the Chicago community and the state, is vitally interested in medical education. The following statement prepared by the Chairman of its Professional Education Committee, seemed to the editors of the *Proceedings* to be of sufficient importance to publish as a pro tem position paper. The problem is too important for a final policy statement to be made without more prolonged study. But, at the present time, the Board of Governors supports the stand taken by its Professional Education Committee.

The Professional Education Committee of the Institute has considered the problem of increasing the number of physicians graduated from medical schools in the State of Illinois. It was generally agreed that undergraduate medical education is a national obligation which must be assumed by local bodies. Such bodies include state supported and privately supported medical schools and universities, which are the only educational

institutions producing physicians in this country.

Currently, the five medical schools in the state admit 583 students annually (Chicago Medical School 75; University of Chicago 79; University of Illinois 205; Northwestern University 136; Stritch School of Medicine 88). This number does not fulfill the state obligation to produce enough physicians to meet the manpower needs of the state and the nation. Despite this, the number should not be enlarged until the existing medical schools are given enough support to adequately meet the needs of their existent students and faculties. It is now recognized by medical school and university administrators that current sources of support are inadequate. Some states have seen this need for years and have supported all medical schools within the state. Notable among these is the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which now grants each school in the state \$3,400 for each enrolled student regardless of home. In addition, the legislature has granted additional funds to both the University of Pittsburgh and Temple University since these institutions have become more closely affiliated with the state. By continuing this support, the state has assured the schools that they can continue not only to exist but to excel. Such support is now urgently needed by all five medical schools in the State of Illinois.

Only after this support has been obtained should the state look toward the expansion of facilities to train more doctors. It is clear that more medical schools will have to be established to meet the needs of our growing population. This is emphasized by the fact that approximately 20% of the newly licensed physicians in the United States each year are graduates of foreign medical schools. This drains well-trained men and women from parts of the world which can ill afford this loss.

Despite this need and despite the logical argument that one or more new schools should be developed in Illinois, members of this committee believe that an increase in the enrollment of the existing schools should be carefully explored as the most efficient method of immediately swelling the ranks of graduating physicians from Illinois medical schools.

It may well be that some of our schools could expand at a cost which would be significantly less than the funds which would be needed for a completely new facility. Already there has been a small increase in the size of the entering classes in response to federal legislation. This increase could, perhaps, be significantly expanded provided that funding could be arranged.

We acknowledge that one or more new medical schools must be established in the state in the long run to help meet the critical shortage of physicians. Once the above considerations have been met, appropriate bodies can turn their attention to the problem. Certainly, even at this stage, planning should be started. Such matters as size, location and duration (two- or four-year program) must be dealt with in a thorough fashion. If there is to be more than one new school, these questions become even more important.

Location is a topic fraught with many implications. Certainly, the relationship of any new school to a university is important. The effect on the community in which such a school would be located is also germane. For example, the effect that a new school in Chicago would have on the community might be relatively less than the effect on another location within the state. On the other hand, the metropolis may well be able to better support a medical school than could a smaller city.

We believe that a four-year school allows more flexibility in curriculum than does a two-year school. This is particularly true when one considers the newer programs which have been developed in the past few

years. Such curricula demand an increasing interaction between the basic and clinical sciences. Furthermore, there is a trend for multiple pathways through medical school—usually informal individual arrangements by the liberal use of elective time but also in a more formal structure in some schools.

In summary, we believe that all the existing medical schools in the state should receive state support before any expansion of facilities should be considered. Second, when this has been accomplished, an increase in the number of physicians educated in Illinois should have high priority in state planning. This should be done by, first, increasing class size in existing schools and, second, by starting one or more new schools.

WASHINGTON WELCOMES SULTAN RASCID ABDILLAHI OF SOMALI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and for myself personally I have the honor and the pleasure of welcoming to Washington Sultan Rascid Abdillahi, Vice President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Somali. He is numbered among the foremost statesmen of Africa, and on this, his first visit to the United States, expects to spend 2 months in travels and conversations in all sections of our country.

The bonds between Somali and the United States are close and warm, although Somali adheres to a course of strict neutrality between the East and the West.

Anthony Astrachan, writing in the Washington Post, said that Vice President HUMPHREY received the most genuine welcome perhaps in Somali than in any of the seven African nations the Vice President visited on his goodwill tour. In the same spirit of warm cordiality we welcome to our Capital City and to our country, this outstanding African leader, Sultan Rascid Abdillahi.

Here is the biographic data on our distinguished visitor that I am certain will be of keen interest to my colleagues:

BIOGRAPHIC DATA OF SULTAN RASCID ABDILLAHI

Born in or near Hargeisa.

Age: About 42.

Educated in British Somaliland Protectorate schools.

Founding member of the NUF political party in the Protectorate and imprisoned for 18 months for participating in a riot in 1952.

Elected member of the Legislative Council for Hargeisa in 1959.

From late 1960 to early 1964 Counselor of the Somali Embassy in Saudi Arabia.

Elected to the National Assembly in 1964 from Hargeisa and elected Vice President of the Assembly on March 9, 1966.

Eldson son of the Sultan of Eldagalla sub-tribe of Is'hak; on father's death in January 1967, became Sultan.

Also the nominal leader of "Gerhargis," a combine of Eldagalla and Habr Yunis tribesmen in the Hargeisa region.

Fluent in English and Arabic.

RETREAT FROM THE HILLS—THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. WHITENER. 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 Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1967, WBTV of Charlotte, N.C., presented a documentary on the war on poverty. This documentary was based upon months of study of the program of WAMY, Inc., a community action program involving the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey. This area of Appalachia has been the source of much discussion and the results of the WBTV research will be of interest to people throughout the country.

The work of Dave Larson, a member of the news staff of WBTV on the project, kept him occupied for several months. The transcript of his report will indicate that he took thorough and painstaking care to do an accurate and objective study.

When so many voices are being raised against the programs of our Government for the purpose of political gain, it is encouraging to see a private concern do what was done in this study by Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Corp. The officials and employees of WBTV had no personal purpose to serve as they sought to develop the facts surrounding the operations of WAMY, Inc. I commend them for the objectivity and thoroughness in the development of this documentary program.

WBTV has furnished me with a transcript of the documentary which I make a part of the RECORD at this point:

RETREAT FROM THE HILLS—THE WAR ON POVERTY

(NOTE.—A half hour documentary produced in color for television by the News Department, WBTV, a division of Jefferson Standard Broadcasting, Charlotte, North Carolina.)

(This program was broadcast from 7:00 to 7:30 p.m., Friday, December 29, 1967 by WBTV, Channel 3, Charlotte, North Carolina.)

DAVE ATKINS (local mountaineer). And . . . uh . . . uh . . . it's not only our family, but others—there's no young people . . . uh . . . in this community . . . uh . . . that has . . . uh . . . finished school. They're all gone—had to leave to go find something to do. Uh . . . we have . . . uh . . . uh . . . children from . . . uh . . . scattered from Alabama to California. It's all because of lack of something for a livelihood to stay here—they couldn't stay.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Four counties, high in the mountains of Western North Carolina have never known prosperity. Over half the highland families in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties have been poor since they walked into the Blue Ridge Mountains in the early 1800's.

But WAMY, the mountain arm of the War on Poverty has pledged to help these mountain poor . . . to break the cycle of their despair and lift them up to the standards that many now enjoy. That promise, like the many that have come to the highland poor since the Civil War disrupted their primitive way of life, that promise is now shattering.

In 1964 the OEO warriors drove into these mountains from Chicago, Milwaukee, Wash-

ington, and even from Haight-Asbury. They were 'dedicated to the proposition' that to do battle with poverty they must organize the poor, build leaders, present a solid front to local governments, the state house and even the many agencies of the federal government. Most of the soldiers had their own ideas about organizing the poor . . . and then what to do with them once they were formed up.

Their previously untold goal? A revolution, against alleged discrimination from county politicians, health departments, and even the Welfare Department itself. How did they plan to fight this folk revolution? One glib organizer attempted a march on Washington; another tried to convince the poor that they were being cheated by the Welfare Department . . . that the mountaineers should have been getting much more money.

Three years and three and a half million dollars later, their uniforms tattered, the revolutionaries are in retreat . . . rejected by the mountaineers they sought to help. Most of the original fighters are now gone. WAMY's director has resigned; some have joined poverty agencies in big city slums . . . a few of the more radical were fired. Talk of immorality has followed them wherever they have gone. Mod clothes and hippy haircuts were not the key that unlocked the mountain man's heart. Stories of wild parties and radical teaching filters through to the conservative highland middle class. The mountaineers rebelled. They wouldn't join the fight, believe in new ideas. And then, as quickly as they came, these new fighters were gone . . . back to the big cities, back to the mainstream of America.

But sorrow remained, hanging over the isolated coves like the mist that gave the mountains their name. The terrible poverty stands stark amid a countryside whose natural beauty says this can't be.

WAMY Community Action, a step child of the North Carolina Fund's experimental program to find new ways of solving poverty, is now entering its fourth year. Its primary aim, and also that of the Fund, is to, quote, "Organize the economically deprived people." WAMY was to achieve this goal by developing special techniques to get poor people to meet together to discuss their problems . . . the, quote, "easiest and quickest way to attack the causes of poverty," end of quote. Except for a few small communities, the highland poor remain unorganized. WAMY's largest success was helping a small community build a water system. According to some WAMY staffers that same community's unity has since disintegrated WAMY's self-stated goal, "organization of the poor," has failed according to professional observers.

Recently resigned WAMY Director Ernest Eppley, who is now special assistant to George Esser, director of the North Carolina Fund, was in command for three years. During this time his office issued a background paper which indicated that the effectiveness of the poverty fighters was hampered by gossip of wild parties and ill-advised conduct. Quote, "Some of the coolness of the press and public could be attributed to . . . alleged misbehavior of Vista's and Neighborhood Youth Corp enrollees," end of quote. Eppley was in charge of both groups and I asked him why offending workers hadn't been stopped or fired.

ERNEST EPPLEY (former director of WAMY). Given the situation we had . . . uh . . . we couldn't tell Vista volunteers exactly how it should . . . uh . . . behave themselves . . . uh . . . in their private time and this kind of thing—this is the thing . . . uh that was offensive, their behavior, uh as you say when they had parties and things of this type was, uh, evidently offensive to a lot of local people. And it was offensive to me too in a lot of cases, uh. But here again they . . . they were young people—we thought they were adults—they were on—they were in a na-

tional program and they were sent to us, we didn't select them—they were sent to us and we, we felt we had an obligi . . . obligation to them so I don't see what we, uh, handled the situation badly as far as, uh, the administration of WAMY goes. Uh, I . . . I regret, that, uh, that a lot of people got negative views about the Vistas and that some of the things they did were offensive to the community, but there's no way that I see now looking back that we could have improved on what we did.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Vista, the at-home version of the Peace Corps, is a volunteer corp, supposedly trained to fight poverty in America. One Vista volunteer in Boone broke the cycle of poverty for a Neighborhood Youth Corp enrollee . . . by marrying him. According to Vista, selection of members is based on emotional stability, maturity, resourcefulness, dependability, motivation and ability to help people help themselves. But, apparently Washington forgot to tell Eppley that his Vistas were supposed to be mature and emotionally stable.

ERNEST EPPLEY (former director of WAMY). Vistas that we had at that time were a very, uh, uh, difficult group to work with. We've had a number of Vista volunteers who have, uh, been difficult for us to supervise. We had to, uh, control—. But, I'd had no evidence whatsoever personally that there was, was, immoral activity going on—I couldn't, uh, prove it right now if I wanted to and I don't think any one else can. Uh, they were, uh, a group of people who like to . . . who worked as a team—they were very closely united. They had, uh, great deal of idealism, great deal of ability to work long hours and, uh, but as a result of many things going on, uh, most of the Vistas left before their terms were up and uh, whether—whether this was, uh, good or bad, I'm not saying, but I say that, uh, this was done in a uh, way—in a way that protected those Vistas, uh, as well as every other person involved.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Eppley did not comment on how the poor were protected. He would not elaborate on "these things" that were going on. Bill Stout, who has remained as the chief financial officer of WAMY is highly critical of this method of fighting poverty. His attitude reflects the backwash of the rejected revolution.

BILL STOUT (present financial director of WAMY). I'm sorry to say that the Vistas did cast what you might say a bad image on WAMY and it was WAMY's responsibility at that time I felt like, to move them out and get rid of them. However, we did not, uh, members of the staff, uh back at that time were not in favor of the Vista program at all.

Uh, some members of the staff were. There was a . . . uh . . . difference of opinions regarding Vistas then, but now as I said, Vistas have been upgraded and they are behaving like ladies and gentlemen, at least most of them are. And we have made it a mandate now if they don't behave like ladies and gentlemen, they'll not be associated with WAMY any longer than it takes us to find out.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). During the past three years Stout has been credited with maintaining a highly competent accounting system for WAMY. He is a mountaineer—one of the few hired at the beginning of the program.

The present deputy director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is a Durham man, Jay Rodgers. During an interview, Rodgers talked about Vista and WAMY parties. He said that he held several of the parties at his downtown Boone apartment. At one party, the WAMY official said a Vista volunteer fell out a window. At another the party goers moved out onto his downtown lawn . . . continuing as if they were still inside. He said that in the summer of 1966, quote, "The parties got so wild I had to stop having them."

ERNEST EPPLEY (former director of WAMY).

Let me say . . . let me say this right off the bat. No one required me to employ Jay Rodgers,—no one. No one ever said that I had to employ him—no one ever said that I had to keep him. I employed him because I wanted him—I employed him—I kept him because I wanted him.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Rodgers is now said to be a highly capable worker by several remaining WAMY officials.

If, as Eppley has said, he did not know about the alleged misbehavior, the extremely radical organizing techniques of North Carolina Fund Consultant Ed Atkins drew his attention. Ed Atkins was hired by WAMY to develop the methods of organization so necessary to fight poverty by organizing the poor. But Ed Atkins had strange ideas about what to do with the poor once organized.

ERNEST EPPLEY (former director of WAMY). Ed Atkins was a community organizer who came here to work with the Vistas to get some meetings set up with poor people. And these were countrywide meetings and there was a, uh, real crash effort to get people to come into meetings, uh, and many things that were said and done, uh, during . . . during that time about two months period that, uh, offended local people. This is mainly the Vista volunteers and Ed Atkins trying to get poor people to come out and saying to them that you're poor and that you should come out and uh, meet with other people and start doing something about your problems. And, uh, I think many times Ed Atkins, uh, and the Vistas gave the impression that they . . . they almost immediately . . . these . . . these problems could be solved when . . . when it really wasn't true. Uh, so uh, I personally terminated Ed Atkins when I found out the situation was not . . . uh . . . was becoming too offensive to the community.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Nobody at WAMY seems to know very much about Ed Atkins. A few thought he was a CIA agent. They say he was always getting calls from Washington. Eppley wouldn't say just what Ed Atkins did. What caused him to fire this man of mystery?

ERNEST EPPLEY (former director of WAMY). Ed Atkins had some real skills. He had some . . . some, uh . . . a, a personality that was appealing to a lot of people. Uh, at the same time he . . . he, uh, went too far in many things he did. Uh, so I think that . . . uh . . . Ed Atkins taught us something as a consultant, but he did some things that we didn't . . . didn't want to have done and uh . . . I don't think that uh, we can completely look at his being there as a negative kind of experience because we did learn from it.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Many present staff members do not agree with Atkins' philosophy. A WAMY official said Ed Atkins told him that he believed the poor would have to take from the rich, by force if necessary, in order to get out of poverty.

ERNEST EPPLEY (former director of WAMY). May have been something in his mind maybe that other people heard him say and other people thought about him. He didn't express this to me particularly. But I think he know that . . . uh, you can go and talk to people on . . . on, their level about their problems and . . . and . . . and, name the problem which is poverty with them and they're not offended by it if they begin to be inspired by the understanding of the man that really communicates with them.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Eppley calls it the "maximum involvement method." He says, quote, "It begins with mass meetings of the poor centered around a talent show or a gospel sing. The program allows for the establishment of an environment of rapport, good feeling, familiarity and unity. Then the staff is able to follow up on the specific needs of the poor." What or how Ed

Atkins took this meeting further, into what seemed to some the beginning of a revolution, remains a mystery of the highland coves.

With Atkins fired, many of the Vistas gone, and public opinion against WAMY at an all-time high, the warriors prepared for the summer of 1967. A new program, using college students to organize the poor was set up. But it too was disastrous. The radical element of WAMY, apparently sensing the end of the battle, made a last ditch effort. The students were to create community meetings, to teach the poor their rights, duties and responsibilities. A one week training session was held. Some of the teachers, however, held unusually controversial qualifications.

One was Myles Horton, director of the Highlander Folk School in Knoxville, Tennessee. The Highlander Folk School was investigated in 1959 by a Tennessee Legislative Committee which linked it with many known and admitted Communists. In a national review magazine article, Stokely Carmichael credits Horton with having developed the concept of "Black Power," Congressman John Williams said about Horton, he is, quote, "an avowed Socialist and Communist sympathizer. Horton ran what has been described as a Communist training school in Tennessee until the State closed it down."

Another of the teachers, Howard Fuller, a controversial civil rights worker from Durham—since suspended from a North Carolina Fund job that was partly financed by federal money. What did the students think? How did they react to their unusual teachers? Some said they didn't think helping the poor was supposed to involve marches on local governments . . . sit-ins, and even mob violence. One of the speakers at the camp, which is owned by Appalachian State University, reportedly encouraged the burning of a school bus. One student said he felt he was being asked to organize a revolution. The students worked half-heartedly this summer to organize the poor. But even with the teachings of Myles Horton and Howard Fuller, the students were unable to organize the mountaineers . . . they did not join. WAMY has had Vistas whose behavior was offensive to the program's director. It has hired persons like Ed Atkins and Howard Fuller to organize the poor. And, it has also wasted money.

H. C. Moretz, acting WAMY director, was formerly director of the Neighborhood Youth Corp. Moretz expresses displeasure with the Washington-issued guidelines within which he had to operate. This year he was able to drop a work-crew concept which has drawn the most criticism . . . and he adds, "didn't accomplish very much." In a two year period over \$1,800,000 was spent on the program that Moretz says didn't accomplish very much. The federal approach, Moretz says, "is to get kids in the Neighborhood Youth Corps . . . whether they want in or not." The bait . . . money. The major problem he says, "was an inability to hire good supervisors . . . and a lack of money for councilors."

Dave Mast, welfare director in Watauga County, was a member of the original WAMY Board of Directors. Mast says the first Headstart programs were hastily drawn and ineffective, due to pressure from Washington to get started. He said they were told they had \$198,000 . . . to begin a Headstart program right away and complete it in four and a half months. "They just hired teachers," he said, "until they ran out of money." He says they were told to spend the money quickly, eliminating the time necessary for proper planning. Mast had an interesting impression of WAMY employees—quote, "persons who have failed somewhere else." The WAMY administration has changed some of the more radical programs this year, but on paper they are still dedicated to organizing the poor. WAMY began as an experiment, and it has

been a costly experiment, run by persons committed to reaching one result—community organization. Yet no new look has been taken. No one has tried another method . . . tried changing the chemicals used in the experiment. Eppley still says this is the only way to win the war on poverty in the mountains, even though he has clearly failed to organize large groups of the mountaineers. This year the experiment will be performed again—the cost will be well in excess of \$400,000. And the outcome will probably be the same. Yet there is another agency dedicated to helping the poor that is succeeding. It is also dedicated to belief in God. Father Paul Ackermann is one of the Glenmary priests.

Father PAUL ACKERMANN (Glenmary priest). Glenmary was founded to go to really what you'd say the "backwoods of America"—the small towns and the rural sections, the predominately rural sections, to try to bring the full witness of uh . . . of the church. We all know that there are things in our small towns which with no . . . uh detriment to some of the churches there. They are, you might say, and I hate to use the word, but they are "one-sided."

Uh, for instance we might say some of the attitudes with Blue Laws, uh, some of the attitudes with regard to drink. Uh, there would be examples, I think, of cases where one or two churches have had a monopoly on influencing the religious attitudes of the town.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Through Father Paul's efforts, a low price clothing store has been opened. A mental health clinic is in operation in Burnsville. The Yancey County WAMY office has cooperated with him in these efforts. His church was the only church to make space available for these badly needed operations.

The Glenmary priests have been fighting poverty in the mountains for a long time. Are they dedicated to organizing the poor? Have their successes come through community action?

Father PAUL ACKERMANN (Glenmary priest). I firmly believe in the personal approach, and I feel that in our counties here that we're not gonna move all the people in any one direction—no one ever has including the government. And therefore, I think we can where we find healthy desire, that we can capitalize on this and work with these individuals to enable them to take the homes that they, maybe some have found by reading or listening or seeing, on television for instance—uh, television in these mountains has a tremendous impact on changing the customs of children the next generation and maybe this is the way we can step in.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). There have been good side effects from WAMY. More persons are aware of the mountain poor. Some very intelligent and dedicated people have and are working in the WAMY program. But WAMY had the chance to get one of the area's most talented citizens to develop a crafts program . . . but they apparently ignored him.

Bill Brown is the director of the Penland School of Crafts. The school, founded in 1929, is not only one of the oldest such schools in existence, it is one of the best. Students have come from all fifty states and sixty foreign countries. Brown was asked to develop a crafts program for the area in typical WAMY fashion.

BILL BROWN (Director, Penland School of Crafts). They asked us on Thursday at 5 o'clock and on Monday at 4 o'clock—we had to have uh, some great proposals written and so it was kind of a scramble, but luckily I had written up one before that uh, I could use that seem to fit or I thought fit.

DAVE LARSON (WBTV reporter). Brown had in mind a long term plan, including two years of training for those mountain poor who had the talent and interest to become skilled craftsmen. He was going to throw

open the doors of one of the best craft schools in the country. The end result of his plan would have seen the establishment of other work shops in the area . . . all opening their doors to those mountaineers who wanted and needed a skilled profession. Its future impact would have been tremendous. What did WAMY do with this plan? This different type of experiment—

BILL BROWN (Director, Penland School of Crafts). Well, they took all the ideas and they were many—and then they were taken, I think, to Boone, uh, to where, uh, the whole area ideas were put together. And I think that's about the last I heard of it.

DAVE LARSON (WBTB reporter). WAMY developed another craft program. Many persons are taking part in it . . . but it is intended only to supply additional income to the families, letting the mothers sew dolls for sale to a government marketing set-up. Some poor are getting a little extra money . . . but this program cannot lift them out of poverty, set them up as skilled craftsmen. But the large interest shown by the highlanders indicates they do want to help themselves. I'll return with some concluding observations about WAMY and the mountains after this message.

Dave Atkins is one of the mountaineers WAMY came to help. He is in his sixties and has raised 12 children. But both he and his wife are sick now—their only income—a 126-dollar a month social security check. Dave Atkins needs help:

DAVE ATKINS (local mountaineer). Plan to build a house—and would have worked to that end—saved money for that purpose—started a savings account for that purpose and uh, we built it uh, for \$2,800. We could, uh, built by going in debt but we wanted to pay as we went and uh, we thought that we were ready to start and uh, things looked pretty good. But because of uh, the company or corporation that we were working for went into red—and they decided to move, uh left me without a job. And, uh, about the uh, time that the job went out, my wife got sick, hospital bills, doctor bills took our savings. I didn't get enough hardly to make ends meet and then a disability hit me. And uh, uh—this took it all.

DAVE LARSON (WBTB reporter). Is the mountain man to once again be forgotten? WAMY came to fight, but so far it has failed. The original warriors are gone. But the mountains and their problems remain. Dave Larson WBTB News, good night.

NATIONWIDE UNIFORM EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of deep satisfaction that I was informed by the officials at A.T. & T. last week that they will begin immediately to make available to the public a nationwide, uniform, emergency telephone number. It will be "911"; short, simple, a number that is easy to remember and dial.

I feel that a very important goal has been reached, that a significant step has been taken in providing for the emergency needs of the American people, whether they suffer from accidents, from criminal assaults, from whatever circumstances threaten their safety and security.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee which sponsors a great deal and variety of research, and more specifically as a member of the Daddario subcommittee I have long argued for the application of scientific, technological improvements to the everyday needs of the American public. This action by the officials at Bell Telephone today is an exact implementation of this philosophy. I congratulate them on their safety consciousness and their concern for the American public.

The end of the road, however, has not been reached. We are, to adopt Winston Churchill's phrase, perhaps only at "the end of the beginning." Now we must make a national effort to persuade the American people in large communities and small, in metropolitan areas like Chicago and small, rural communities like Converse, Ind., to urge, to persuade their local public officials to adopt this single, emergency number.

A.T. & T. estimates a cost to themselves of some \$50,000,000. There will be some expense for the cities and communities which adopt this number, but that cost is minimal in terms of the present high cost of accidents, of death, of fire, of crime. What will be saved in property and lives is unaccountable—to say nothing of the profound sense of security such an easily remembered number will provide each of the American people.

Because the intent of my original resolution has now been essentially achieved, I am introducing a new resolution. This resolution expresses the Congress support of the single, nationwide emergency number of "911." It also earnestly recommends the adoption of "911" locally by the American people through their chosen officials. A.T. & T. promises that this can begin in 1969. I intend to spend a great deal of time and effort to educate the American people to the need and the value of this important improvement in emergency telephone communications. I ask that all interested parties individuals and groups, public and private citizens, join me in this effort.

NATIONWIDE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] concerning the action taken over the weekend for the establishment of a uniform emergency telephone number.

I also introduced on May 25, 1967, a resolution along the same lines as the gentleman from Indiana, and am introducing a resolution calling on all levels of government to assist in implementing this idea. In view of the upswing of crime throughout the Nation, I think it is both significant and salutary that action of this nature should be taken for the pro-

tection of the average individual in this country.

I am very pleased that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has taken this initial action, and I hope now the telephone exchanges throughout the Nation will be adapted and modified so that this emergency number can be put into effect, and the States and localities will cooperate in making sure that citizens of every locality of the Nation can take advantage of this emergency number.

WASHINGTON AREA FREEWAYS

Mr. GUDE. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, today's edition of the Washington Post attributes to Transportation Secretary Alan Boyd an incredible compendium of contradictions in defense of his opposition to Washington area freeways. I believe all Members of Congress and of metropolitan areas should well note what is happening in Washington.

He quotes surveys supporting the Wisconsin Avenue corridor for an interstate link to argue against the North Central Freeway. This ignores the fact that some experts have said both are needed, as he would know, had he not studiously isolated himself from local freeway experts. Of the two, the North Central has been selected. Yet the same Mr. Boyd, has charged that the area's transportation plans rely too heavily on freeways.

And consider his avowed support of roads planned for "where the traffic wants to go." My testimony before the House Roads Subcommittee last month forecast the paralysis to result if North Central's link with Montgomery County is abandoned.

Local highway decisions following years of debate are dismissed as the product of "political clout," by the Secretary, who, in the next breath insists, "decisions affecting local transportation should be made locally." He crowns this absurdity by his own moves to block the Three Sisters Bridge, and his own attacks on local freeway planning, of which this morning's article represents the most recent example.

I can only deplore his statement that "we should not just tear up homes of poor people and Negroes," as irresponsible demagoguery; a further contradiction, in view of his stated awareness that air rights construction can not only do much to alleviate highway dislocation problems but actually provide better use of the land and provide for better housing. Such statements hardly contribute to the local decisionmaking process by Mayor Washington and the new District government. Just last month Mr. Boyd was talking about converting a park along the Potomac into an interstate highway. One can only wonder what he will recommend next month.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the article in today's Post, and the hear-

ings held last month by the Roads Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works.

A LESSON IN LOYALTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, against a background of dissension, demonstration, and draft-card burning over the war in Vietnam, a refreshingly patriotic action was taken recently by the students of Shades Valley High School in Birmingham, Ala.

The Shades Valley Student Council proposed for adoption by the school's student body a resolution in support of the fighting men in Vietnam and the freedoms they so gallantly defend. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 1,085 to 9.

These students prove that there are many young people, and I believe them to be in the majority, who believe our American heritage is worth defending and preserving. Their devotion to America and the cause of freedom in the world is a lesson in loyalty which every American citizen could well follow.

It is a privilege to represent these young men and women in the Congress, and on their behalf I am including a copy of their resolution, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY SHADES VALLEY STUDENT BODY,
F. A. PEAKE, PRINCIPAL

Whereas, We the students of Shades Valley High School recognize that justice, faith, hope, and loyalty have made our country strong; and,

Whereas, We recognize the need for the defense of all people against tyranny; and,

Whereas, We believe that this nation, under the guidance of God, is destined to resist aggression against all people; it is therefore,

Resolved, That we declare our full physical, moral, and spiritual support to our soldiers in Viet Nam, and the freedoms they defend.

MANDATORY FEDERAL RETIREMENT AT 70

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Pittsburgh Press carries a report with a London dateline recommending compulsory retirement for persons who have reached their 55th birthday. In view of the innumerable major and vital contributions to science and mankind in general that have come from far older individuals, the suggestion has to be regarded as ludicrous, yet the issue resurrects the timeless question about the age level at which most persons pass the peak of competence and efficiency.

Only to call attention to a current comment on this subject, I include the Press item in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. At the same time I am introducing a bill calling for mandatory retirement of Federal Government employees at the age of 70. While conceding that the figure is arbitrary on my part and that I have no statistics purporting to show that 70 is the year at which the average person begins to find it impossible to keep up with the requirements of his employment, I insist that the legislation is necessary if only to provide for normal and equitable advancement of subordinate employees into positions of greater responsibility.

My bill in no way reflects upon the mental or physical ability of persons who reach the age of 70 and are still in Government service, although no doubt there is ample evidence that the demands of most jobs are too exhausting for the average individual in that age group. There are exceptions, of course—history is replete with accounts of older men whose inventions, paintings, writings, military and political leadership, teachings, and other talents have helped to make this world a better place in which to live.

The fact remains, however, that there is some point at which a person should be required to retire from the Federal service. Otherwise, if for no other reason, many younger employees qualified to step into key positions can lose ambition and go to seed without ever having the opportunity to make full use of their potential. A younger employee who has been loyal and productive in his work should most certainly be able to look to the future with reasonable hope of moving up the ladder rather than to be discouraged in the knowledge that the man ahead of him will not voluntarily retire and is not forced to do so.

The report from London follows:

OVER-55 WRITTEN OFF BY EDUCATOR

(By Ivor Key)

LONDON.—You are too old at 55. Once past this age a man must no longer be allowed to hold any kind of responsible administrative office in certain fields.

Dr. Edmund Leach, 57, a social anthropologist, advocated this last night in the fifth of his series of Reith lectures on the BBC.

He said since those who hold offices of power will never willingly give them up, the young must enforce arbitrary rules of early retirement.

His compulsory retirement plan would affect those concerned with research and technical development, either in education, or in industry, or in politics.

The old, he said, should accept Voltaire's advice and retire gracefully to cultivate their own gardens.

Dr. Leach, provost of King's College, Cambridge, made his startling proposals in a lecture called "Men and Learning" in which he made a slashing attack on Britain's educational system.

"In a changing world," he said, "machines get obsolete very quickly. So do human beings. How can young people possibly have confidence in the advice and judgment of old men who freely admit they are totally bewildered?"

"The old are only competent to do the job that they were brought up to do—that is, to operate with the out-of-date over-simplified stereo-types that were current in their youth."

SUPREME COURT AND CRIME

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, by striking another section of the Subversive Activities Control Act, the Supreme Court has again demonstrated why Congress should act quickly on House Joint Resolution 418 to authorize the legislature, by two-thirds vote of both Houses, to override Supreme Court decisions.

I ask my colleagues to add this latest judgment to the growing number of decrees that serve but to impair the Nation's welfare and security. In effect, the Court has invited saboteurs into our arsenals of defense.

Not only must we provide a way of correcting decisions that benefit the Communist conspiracy; we must also have the opportunity to undo the great harm that has come from the High Court on issues that include prayer in school, obscene literature, and law enforcement.

During the past Christmas season, the religious motif in schools has faded measurably, pointing up the unpleasant fact that at a time when America was never more in need of divine assistance, the Court has too often deferred to atheistic demands in preference to national tradition and desire. Further debilitation of the subversive activities control law, in addition to constituting a peril to our defense structure, is another instance where the Court has ruled in favor of those who deny God and seek to prevent others from worshiping Him.

Recent history is replete with instances of Supreme Court decisions that disregard constitutional precepts and are destructive of accepted social and moral standards. Last August 29 the Punxsutawney, Pa., Spirit reprinted an editorial from the Latrobe Bulletin which should be included in the RECORD as further evidence in the dossier supporting the need for House Joint Resolution 418. It follows:

SUPREME COURT AND CRIME

President Johnson wants to spend \$50 million to combat crime in the U.S.

No one who has been following the events of the last couple of years or who has read or heard about the Crime Commission's investigation or the FBI's director J. Edgar Hoover, comment on the alarming crime spiral, will question that something must be done.

However simply the outlay of money for the improvement of local law enforcement, the institution of better crime investigation, the creation of better rehabilitation methods and the upgrading of the deprived or underprivileged will not do the trick alone.

The U.S. Supreme Court must help. It cannot continue to hand down decisions making it difficult for policemen to be policemen and to impede the conviction of criminals.

Over the past couple of years, the High Court has handcuffed the law enforcement agencies and not the criminals.

As one Pennsylvania State Police veteran said, "I'm glad I'll be retiring soon because I can't do my job with all the restrictions placed upon me and other police officers."

And he added, "... on the courts, too." No one denies the accused has rights, but there are many who are wondering today in the wake of the Supreme Court decisions, whether the pendulum has swung too far toward the accused to the detriment of the law-abiding.

Even the juveniles are now quoting chapter and verse of the Supreme Court's new safeguards for the criminal, let alone the habitual and hardened adult criminal being aware of his "right."

The High Court's ruling has resulted in the freedom of many criminals because of what has been determined as "procedural defects" in arrest and prosecution, most of them resulting from these High Court rulings on the "criminal's rights."

Certainly some of the facets of the President's proposal to reduce crime are necessary and laudable, but it appears rather curious that on one hand money is being spent to fight crime and on the other the Supreme Court is making it more difficult to fight it.

All the money in the Federal Treasury will not even scratch the surface of the crime problem unless those fighting it are given the chance to do their tasks with the law on their side.

Crime has been rising at a more rapid rate than population growth for so long in the U.S. that one can anticipate each quarterly FBI report to show further deterioration. Even so, statistics just released for the first quarter of this year show a disappointing record increase in major crimes.

Twenty percent more major crimes were recorded by the 4,960 police departments which report to the FBI than in the similar three months last year. Not since the bureau began reporting on a quarterly basis in 1958 has the first quarter shown such a sizable increase.

Robbery, which jumped 32 percent nationwide, led the crime increases. But nearly all major crimes contributed to growing lawlessness.

FBI records indicate total crime rates are little different in the first quarter than in the rest of the year, although emphasis on certain types of crime changes with the seasons.

In Director J. Edgar Hoover's analysis of the rising crime rates, few patterns have emerged which would indicate sectional differences. Almost similar increases were noted in all areas of the country and in cities and towns of all sizes.

Many persons tend to equate affluence with well-being, refusing to accept the possibility that a wealthy society also can be a sick one.

If crime statistics gathered by the FBI mean anything—which they do—it is that a growing sickness has settled in America, the land of plenty, and the Supreme Court's handcuffs on law enforcement must share a great deal of the blame.

BINGHAM INTRODUCES SOCIAL SECURITY REVISIONS

Mr. BINGHAM. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, the House agreed to a House-Senate compromise social security bill which was subsequently signed into law by the President. Throughout the lengthy committee hearings, discussions and debates on this legislation, I urged that we enact the comprehensive overhaul of the social security system which I felt was

so sorely needed. Instead, the bill we approved contained only a very inadequate 13-percent increase in benefits. There were numerous other provisions in the bill—such as the sharp cutback in Federal participation in State Medicaid programs—which I found particularly unwise in this time of spiraling hospital and medical costs. Like many of my colleagues I voted in favor of the bill because I felt our senior citizens should not be made to wait any longer for benefit increases.

Continuing study of the new law over the recess has confirmed my view that in many respects it is gravely inadequate. I think we owe our older citizens—those who have spent a productive lifetime contributing to both the economy and the social security trust fund—a rosier future than the mere subsistence many of them are now receiving as they turn 65. Accordingly, I am today introducing a comprehensive new social security bill which would bring to many millions of older Americans a retirement of greater comfort, independence, and self-respect.

Social security is virtually the sole source of income for about half of those receiving its benefits and is the major source for almost all other beneficiaries. Since the aged constitute between one-fifth and one-fourth of all the poor in the United States, it is quite clear that the adequacy of social security benefits is the key to eliminating poverty among some 5 to 7 million retired Americans. The 13-percent increase included in last year's bill was inadequate to begin with and doubly so when we remember that much of it merely reflected cost-of-living increases.

The bill I am introducing today would raise benefits by about 35 percent above the new level, would establish a retirement floor income of \$100 a month for an individual and \$150 a month for a couple, and would yield average benefits of \$133 a month for individuals and \$220 a month for couples. In addition, I am including an automatic cost of living adjustment, based on these higher benefits, which would increase social security benefits to keep pace with a rising consumer price index. No couple can live luxuriously on the minimum of \$150 a month, or even on the average benefit of \$220 a month. But these benefit levels would at least assure a decent old age for those who must subsist on social security alone.

The second major item included in this bill is elimination of the restriction placed on Federal contributions to State programs for their medically indigent. Shortly after title XIX was passed in 1965, New York State took the lead in establishing one of the most progressive and far-reaching programs for extending Medicaid benefits to the medically needy. That program was formulated on the basis of the 1965 law which promised matching Federal grants to States with eligible title XIX programs. By drastically cutting back on the percentage of Federal participation, the Congress has, in effect, penalized those States like New York which organized medical programs, in reliance on the Federal contribution, and now stand to lose many many mil-

lions of dollars because of the withdrawal of that contribution.

One of the most discussed proposals not adopted in last year's social security bill was the extension of Medicare to prescription drugs. Drugs are a major high-cost item to the elderly whose doctors often prescribe long-term drug treatment to deal with continuing health problems. There was plentiful testimony given on the Senate side last session which detailed the high cost of many essential drugs. For those living on small, fixed incomes, such constant financial drain can be truly disastrous. The bill I am introducing today would extend part B benefits of Medicare, for the extra cost of \$1, to prescription drugs and thus relieve the elderly of this crushing burden.

There are a number of other provisions included in the legislation I am introducing which, though of lesser magnitude, have significant impact on those affected. For example, dependent parents of social security recipients should also be eligible for benefits as other dependents of those recipients now are. An individual over 65 who is still employed should have the option of continuing his contribution to the social security system so as to raise his future benefits or to halt his contributions and keep his benefit eligibility at age 65 level. The inequities against working wives who are forced to choose benefits based on either their own wages or on their status as a wife should be removed and a pooling of credits should be allowed. Finally, those over 65 who receive benefits as widows or widowers should not be penalized because of their subsequent remarriage as is the case under current law.

The welfare amendments included in last year's bill were among the most controversial and bitterly contested of all its features. Many of the professional organizations concerned with welfare problems strongly protested against these provisions and even went so far as to urge Presidential veto of the entire social security bill because of their primitive nature. I am including certain changes in these provisions to mitigate their harshest effects.

Surely it would be a mistake if, after the long battle for last year's social security bill, we deluded ourselves into believing that we had finished our work and could afford to forget about the social security system for a while. Last year's bill contained some worthwhile steps, and some truly damaging missteps. The sooner we get to the hard job of extending the former and correcting the latter, the sooner we will be fulfilling our obligations to the 21 million who rely on their social security benefits as protection against economic catastrophe.

A FORTHRIGHT INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess period, President Johnson held a frank and forthright interview on national television in which he assessed America's role at home and abroad in the weeks and months to come.

He made clear that, under his leadership, America will continue to keep its commitments in Vietnam and its promises here at home.

We are working for a peaceful solution to the Vietnamese conflict but we shall continue to stand up against aggression. And we will continue to meet the needs of the American people—in health, education, jobs, and expanded opportunity—here at home.

This is the Johnson administration program—a program supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people. And it is a program that shall grow and strengthen in the coming weeks and months. The President has made clear his determination to meet the Nation's obligation at home and abroad.

With the continued support of Congress and the American people, he shall succeed.

I include herewith the text of the President's interview:

INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT BY RAY SCHERER, NBC; FRANK REYNOLDS, ABC; DAN RATHER, CBS

Q-1. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, I think any American seated in this chair tonight would want to ask you about peace. Do you have any fresh, new ideas about getting peace in Vietnam, or are we stuck with, as I think Secretary Rusk has put it, "waiting for some sign from the other side"?

The PRESIDENT. Peace is the Number 1 subject in the mind of every leader in the Government. We are searching for it a part of every day.

There are four or five specific things that we think should be agreed upon. We think that the war now going on at the DMZ, at the 17th Parallel, should stop. We think that infiltration of Laos should stop. They have previously agreed to that.

We think that the people of South Vietnam have demonstrated that they want to be governed on the basis of one man-one vote, and people who are prepared to live under that kind of an arrangement could live under that kind of arrangement.

The thing that we must recognize about peace is that it is much more than just wishing for it. You can't get it just because you want it. If that were true, we would have had it a long time ago, because there are no people in the world who want peace more than the President, the Cabinet, and the people of the United States.

But if we are to find the solution of uniting the people of South Vietnam, and solving the problems in South Vietnam, it must be done not by some Senator or Congressman Ryan, or Senator Hartke, or Senator Fulbright, or some of our best intentioned people who want peace. This peace is going to be found by the leadership of South Vietnam, the people of South Vietnam, in South Vietnam.

We are encouraging that. We are going to continue to do our dead-level best to see this constitutional government, where 70 percent of their people registered and 60 percent of their people voted, develop some kind of a plan that we think will ultimately unite South Vietnam and bring peace to that area.

This will take time. This will take patience. This will take understanding.

The great problem we have is not misleading the enemy and letting him think—because of some of the statements he hears

coming from us—that the way is cheap, that it is easy, or that we are going to falter.

Q-2. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, there seems to be a growing impression throughout the world that the United States will settle for nothing less than military victory in Vietnam. What is your view on that?

The PRESIDENT. I have just explained what I thought would be a fair solution. I will repeat it as briefly and succinctly as I can.

The Demilitarized Zone must be respected as the 1954 agreements require. The unity of Vietnam as a whole must be a matter for peaceful adjustments and negotiation.

The North Vietnamese forces must get out of Laos and stop infiltrating Laos. That is what the 1962 agreement required, and it must be respected.

The overwhelming majority of the people of South Vietnam want a one man-one vote constitutional government.

About 70 percent of all the citizens who might have voted in South Vietnam registered in the election, and about 60 percent of them voted.

The 20 percent or so of the population now under Viet Cong control must live under a one man-one vote constitutional system if there is to be peace.

President Thieu has said that the South Vietnamese Government is not prepared to recognize the NLF as a government, and it knows well that NLF's control is by Hanoi. And so do we.

But he also has said that he is prepared for informal talks with members of the NLF, and these could bring good results.

I think that is a statesmanlike position. And I hope the other side will respond. That is why our statement in early December said we believe that the South Vietnamese must work out their own future, acting through electoral processes of the kind carried forward in the last two years.

The political future of South Vietnam, Mr. Scherer, must be worked out in South Vietnam by the people of South Vietnam.

It is our judgment that this war could be ended in a matter of weeks if the other side would face these five simple facts, and if some of our own people here in this country would encourage that that be done instead of broadcasting alarms that may give false signals both to Hanoi and to the Viet Cong.

Q-3. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, are we willing to accept Communists in a coalition government, if the South Vietnamese Government and the NLF got together? Are we willing to accept Communists in a coalition government?

The PRESIDENT. I think we must bear in mind that what happens in South Vietnam is up to the people of South Vietnam, not to North Vietnam, China, the Soviet Union, or the people of the United States—but the people of South Vietnam.

We are prepared to have every man in South Vietnam under their constitutional government, one man-one vote—for those people themselves to determine the kind of government they want. We think we know what that determination would be from the 70 percent who are registered and the 60 percent who have voted. It is a matter for them to determine, not for me to determine.

I think we might add one other thing here: When Mr. Reynolds says what are the minimum conditions for this or that, we don't want to get sparring with each other.

But I can say that so far as the United States is concerned, we are ready to stop fighting tonight if they are ready to stop fighting. But we are not ready to stop our side of the war, only to encourage them to escalate their side of the war.

We will reciprocate and meet any move that they make, but we are not going to be so soft-headed and pudding-headed as to say that we will stop our half of the war and hope and pray that they stop theirs.

We have tried that in some instances. We

have leaned over backwards. Every time we have, they have escalated their efforts and they have killed our soldiers. We have no result from it. A burned child dreads the fire.

If you want us to stop our bombing, you have to ask them to stop their bombing, stop their hand grenades, stop their mortars.

At San Antonio I laid out the formula and said we will stop bombing immediately "provided you will have prompt and productive discussions."

That is about as far as anyone can go. That is as far as anyone should go. That is as far as we are going.

Q-4. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, is it your feeling that you have now made our proposition and the next move is up to them?

The PRESIDENT. It is my feeling that our position in the world is very clearly known. If it is not, I have tried to repeat it enough tonight that the people can understand it.

Q-5. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, what is your assessment of Hanoi's attitude at this point in the war? Do you believe they are counting, sir, on your defeat next November?

The PRESIDENT. I think that Hanoi feels that if they can hold out long enough, they will not win a military victory against General Westmoreland. They haven't done that. They can't point to one single victory they won from our Marines, from our Air, from our Navy or from our Army.

They think, though, that they can repeat what happened to them with the French; that if their will is strong and they continue to remain firm, that they will develop enough sympathy and understanding in this country, and hatred for war in this country, that their will will outlast our will.

I don't think that is true. I think in due time, if our people will understand and recognize what is happening, I think they will help me prove it is not true.

Q-6. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, just to make this abundantly clear, what you seem to be saying here tonight is that peace in Vietnam is principally up to the Saigon Government rather than the United States, and B, that the Saigon Government can have useful talks with the Viet Cong without recognizing them.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, I have said that I think that war can be stopped in a matter of days if President Thieu's suggestions that he informally talk with members of the NLF are carried out and if they would agree to what they have already agreed to in the 1954 accords and the 1962 accords and the other points that I mentioned this morning, like one man-one vote under the present constitutional government.

I think that would be a useful starting point. And I think the result could be that we could find a way to stop the war.

Q-7. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, I think what bothers some people, though, is that President Thieu and the South Vietnamese Government, as it is now constituted, say that they do not recognize the Viet Cong, they do not recognize the NLF. How are they going to have negotiations with them if they don't recognize them?

The PRESIDENT. They could have informal talks with them, Dan. I said that the President had made clear that he would not recognize NLF, but we have made clear for many, many months that their views can be heard and we can respond to them; their recommendations can be received and we can react to them.

President Thieu, himself, in a very statesmanlike manner, has said that he would be agreeable to having informal talks with their representatives. We would hope that out of that some understanding could be reached.

I believe if it could be reached, the war could be brought to a close.

Q-8. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, much has been made of your 1964 campaign statement about not sending American boys to fight

in an Asian war. As you look back on that now, was that a pledge, a hope, or was it simply a statement of principle in a larger context?

The PRESIDENT. It was one of many statements, if you will look back upon it, as a part of a policy, namely, our policy then and now was to keep our hand out of negotiations and for discussions, and for peace, and our guard up that would support the South Vietnamese to keep them from being enveloped.

We made clear all through that campaign, and in this speech which you have extracted one single sentence out of, that we felt that the South Vietnamese ought to pledge every resource they had, their men, their materials, all of their resources, to defending themselves; that we would never supplant them. But we would supplement them to the extent that is necessary.

We did not plan to go into Asia and to fight an Asian war that Asians ought to be fighting for themselves. But if Asians were fighting for themselves and were using all the resources that they had in South Vietnam, there was no pledge, no commitment and no implication that we would not supplement them and support them as we are doing, and as we agreed to do many years before in the SEATO Treaty, and as we had agreed to do in the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution before that statement.

Mr. RATHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. That has just been a part of the politicians' gambit of picking out one sentence before you get to the "but" in it, and say, "We are not going to take over all the fighting and do it ourselves. We are not going to do what Asian boys in South Vietnam should do."

They are doing it. They have over 700,000 men there out of 17 million population, and they are raising another 65,000 compared to the additional 40-odd that we are sending.

No we don't plan to supplant them at all. But we do plan to supplement them to whatever is necessary to keep the communist conspiracy from gobbling up that nation.

Q-9. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, if the South Vietnamese are as dedicated to freedom as you say, and as many who have been there say, why is it that they don't fight as well motivated, or at least seemingly, as the Viet Cong and the Communist North Vietnamese?

To put it more bluntly, why don't our South Vietnamese fight as well as theirs?

The PRESIDENT. I don't think all people do everything alike. I know some television broadcasters are better than others. I know some Presidents that can perform in a conversation better than others.

General Abrams, who is giving leadership to the South Vietnamese people, thinks that their army is developing very well.

That is not to say that they are equal to the best troops of every other nation, but they have made great improvements. They are working at their job. They still have some problems to correct in leadership. That is what really determines what kind of a fighting force you have. But they are getting at it and they are getting results.

It is mighty easy to blame someone else. That is what we do. I don't think we get much out of blaming our allies or talking about how much better we are than they.

Most of the people out there tell us that they believe that the South Vietnamese army at this time is equal to the Korean troops in 1954. If they are, I don't think we will have to apologize too much for them. They are taking up their positions on the DMZ.

They have been giving very good results from their actions. General Abrams thinks they are doing all right. I would prefer his judgment to anybody's judgment that I know.

Q-10. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, you have always credited the Russians with a sincere desire for peace in South Vietnam. Do you

still hold to that view? If they really want peace, why do they not stop supplying the North Vietnamese?

The PRESIDENT. Without going into your statements as to my views, I would say this: We are not sure just at this point of all that motivates the Chinese or the Russians, or any of the other Communists who are supporting the North Vietnamese.

I don't think I could honestly tell you just what their motivations are. We have always hoped that they would like to see this war brought to an end. That has been their indication to us. Whether that would work out in the long run, I don't know.

Q-11. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, that brings us back to Glassboro and your conversations this summer. How much of a factor in the restraint that we and the Russians seem to show in the Middle East crisis was a product of the dialogue that you established with Mr. Kosygin at Glassboro?

The PRESIDENT. I think the Glassboro conference was a very useful conference. I am not sure that it really solved any of the problems of the Middle East. I think the situation in the Middle East is a very dangerous one.

I think we have made clear our viewpoint in my statements of June 19th, the five conditions that ought to enter into bringing about peace in that area. We stressed those to Mr. Kosygin at Glassboro. He understands them. He did not agree with them. But I think that the Soviet Union understands that we feel very strongly about this matter that we do have definite views.

I think Ambassador Goldberg, at the United Nations, has made our position very clear. As a result of the action of the United Nations, in sending Ambassador Jarring there as a mediator, we are hopeful that the conditions I outlined on June 19th can be worked out and that a permanent solution can be found to that very difficult problem.

I would say it is one of our most dangerous situations, and one that is going to require the best tact, judgment, patience and willingness on the part of all to find a solution.

Q-12. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, do you consider that this country has the same kind of unwavering commitment to defend Israel against invasion as we have in South Vietnam?

The PRESIDENT. We don't have a SEATO treaty, if that is what you are asking. We have made clear our very definite interest in Israel, and our desire to preserve peace in that area of the world by many means. But we do not have a mutual security treaty with them, as we do in Southeast Asia.

Q-13. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, if we might come back for a moment to the question about relations with the Soviet Union, it has often been said that one of the most tragic consequences about the war in South Vietnam is the setback in American-Soviet relations. Do you agree with that? Do you think we are making progress in getting along?

The PRESIDENT. There are a good many things said Mr. Reynolds, that people have to take with a grain of salt. First, they have to look at the sources of these statements. I have tried to analyze our position in the world with other nations. We do regret that we don't see everything alike with the Soviet Union or other nations. We hope that there wouldn't be this tension and these strains that frequently are in evidence. Now, we don't say that everything is 100 percent all right, because we have very definite and very strong differences of opinion and philosophy.

But if you are asking me if the tension that exists today that existed when the Berlin Wall went up, the answer is no.

Now, we can understand the Soviet Union inhibitions and the problems they have as long as Vietnam is taking place. They are called upon to support their communist

brother, and they are supporting him in a limited way with some equipment. We wish that were not so.

We would hope that they would exercise their duties and their responsibilities as co-chairmen and take some leadership and try to bring this war to an end.

But we don't think that things are as tense or as serious, or as dangerous as they were when the Berlin Wall went up, in the Cuban missile crisis, or following Mr. Kennedy's visit with Mr. Khrushchev at Vienna.

Q-14. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, moving now to Europe, what about the complaint of Europe that our preoccupation with Vietnam has caused relations with Europe to take a back seat?

The PRESIDENT. I don't find that complaint in Europe. I find it in Georgetown among a few columnists generally.

The European leaders, we are having very frequent exchanges with them. Prime Minister Wilson will be here early in February. He has been here several times.

We have been to Germany, and Mr. Kiesinger and ahead of him Mr. Adenauer have been here.

Many of the Scandinavian leaders have come here.

The Dutch leaders have come here.

This year in Europe we have had a very long agenda that has produced what we think are very excellent results. We have just concluded an agreement on the Kennedy Round, which involved very far-reaching trade concessions. We think it will stand as a monument to the relationship of the people of Europe and the people of the United States, and very much to both of their advantages.

We had a challenge of NATO and General deGaulle asked us to get out of France. We sat down with the other 14 members of NATO, the other European nations, and we looked at our problem. We decided that we would go to Belgium. Thirteen of those nations joined the United States and 14 of us went there.

NATO is now intact as solid as it can be, unified. Secretary Rusk has just returned from very successful meetings with them.

So the challenge to NATO has been rebuffed. The difficulties of the Kennedy Round have been solved. The frequent predictions that the Germans would reduce their troop strength 60,000 and we would bring our divisions back from Europe—these matters have been worked out.

We are working feverishly every day trying to bring about a non-proliferation agreement and we are making headway.

So I think if you take the results of this year's efforts in Europe that most European statesmen who have engaged in those efforts would think we have been quite successful and probably more successful than any other period. And I do not see that we have either ignored them or neglected them.

Q-15. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wonder if we might turn to matters at home, sir.

The civil rights movement in this country was founded and thrived on the principle of nonviolence. Now all that seems to be changing. There are people openly advocating violence. We had violence last summer. What is your explanation for these riots, sir? What happened?

The PRESIDENT. I would say that not all of it is changing. I would say that all through our history, as these changes occurred, there has been violence connected with them.

We found that true in World War I. We found that true in World War II. We had a strike in Detroit—we had a riot in Detroit during President Roosevelt's administration where he had to send out troops that compared very much to the same one we had there this year.

We have this unrest. We have this uncertainty. We have this desire of people who have been held down all these years to rise

up and try to acquire, quickly, what has been denied them so unjustly so long.

We have more violence than we want, and more than we should have; more than we are going to be able to tolerate. But I don't think that represents all the country at all. I think that represents a very small minority.

I think our big problem is to get at the causes of these riots. I think that some of the causes are the hope of the people themselves. They don't have jobs. They want jobs. So we are going to have to provide jobs.

There are some half-million unemployed, hard-core unemployed, in our principal cities. We just have to go and find jobs for them.

I am going to call in the businessmen of America and say one of two things have to happen: You have to help me go out here and find jobs for these people, or we are going to have to find jobs in the Government for them and offer every one of them a job. I think that is one thing that could be done. I think that will have to be done, as expensive as it is.

Second, I think we will have to do something about the housing situation. People live in filth, in dilapidated houses. More new housing ought to be built and has to be built. We have to find places to build that housing.

I have tried to pass legislation that I thought would be helpful, such as the open housing bill. I have tried to encourage the Congress to take action on model cities and on rent supplements. We have made progress, although not as much as we would like. So, we are going to have to accelerate and step up rebuilding our cities so we can have decent housing.

In the field of education, education has been denied to the poor on an equal basis for many years. The poor children haven't had the advantages because of lack of transportation, because of the economic situation in their family, because of a lot of reasons—their own health conditions.

So, they haven't had the education. And because of discrimination, they haven't had the educational opportunities that the other children have had.

So we are fast correcting those. We have tripled our education program in three years, and the poor have been the primary beneficiaries. We are spending three times as much on health today as we were four years ago, and the poor are the primary beneficiaries of medicare and Medicaid. They can have their hospital bills paid now. They can have their doctors paid now.

As a result, our infant mortality rate is going down. As a result, our death rate is going down. We have made great progress with health and education. They are important things.

So I would say jobs, health, education, and housing are all contributing to this general dissatisfaction that results in violence on occasions, and we have to accelerate our efforts there. We have to appeal to these people to keep their feelings within bounds and keep them lawful, because every person in this country must obey the law of this country, and there is no situation that justifies your violating the law.

Q-16. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, for those Americans, especially Negroes, who live in crowded areas, live in poverty, with no education, no jobs, and seemingly no help, why not follow an extremist? Why not revolt?

The PRESIDENT. I told you the reasons why: Because revolting and violence are unlawful. It is not going to be allowed. It doesn't solve the problem. It is not the answer to the conditions that exist.

The answer is jobs. The answer is education. The answer is health. If we refuse to give those answers, people are going to lose hope, and when they do, it is pretty difficult to get them to be as reasonable as we think they should be.

But there is every reason why they should not. Violence is not going to produce more jobs. Violence is not going to produce more

education. Violating the law and taking the law into your own hands is not going to produce better health or better housing. It is going to produce anarchy. That cannot be tolerated.

Q-17. Mr. RATHER. Some of these extremists, Mr. President, say that anarchy is what we need; that they want to tear down the fabric of this society.

The PRESIDENT. I don't agree with the extremists and I hope you don't.

Q-18. Mr. SCHERER. What is your administration doing now, Mr. President, to see that we don't have another riot this summer?

The PRESIDENT. I have outlined that: Jobs, housing, education, health—all of these things, trying to get at these problems. We think if we can have a program for the cities, like model cities, we think if we can have jobs, like Neighborhood Youth training and the job program we are working out, if we can find employment for all the hard core, we think that this will answer some of the causes of the riots.

Q-19. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in the ghetto I think they say that is just talk, white man's talk. What is your reaction to that?

The PRESIDENT. You know what my reaction to it is.

Q-20. Mr. REYNOLDS. Isn't there this sense of despair, this growing estrangement?

The PRESIDENT. What is your answer to it, Frank?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I would hope that—I don't know that my answer is necessarily the one, sir, that we want.

The PRESIDENT. What is your answer, though, Frank?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My answer is that it is not talk, and that there will be an attempt made. But can it come in time? I am thinking of these young—

The PRESIDENT. If not, what? What is your solution? What do you recommend?

Q-21. Mr. REYNOLDS. What do you think you think you should do, sir?

The PRESIDENT. You are not going to answer it now? You are not going to give us your recommendations or your thoughts?

Q-22. Mr. REYNOLDS. My recommendation is to get going as fast as we possibly can on all the programs that you have just mentioned.

The PRESIDENT. That is what we are doing. We accept your recommendation and we will carry it out.

Q-23. Mr. SCHERER. If this situation is as serious as we think it is, people say we are spending \$30 billion a year in Vietnam and why can't we spend \$30 billion a year at home. If you can't get programs such as you are talking about through in this Congress, how will you get them through in the future?

The PRESIDENT. We hope that the Congress will, as these things develop, see the need of them. We think we have made progress. We couldn't get the model cities program authorized and funded two years ago, but we did this year. We couldn't get rent supplements authorized and funded, but we have this year. We couldn't get the housing programs that we have underway now authorized and funded two years ago, but we have this year.

We are making progress. We can't correct it overnight. You can't take the errors of 100 years and solve them in 100 days.

We would like to do as much as we can. I am recommending a good deal more than the Congress is willing to do.

In the poverty field I recommended and urged, and asked every Cabinet Member to join us in doing so—we urged the Congress to provide \$2.2 billion in funds for poverty. They cut it several hundred million dollars.

We have recommendations for 40,000 rent supplement units, \$40 million. They cut it to \$10 million. I regret it. If I could issue an Executive Order and vitiate it, putting my own program into effect, I would do it.

But we are moving in that direction. We are going to do all we can to accelerate it and to escalate it.

Q-24. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, if I may, let's turn to the subject of youth. I think everyone expects youth to rebel and to be restless. But there seems to be an unusually large number of American youth at this particular point in history who feel alienated to the traditional American ideas of God, patriotism and family. Do you sense this alienation? What can be done about it?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, I sense it. I think we have that condition. We are trying to meet it as best we know how. I have seen it several times in my lifetime.

I remember the days of the zoot suiters in World War II. I remember the doubters who thought all of our youth were going to the dogs because of the sitdown movements in some of the plants in our country at certain periods of our country. I remember the doubt expressed about our ability in World War II to take a bunch of beardless boys and resist Hitler's legions.

There have been some disappointments. But I have visited the campuses of this country. My Cabinet has gone and met with the young people of this country. We deal with young folks every day in the Peace Corps, in the poverty program, in the VISTA program, in the job camps.

I think it is a very small percentage that have given up, who have lost faith, who have deep questions about the future of the country and of themselves.

We have more than 3 million young people serving in uniform. I hear from about 100 of them every day. They don't get the attention that you television people give these exhibitionists. They don't have anyone to make signs for them and parade, getting their picture in the papers. They are just there from daylight to dark, fighting for freedom and liberty, and willing to die for it. They are a pretty large number, comparatively speaking.

I doubt that there is anything like that many hippies, or I doubt that there are that many disillusioned people. If you added them all up and put them in one unit, I think they would make a very small percentage.

And I think anyone who thinks the youth of the country is going to the dogs, or implies it, better take another look at it. I have just gone through two weddings this year, and I have been associated with a lot of young people. The kind of young people I see, who I hear, who write me, are not the little group that you all can ferret out up here at some park or someplace that has nothing to do but carry a sign around on their shoulders and try to obstruct someone else from getting to a place or try to howl them down after they get there.

I think we have young people who are terribly upset at what is going on. I know they hate war. We all hate war. But I think there is a very small percent who are going to take these extreme means and going to employ these extreme ways to express lack of confidence in their future and in their country.

Q-25. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, how much of an inhibition does it give you, as you go about the country, to have to face these dissenters and demonstrators? Do you feel you can go where you want to go?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, and do.

Q-26. Mr. SCHERER. Do you think that will be true all through next year?

The PRESIDENT. Yes. I think there has been a very subtle effort made by a few politicians to suggest that it would be difficult for the President to travel, it would be very dangerous. Probably the wish was father to the thought. I think there has been some indication that certain organized groups would try to bring embarrassment to the Secretary of State by not letting him talk, or to the Vice President by interrupting his talk.

But every time that has happened—and it has been encouraged some by some of the political groups, because we have followed them and have seen that that has happened—the people have been resounding in their disapproval.

While we all recognize dissent, and we expect it, and we treat it respectfully, we listen to it, we don't think that dissent should be turned into hooliganism, and we don't think because a person has a right to dissent, as a great Justice one time said, you have a right to holler fire in a crowded theater or you have the right to tear a speaker's necktie off or to put your hand over his mouth and prevent him from speaking.

We think the dissent should be within the law, within the Constitution. We respect it when it is.

But if they are going to use stormtrooper tactics, it will be dealt with and will be dealt with properly.

If they are going to encourage folks to bring bodily harm to a President, or to any other official, that is sinking very low, and we don't think the people want to hear much like that, either over the television in the form of suggestion, or by some who are sent to these campuses to incite folks.

Q-27. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, who are these people who are encouraging this sort of thing? Do you see an element of subversion in it?

The PRESIDENT. You see them on every campus on your television every night. They are representatives of various groups.

I don't want to get personal and I don't want to give them advertisement, but if you are interested just turn on ABC tonight and look at the newscast. A good part of every newscast you have will have some of these folks who are encouraging the dissent, appealing to them. They will be parading. They will have their signs. They will be charging us with murder, this and that, because we are trying to carry out our obligations and our treaty commitments and protect that flag.

Q-28. Mr. REYNOLDS. You feel, sir, apparently that the press, the television, radio, the whole works, gives a disproportionate share of attention to this?

The PRESIDENT. No, I didn't say that. I said they report it. If you want to see it, it is there for you to see it. I didn't say anything about disproportionate.

Q-29. Mr. REYNOLDS. Do you think we do, sir?

The PRESIDENT. I think that is a matter for your judgment. I don't think it is up to the President to be making up your newscasts.

Q-30. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, you have said, I think, Mr. President, that you welcome responsibility dissent. For those Americans who so strongly dissent from your war policy, but who want to be responsible and yet want to be effective, what can you recommend? What can they do?

The PRESIDENT. In the first place, I am not in the business of recommending their program for them. I have enough problems with my own program.

But we do have a way of people in this country expressing their viewpoint, giving out interviews, making speeches, having picketing. I would say generally speaking, Mr. RATHER, being lawful, abiding by the law of the land, doing whatever the law will permit them to do.

I don't think you have to be a law violator in the name of the First Amendment. I don't think you are justified in being a law violator in order to have your right of free speech.

I think that the people who ought to want to follow the law and the Constitution the most are the dissenters themselves because it is that law and that Constitution which give them their right to dissent and protects that right.

I am amazed that some of these so-

called liberal folks who reserve for themselves the right to speak long, loud, and freely, but when the opposition views are expressed, they try to drown it out with cat calls, eggs or tomatoes.

I don't understand that.

Q-31. Mr. RATHER. Some of these dissenters say that the only way they can get your attention is to do something unlawful.

The PRESIDENT. I am not familiar with that. Who says that?

Q-32. Mr. RATHER. There is Mr. Dillenger, for one, who led the march on the Pentagon, who said there was no way to get the attention of the government.

The PRESIDENT. I don't think that is correct at all. We read the papers, see the television, read our correspondence. We spend a good deal more time on that than we do out viewing what he is saying or doing in the Pentagon.

Q-33. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, 1968 will soon be upon us. I am wondering as you sit here in your rocking chair whether you can tell us when you sit down to make your decision about running again what are the factors you are going to weigh?

The PRESIDENT. I haven't done that, Ray. I think in due time I will cross that bridge. Until then, I don't want to speculate about it.

Q-34. Mr. SCHERER. Not even the factors? The PRESIDENT. Until I do that, I am not going to speculate about it.

Q-35. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, you often say that a President has plenty of advice. Regardless of when you intend to leave this office, and we know you are not going to tell us that, what advice would you give to the man who does succeed you?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I will do that when I leave it.

Q-36. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, I know that with the campaign coming up you don't want to get into politics too much, but I would be remiss in my duties as a reporter if I didn't ask you, regardless of who the Democratic candidate is in 1968, what effect do you think the candidacy of Senator McCarthy and the position of Senator Robert Kennedy will have on the Democratic Party.

The PRESIDENT. I just don't know. I don't know what the effect of the Kennedy-McCarthy movement is having in the country. I am not a reporter. I haven't followed it. I am not privileged to all the conversations that may have taken place.

I just observe they have had some meetings and some discussions. I do know of the interest of both of them in the Presidency and the ambition of both of them. I see that reflected from time to time.

But just what they are prepared to do, how they are going to do it, whether they are going to do it in concert or what will be the effect upon the American people of these maneuverings, I am not prepared to say.

Q-37. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, French President deGaulle, in light of his picking at NATO, his attacks on the dollar, and now even training of Russian troops, do you consider him a friend or an enemy of this country?

The PRESIDENT. I believe that the French people have an understanding, an interest and affection for the American people, and I think it is greatly reciprocated.

I am sorry that the relationship between the President and Mr. deGaulle is not a closer one and that we don't see matters alike any more often than we do. We have tried to do everything that we know to do to minimize the differences that exist in the leadership of the two governments. We strongly feel that the peoples of the two countries have a long history of friendship and we are determined to preserve that.

We are also determined to minimize our differences and, from my part, to do nothing to unjustly or unduly provoke the French Government.

Q-38. Mr. RATHER. To get precisely to the

point about General deGaulle as apart from the French people—

The PRESIDENT. I got precisely to the point. I don't want to do anything to accentuate, aggravate or contribute to emphasizing the differences that we have and straining the relations.

I think basically our people are friendly and I am going to do all I can to keep them friendly.

Q-39. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, the other day one of the elder statesmen in our business gave it as his view that unless you regained the trust of the people—I think that is the way he put it—you could not effectively govern. How does that proposition strike you?

The PRESIDENT. I think you must have the trust of the people. I feel we do have the trust of the people. I think we have the support of the people. The people in every election have had a chance to express themselves, in a national election, and have given us a majority vote.

In 1964, the last election, we got 61 percent of the votes, the highest percentage any President ever attained. I am not talking about some individual poll. In the last Congressional election, we had a majority in both House and Senate.

Now we lost our majority. We lost some of our support. I don't think there is any question about that. In a pre-election year you will always do that.

We looked ahead of 1964 when they were having the San Francisco Convention. I think a great many people toyed with the idea of joining or voting in the opposition party until they had the results of the convention, until they saw what would happen if you elected a Republican, and who would be brought into office, the kind of government you would have, the kind of policies you would have.

I think there is some uncertainty in the country. I think there is some division in the country. I don't think that the opposition is in the majority and I don't think they will be on election day. But I don't discount it, and I don't ignore it.

Q-40. Mr. SCHERER. As you look ahead to the world that your grandson is going to grow up in, what kind of a world would you like that to be?

The PRESIDENT. I would hope that it would be a more knowledgeable world and a better educated world. There are four people out of every 10 today who cannot read "cat," who cannot spell "dog," who cannot recognize the printed word "mother." I would like to see every boy and girl who is born in the world have all the education that he or she can take.

We are making great gains in that direction in this country. I would like to see other nations make great gains. I would like to see an enlightened program of family planning available to all the peoples of the world.

I would like to see the problem of food production faced up to and nations take the necessary steps to try to provide the food that they are going to need to support their populations.

I would like to see the miracles of health extended to all the peoples of the world as they were to the fellow who was operated on with the heart change the other day.

I know that the infant mortality rate is going down. I should like to see it reflected in all the 110 nations.

In short, I believe that our ancient enemies are ignorance and illiteracy, are disease and bigotry. I would like to see my descendants grow up in a world that is as educated as possible, as healthy as science will permit, as prepared to feed itself, and which certainly has sufficient conservation forces to permit enjoyable leisure for the people who work long and late.

I think we are moving to that end.

Q-41. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, what do

your experts tell you, and what is your best estimate, on the performance of the economy over the next few months, considering that you did not get the tax increase that you once called absolutely essential to the health of the economy?

The PRESIDENT. It is very hard to predict what is ahead. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisors, and the Budget Director have made the best statement that they could to the Ways and Means Committee.

We think the business activity is going to pick up. We think there is going to be increased production. We think it is very essential that we have a tax bill.

We look forward to continued prosperity. We have had 82 months of unparalleled prosperity in this country, longer than any other period, uninterrupted, and we want to keep things that way.

We think the most important thing to us, from a domestic standpoint, is to provide more jobs and we have added 6 million jobs in the last few years. We think that those jobs ought to have good pay, but that we shouldn't increase our wages or our profits or our dividends, beyond what the increased productivity justifies, so that we can maintain some restraint on prices.

And while we are not satisfied with the job we have done, we have done a better job than any other country and we are urging both business and labor to take that into consideration in their negotiations with each other.

Q-42. Mr. SCHERER. Mr. President, what about China? Many people, as they peer off into the midst of the future, see our future problem with China. If you could sit down with the rulers of China, what would you tell them about America's intentions toward them?

The PRESIDENT. I have said to them in several public statements that we hope that they can conduct themselves in such a way as will permit them to join the family of nations and that we can learn to live in harmony with each other.

We have no desire to be enemies of any nation in the world. I believe that it is possible, over the years, for them to develop a better understanding of the world in which they live.

We think there are some very important things taking place right in China today that will contribute, we hope, to a better understanding and a more moderate approach to their neighbors in the world.

We have observed their failures in Africa, and in Latin America, and in Southeast Asia, where they have undertaken aggressive steps that have resulted in failure for them. And we hope that they will profit by their experiences. We believe they will.

We don't know all that we would like to know about what is going in China. It is a rather closed society and we don't have all the information that we would like to have. But we are hopeful and we believe that over a period of time, that the opportunity exists for them to gain a better understanding of the other peoples of the world and thus be able to live more harmoniously with them.

Q-43. Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there was quite a dust-up in this town recently, perhaps more here than any other place, about the resignation of Mr. McNamara. Is there anything more you can tell us about it?

The PRESIDENT. No. I can only repeat what Secretary McNamara said and what I have said.

Secretary McNamara has been Secretary of Defense longer than any other man. I think he has been the best Secretary of Defense we have ever had. I hate to see him leave as Secretary of Defense.

I take great satisfaction in the contribution that Mr. McNamara has made to the Government. He is only on sabbatical leave. He is not going to be very far away from here

and on anything that is remotely connected with the best interests of the world, that the World Bank is interested in, we will be working very close together.

I do not consider that I have lost his services, or the world has lost his talents, or that I have lost a friend in any way. I think instead of building a great machine in the Pentagon for the purpose of building liberty and freedom that he will be busy at the World Bank in the constructive purpose of building the economies and bettering humanity in these very nations that we are trying to defend. I look forward with a great deal of pleasure to working very closely with him.

Q-44. Mr. RATHER. Mr. President, looking ahead to next year, this will be the final year of this term of your Presidency, what are your priorities, particularly in regards to Congress? Can you get through, do you feel, any more of your Great Society program, any more welfare programs?

The PRESIDENT. We will have detailed recommendations in our State of the Union in connection with the problems the nation faces. There are many unresolved problems. There will be substantial recommendations to the next Congress. There have been substantial achievements in this one.

We didn't get everything we wanted at all. We never have. But we had a good Congress. We didn't have as good a Congress as we had in the 89th Congress. We didn't pass as many substantive measures and they didn't reach as far as the others. They were curtailed some because that was the mood of the Congress. And on a good many measures they were able to reduce our proposals.

They didn't destroy Model Cities. They crippled it. They cut it by several hundred million. They didn't destroy Rent Supplements, but they cut it from \$40 million to \$10 million. They didn't destroy the Rat Bill. They knocked it out for a while and staggered it, but after the Senate worked on it, they approved it. They did not recommit a good many of the bills, but they reduced them.

They did not wipe out poverty, but they reduced it from \$2.2 billion down several hundred million to \$1.7 billion something.

So those are the things that you have to face up to. I am not saying ugly things about the individual. Those men think they are right. They don't want to take some of these new programs. They don't want to fund model cities, rent supplements, or face up to the urban requirements and what I think are 20th Century requirements.

And I understand their philosophy. I have understood it for 35 years. They frequently are the preservers of stagnation. They want to keep things as they are. They don't want to move forward.

Now, I came to the Executive Branch with a man who said "Let's get the country moving again." We have the country moving again and we want to keep it moving. We are going to keep it moving if we can get the Congress' support.

While we didn't get them to support us every time we wanted to, we did move forward and we hope the next session will be a productive one, too.

I am going to appeal to every Republican in an election year to come in and do what is best for his country. If he does that, without regard to how it might cripple the President, without regard to the politics of the year, then I think we will have a good Congress.

I am going to do what I think is best for my country, at home and abroad, without regard to what effect it has on my future. If they will do the same thing, we will have a good government, a good country, and then we can let the election take care of itself. And I think we will have a good election.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. RATHER. Thank you, Mr. President.

TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION AT LEVEL 5, EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE, FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1015) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1015

Resolved, effective January 1, 1968, there will be payable from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, an amount which will permit payment of basic compensation per annum, at a rate not in excess of the highest amount, which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by Level 5 of the Executive schedule by Public Law 90-206, to the administrative assistant of each of the following:

- (1) Speaker of the House.
- (2) Majority leader of the House.
- (3) Minority leader of the House.
- (4) Majority whip of the House.
- (5) Minority whip of the House.
- (6) Each Member of the House who has served as Speaker of the House.
- (7) Each Member of the House who has served as majority leader and minority leader of the House.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader explain the intent of this resolution a little further for the benefit of the Members?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall be glad to if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HALL. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In order to raise the base pay of the administrative assistants of those mentioned in the resolution comparable to that which the Congress provided for employees of the executive departments who have had comparable salaries through the years, this resolution is necessary. This action has been taken in previous Congresses under similar circumstances. This is not a mandatory resolution. It does not set salaries. It only authorizes the salaries of these individuals to be raised if approved by the employing authority of the House, which is the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders of the House, former Speakers and majority and minority whips.

Mr. HALL. I will further ask the distinguished majority leader if this entails any new positions or appointments in any wise or sense of the word.

Mr. ALBERT. None whatsoever I will say to my friend.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would it be interpreted as an added emolument to the benefits of the Members of the House past or present? In other words, could it be interpreted by the public at large as an automatic increase in benefits to any of the Members past or present?

Mr. ALBERT. It does not affect any Member past or present.

Mr. HALL. It is simply a continuing resolution for their assistants?

Mr. ALBERT. For the administrative assistants of the Speaker and former

Speakers, majority and minority leaders, and the majority and minority whips.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. RES. 203

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

S. RES. 204

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DESIGNATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 150) to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this legislation has been before the House on previous occasions, and I objected to it whenever it appeared on the Consent Calendar. In fact, in 1964 there were three separate bills, which were later combined into an overall bill providing for the naming of certain veterans' facilities. As I have explained before, I certainly do not believe there would be any reservation on the part of any Member to section 1, which would name a veterans' center in Bonham, Tex., for our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, nor to naming the hospital in Bedford, Mass., for Edith Nourse Rogers, nor, indeed, to section 4, which would name a cemetery in Houston, Tex., for our former beloved colleague Albert Thomas.

If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs [Mr. TEAGUE] were to present the House with separate bills or simply remove from this bill section 3 which would name a veteran's hospital at Jackson, Miss., for the late Congressman John Rankin, we could proceed with this very expeditiously.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Rankin was in this Congress for 32 years. He was the first chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He was the author of more favorable legislation to veterans than any other Member of this Congress who ever existed.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been one objection from the State of Mississippi, from any individual, or any organization; while there have been requests for this action.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason to separate the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, section 1 of this bill would name the Veterans' Administration center—hospital and domiciliary—at Bonham, Tex., for the late Sam Rayburn, who served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other Member of the House in the history of the United States.

Prior to Mr. Rayburn's election as Speaker on September 16, 1940, Mr. Rayburn had served as majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses and as minority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

During his long period of service which began on March 4, 1913, until his death on November 16, 1961, Speaker Rayburn had always shown a keen interest in the affairs and general welfare of the veterans of this Nation. The hospital and domiciliary at Bonham had a special place in his heart and it is indeed appropriate that this installation be named in honor of this great American.

Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers was elected to the 69th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, John Jacob Rogers, and was re-elected to the 70th and succeeding Congresses and was serving at the time of her death on September 10, 1960, a period of over 35 years.

Mrs. Rogers' first activity in the field of disabled veterans was when she served with the American Red Cross in the care of disabled soldiers in the First World War in 1917. Thereafter President Harding appointed her a special representative in 1922; President Coolidge continued her appointment in 1923.

She served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, or its predecessor committee, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, from the time of her election to Congress until her death and was chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

While Mrs. Rogers was interested in all of the affairs of veterans, she is mainly identified in the public mind with her special concern for paraplegics as evidenced by the two laws in which she was keenly interested; namely, housing for paraplegic veterans, and the so-called automobiles for amputees.

No hospital during her service received more attention from her than the one at Bedford, Mass., though she was keenly interested in the entire medical program. It seems indeed appropriate to the committee that the hospital at Bedford be named in her honor as section 2 provides.

Section 3 of the bill would name the 500-bed Veterans' Administration hospital at Jackson, Miss., in honor of the late John Elliott Rankin, who was chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, or its

predecessor committee, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, for nearly a quarter of a century.

Mr. Rankin was elected to the 67th Congress and 15 succeeding Congresses, thus serving as a Member of the Congress from March 4, 1921, to January 3, 1953. He succeeded the first chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, Royal C. Johnson, in whose honor the hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was named by Public Law 93 of the 79th Congress.

While it is not the general practice of the Veterans' Administration to name its hospitals for individuals, the exception noted above is pertinent and a precedent. The same may be cited for the Veterans' Administration hospital at Montrose, N.Y., which is named for the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, pursuant to Public Law 189 of the 79th Congress.

Mr. Rankin gave long, devoted, and dedicated service to his country and no subject was closer to his heart than the veterans of this Nation. He was the author of literally hundreds of bills affecting the welfare and well-being of our veterans. It seems to the committee it is indeed understandable and quite appropriate that the Veterans' Administration hospital nearest to his home of Tupelo should be named in his honor.

Section 4 of the bill would name the Veterans' Administration cemetery in Houston, Tex., as the "Albert Thomas Veterans' Memorial Cemetery." The late Honorable Albert Thomas served with distinction in the Congress for many years and, at the time of his death, was chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the appropriation for the operations of the Veterans' Administration. Congressman Thomas had a keen insight into the problems of the veterans of this country and displayed a most sympathetic interest in seeing that adequate funds were made available for all phases of the veterans program. This was particularly true in the hospital program in which the distinguished subcommittee chairman had shown a deep and abiding interest. It seems to the committee that it is only fair and equitable that, in view of his long and distinguished service to the veterans of this country, the Veterans' Administration cemetery in his home city of Houston should be named in his honor.

There would be no additional expense to the Treasury as the result of enactment of this legislation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do not believe it is in the interest of justice to name this hospital facility which is intended to serve all veterans regardless of race, creed, or color, for one who was so totally committed to the segregationist way of life. It would be a travesty.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LAND TRANSFER TO LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4892) to provide for the conveyance of certain

real property of the United States to the city of Leavenworth, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4892

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey to the city of Leavenworth, Kansas, without monetary consideration therefor, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this Act, which real property was ceded to the United States by the city of Leavenworth, Kansas, in 1884, without cost to United States, and has been declared excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act comprises a portion of the property known as the Wadsworth Veterans' Administration Center in the county of Leavenworth, Kansas, and is more particularly described as follows:

A tract of land in the southwest quarter of section 7, township 9S, range 23E, county of Leavenworth, Kansas, bounded on the west by United States Highway Numbered 73, on the south by Kansas State Highway Numbered 5, on the east by the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company right-of-way, and on the north by the main entrance to the Veterans' Administration Center, Wadsworth, Kansas; containing 10.44 acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike " , and has been declared excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration".

On page 2, after line 13, back to the margin, add as a final sentence to section 2:

"The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and in the event a survey is required in order to make such determination, the city of Leavenworth, Kansas, shall bear the expense thereof."

On page 2 add this new section 3:
"Sec. 3. Any deed of conveyance made pursuant to this Act shall—

"(a) provide that the land conveyed shall be used by the city of Leavenworth, Kansas, in a manner that will not, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or his designate, interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans Administration Center, Wadsworth, Kansas;

"(b) contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, easements and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States;

"(c) provide that if the city of Leavenworth, Kansas, violates any provisions of the deed of conveyance or alienates or attempts to alienate all or any part of the parcel so conveyed, title thereto shall revert to the United States; and that a determination of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of any such violation or alienation or attempted alienation shall be final and conclusive; and

"(d) provide that in the event of such reversion, all improvements shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Leavenworth, Kans., without monetary consideration, 10.44 acres of land now a part of the Veterans' Administration Center at Wadsworth, Kans.

The land in question is a portion of the 640-acre tract donated by the city

of Leavenworth to a predecessor agency of the Veterans' Administration. The land will be used for park purposes.

In order to protect the interests of the Government the bill has been amended in the form suggested by the Veterans' Administration, and as amended, the Veterans' Administration has no objection to its favorable consideration.

There would be no additional appropriation required as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND TRANSFER TO ALLEN PARK, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8364) to amend the joint resolution of March 24, 1937, to provide for the termination of the interest of the United States in certain real property in Allen Park, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8364

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 54), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 2. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon determining that approximately one acre out of said triangular tract is no longer to be used for the purpose and on the condition for which the same was donated to the United States, is authorized to execute a written declaration describing such one acre and reciting the termination of the use of such one acre for the aforesaid purpose; and upon the delivery of such declaration to the heirs of the grantors who have expressed a desire to give said one acre to the city of Allen Park, for a fire station site, said declaration shall be conclusive evidence of the fact of termination of such use as to said one acre.

"(b) The exact legal description of said one acre (located at the corner of Outer Drive and Snow Road) shall be determined by the Administrator. The Administrator shall not execute and deliver the declaration authorized in subsection (a) of this section until said heirs shall have, at their own expense, caused the property to be surveyed and made arrangements, satisfactory to the Administrator, for the erection of a boundary line fence, nor until said heirs shall have executed and delivered to the United States a written instrument, in form satisfactory to the Attorney General, acknowledging that no right of reentry into the balance of said triangular tract would accrue to them solely by reason of the termination of the use of said one acre thereof. The execution and delivery of said declaration shall be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Administrator shall deem appropriate to protect the interests of the United States."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, and page 2, lines 1-3, strike "written declaration describing such one acre and reciting the termination of the use of such one acre for the aforesaid purpose; and upon the delivery of such declaration to", and substitute "quitclaim deed to the heirs of the grantors conveying such one acre."

On page 2, lines 3 and 4, after "grantors", strike " , who have" and substitute "having".

On page 2, beginning at line 5, after the word "site", strike the comma and substitute

a period, and strike "said declaration shall be conclusive evidence of the fact of termination of such use as to said one acre.", and substitute "Such quitclaim deed shall also contain covenants by said heirs that the one acre parcel shall be conveyed by them to the city of Allen Park for use as a site for a fire station and shall be used in a manner that will not, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or his designate, interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the nearby Veterans' Administration Hospital, Dearborn, Michigan; a condition that if it ever ceases to be so used, the title to said property shall immediately revert to the United States for the use of the Veterans' Administration; a provision that such covenants and conditions shall run with the land and be binding on the grantees, their heirs, successors, grantees and assigns; and such instrument shall further contain such additional terms and conditions as the Administrator shall deem appropriate to protect the interests of the United States."

On page 2, line 11, before "authorized", strike "declaration" and substitute "quitclaim deed".

On page 2, line 17, before "instrument", strike "written" and substitute "recordable".

On page 2, line 18, before "right of reentry", strike "acknowledging that no" and substitute "releasing to the United States all of their interests in such one acre parcel and also releasing any".

On page 2, line 19, after "tract", strike "would" and substitute "which might", and also strike the words "to them solely" in such line.

On page 2, line 20, after "use", insert "by the United States".

On page 2, line 21, after "said", strike "declaration" and substitute "instrument".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey approximately 1 acre of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Dearborn, Mich., to the heirs of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford. The heirs would be required, in turn, to convey such 1 acre to the city of Allen Park, Mich., for the purpose of being used as a site for a fire station.

The maintenance of the fire station on the property in question will, in the opinion of the Veterans' Administration be advantageous to the Government in that it will provide better fire protection to the hospital and its patients.

The tract in question is a part of the ground originally made available to the Government in 1936 by the late Henry Ford and his wife, Clara J. Ford, for the purpose of constructing a Veterans' Administration hospital.

The bill has been amended in the form suggested by the Veterans' Administration, and as amended, is approved by that agency.

There would be no additional appropriations required as a result of the transfer of this property.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8364, a bill to provide for the transfer of an acre of land at the Allen Park Veterans' Administration hospital to the city of Allen Park for the site of a new fire station.

Passage of this legislation will allow the city of Allen Park—one of the largest cities in my congressional district—to build a much needed fire station which

would help the city provide better fire protection for the quickly growing new subdivisions in the northwestern part of the city, as well as for the hospital and for the rapidly developing industrial section along a main expressway.

The tract of land being discussed today is a part of the ground originally made available to the Government in 1936 by the late Henry Ford and his wife, Clara J. Ford, for the purpose of constructing a Veterans' Administration hospital. Because the land was conveyed to the Government by the Fords for specific use by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to act of Congress, congressional approval is necessary to bring about its transfer to the city. The Ford heirs have indicated their complete willingness to comply with the city's request if the land in question is returned to them.

Passage of H.R. 8364—a bill which I introduced the very first day of the first session of the 90th Congress—will require no additional appropriation and, as the Deputy Administrator for the Veterans' Administration has pointed out:

The erection and maintenance of the fire station on the property in question will be advantageous to the Government in that it will provide better fire protection for the hospital and its patients. Relinquishing the 1-acre parcel will not interfere with our hospital reservation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy passage of this legislation and note that there is no objection from any organization involved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND TRANSFER TO MISSISSIPPI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10277) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, since this bill does not conform to the criteria prescribed by the objector's committee, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bills from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, considered today.

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

There was no objection.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are aware, I have been deeply concerned over free world shipping to North Vietnam for some time. Since early 1965 I have repeatedly tried to focus greater attention on this problem in order to prompt the administration to achieve better cooperation from the countries involved through diplomatic efforts and tighter restrictions on our foreign aid legislation. Because I

know many of my colleagues share my concern I hasten, therefore, at the very outset of the new session to make available the most recent information provided at my request by the Department of Defense relating to the volume of shipping to North Vietnam during 1967.

A year ago—in my report appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, page 3555, covering free world shipping activities during 1966—I was encouraged by the fact that some progress has been made in reducing the level of this traffic. I regret to report today that during 1967 this progress did not continue. During 1967 there were 78 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam or four more than in 1966. Instead of the situation getting better, it has become worse. In a war requiring the commitment of over 500,000 of our servicemen, this to me is intolerable. Such aid and comfort to the enemy should not be permitted to continue.

Last year free-world-flag vessels constituted approximately 20 percent of all merchant ship arrivals in North Vietnam and represented a total cargo capacity of more than a half million tons. Despite the attempts of the State Department to depreciate this trade I am informed that during many months of 1967 these ships were suspected of carrying strategic goods. Included among these vessels was a tanker, the *Taipieng*, sailing under the British flag. Furthermore, most of these free world vessels, I am advised, in recent months were chartered by Communist governments to deliver obviously much-needed supplies to North Vietnam. The hiring of free world vessels, just as obviously, serves to relieve the strains and pressures on other transportation facilities available to the North Vietnamese. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a chart indicating the number of arrivals, by month and by flag of registry, of free world ships sailing to North Vietnam during 1967 and 1966:

FREE WORLD SHIPS ARRIVING NORTH VIETNAM

1967								1966							
Month	United Kingdom (British)	Cyprus	Malta	Italy	Lebanon	Greece	Total	Month	United Kingdom (British)	Cyprus	Malta	Italy	Lebanon	Greece	Total
January	6						6	January	13	1		1		3	18
February	3	1	1				5	February	11					1	12
March	3						3	March	5	1					6
April	4						4	April	4	1	1			1	7
May	7	1	1				9	May	4	1				1	6
June	9	1		1			11	June	1	2	1			1	5
July	5						5	July	1						1
August	4	1	1				6	August	1	1	1				3
September	6			1			7	September	2	2	1				4
October	6						6	October	1	1					2
November	5						5	November	5	1					6
December	9				1		10	December	3	1					4
Total	67	5	3	2	1		78	Total	50	12	4	1		7	74

As this chart indicates, 67 of the 78 free world arrivals during 1967 flew the British flag. There has been much discussion over this particular trade but unfortunately very little action. The British Government maintains that these vessels are owned by Hong Kong concerns and that London presently has no effective means of control over their movements because of the provisions of British maritime law. However, for whatever the reasons, the fact still remains that the British are in effect renting their flag for

the benefit of a Communist regime whose policy of terror and aggression has already cost the lives of over 16,000 American soldiers dedicated to defending the free world. As a member of the U.S. delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly last fall, I took the occasion to urge our NATO Allies to reexamine their maritime statutes with a view to considering any revisions that might be needed to conform with present realities. It is my hope that the administration will make a greater effort to bring about co-

operation in this regard, for it is most appalling that during the past 4 years, that is 1964 through 1967, 810 of the 1,852 total merchant ship arrivals in North Vietnam flew the flags of free world countries, and further that 611 of these were of NATO country registry. During the same period Soviet arrivals numbered 429, as you will note from the following chart reflecting merchant shipping to North Vietnam since January 1, 1964:

MERCHANT SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM BY FLAG OF REGISTRY, JANUARY 1964 TO DECEMBER 1967

1964						1966					
Date of arrival	Free world	U.S.S.R.	East European	Chinese	Total	Date of arrival	Free world	U.S.S.R.	East European	Chinese	Total
January	30	5	3	8	46	January	18	9	5	16	48
February	32	3	3	9	47	February	12	10	1	14	37
March	39	5	3	4	51	March	6	12	4	13	35
April	47	1	6	5	59	April	7	11	2	11	31
May	33	7	7	3	50	May	6	9	5	5	25
June	20	4	5	8	37	June	5	12	3	9	29
July	30	4	3	4	41	July	1	13	3	10	27
August	34	3	7	5	49	August	3	11	1	7	22
September	32	1	4	6	43	September	4	7	5	10	26
October	36	4	8	6	54	October	2	8	7	13	30
November	34	4	5	2	45	November	6	9	3	14	32
December	34	6	4	3	47	December	4	11	6	16	37
Subtotal	401	47	58	63	569	Subtotal	74	122	45	138	379
1965						1967					
January	38	12	4	5	59	January	6	16	4	11	37
February	38	5	5	5	52	February	5	24	3	10	42
March	34	4	3	16	57	March	3	23	4	12	42
April	8	6	7	13	34	April	5	18	4	10	37
May	27	8	3	13	51	May	9	18	2	10	40
June	24	6	5	9	44	June	11	8	4	11	34
July	21	7	4	8	40	July	5	10	2	5	22
August	12	7	3	15	37	August	6	12	1	4	23
September	11	3	3	8	25	September	7	8	2	8	25
October	16	4	4	11	35	October	6	13	1	6	26
November	15	7	6	16	44	November	5	15	1	5	26
December	13	10	4	14	41	December	10	16	1	5	32
Subtotal	257	79	51	132	519	Subtotal	78	181	29	97	385
Grand total						Grand total					
						810 429 183 430 1852					

Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary for a Member of Congress to have to continually bring the problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam to the attention of the administration. If we are to keep faith with our servicemen, more must be done to choke off the shipping being carried by vessels flying free world flags, for clearly every cargo unloaded on the docks at Haiphong makes our job that much more difficult. A year ago I said we should be doing more than just watching these ships sail-

ing into North Vietnam. Regrettably, from the standpoint of total results, that is all that has been accomplished during the past year, for we have, in fact, watched even more free world ships sail to North Vietnam. I urge again, therefore, that the administration take effective action to stop this immoral aid and comfort to the enemy. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to include a chart reflecting the cargo capability of free world ship arrivals to North Vietnam during 1967 by month:

CARGO CAPACITY OF FREE WORLD SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1967, BY FLAG OF REGISTRY

Month	British		Cyprus		Maltese		Italian		Lebanese		Total	
	Number	Dead-weight tons	Number	Dead-weight tons	Number	Dead-weight tons	Number	Dead-weight tons	Number	Dead-weight tons	Number	Dead-weight tons
January	6	48,850	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	6	48,850
February	3	10,730	1	10,900	1	10,900	---	---	---	---	5	32,530
March	3	10,700	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	10,700
April	4	24,800	1	10,900	---	---	---	---	---	---	5	35,700
May	7	32,220	1	10,600	1	10,900	---	---	---	---	9	53,720
June	9	57,620	1	10,800	---	---	1	10,000	---	---	11	78,420
July	5	26,436	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5	26,436
August	4	25,520	1	10,600	1	10,900	---	---	---	---	6	47,020
September	6	49,730	---	---	---	1	10,000	---	---	---	7	59,730
October	6	43,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	6	43,000
November	5	42,820	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5	42,820
December	9	70,120	---	---	---	---	---	1	10,700	---	10	80,820
Total	67	442,540	5	53,800	3	32,700	2	20,000	1	10,700	78	559,740

FERTILE SEEDBED OF TRANSPLANT SURGERY

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have been extremely proud of my alma mater, the University of Minnesota.

However, at no time have I been prouder than in recent weeks with the news that heart transplant surgery had

been successful in South Africa and in California. In both instances the surgeons performing the miracle of modern medicine had been students at the University of Minnesota Medical School—Dr. Christiaan N. Barnard of Cape Town, South Africa, and Dr. Norman E. Shumway of Stanford University Medical School.

Business Week, in its issue of January 6, 1968, carried an article entitled "Fertile Seedbed of Transplant Surgery," which discusses the impact of the University of Minnesota Medical School on heart transplant surgery. Among many other important facts, this article points out: "Today, over 100 Minnesota-trained surgeons hold posts in medical schools; 33 of them are either chairmen of their

departments or full professors of surgery."

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today:

FERTILE SEEDBED OF TRANSPLANT SURGERY

(NOTE.—Under the cultivation of Dr. Owen Wangenstein, the University of Minnesota produces scholar-surgeons. And their lab work and techniques proved human heart replacement feasible.)

When his excited voice came crackling over the transatlantic phone from Cape Town, South Africa, last month, Dr. Christiaan N. Barnard commented: "I want to thank my colleagues in America, particularly Doctors Wangenstein, Lillehei, and others at the University of Minnesota. A lot of the credit on the operation must go to them."

Two days earlier, Barnard, a 44-year-old heart surgeon who studied at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, had pulled off one of the surgical feats of the 20th Century. Working through the night with a team at Groote Schuur Hospital, he had transplanted the first human heart.

Louis Washkansky, the patient, died 18 days after the operation of double pneumonia. But it was clear that the technique had worked and that a new era in heart surgery was beginning.

On Tuesday of this week, Barnard and his team were back in the operating room, performing a second heart transplant. The patient this time was a 58-year-old Cape Town dentist, Dr. Phillip Blaiberg. Five and a half hours later, the hospital pronounced the operation a success and reported that the patient was in "satisfactory" condition.

UNKNOWN

Barnard's success pointed directly to two men who have been in the background of the revolution in heart surgery: Dr. Owen H. Wangenstein, 69, who retired this summer as professor and chief of the department of surgery at Minnesota; and Dr. C. Walton Lillehei, 49, who like Barnard is a protégé of Wangenstein and is credited with starting the worldwide fraternity of open heart surgeons.

Not only Barnard was ready to try the revolutionary operation. Earlier, Dr. Norman E. Shumway of Stanford University Medical School had said he was only waiting for a patient; the technology and the technique were perfected, he said. Other surgery teams were also standing by in Philadelphia.

And at Maimonides Hospital in Brooklyn, where Dr. Adrian Kantrowitz had tried the world's second human heart transplant, another attempt appeared imminent.

Progress

From the public's viewpoint, it may have seemed that the state of the art in heart surgery has taken a sudden leap forward overnight. But actually the Cape Town operation can be traced to a long series of developments in surgical science over the last 15 years—many of them in the U.S., and many of them at the University of Minnesota.

These achievements—such as open heart surgery—have come in large part as the result of a pioneering, and controversial approach to surgical education. Since 1930, when Wangenstein took over the young department of surgery, Minnesota has been training "academic surgeons," a combination surgeon-teacher-researcher, for medical schools.

Today, over 100 Minnesota-trained surgeons hold posts in medical schools; 33 of them are either chairmen of their departments or full professors of surgery.

I. NEW APPROACH

Normally, after a period of internship, new doctors who want to become surgeons spend another two or three years as surgery residents in a hospital or medical center to attain certification by national review groups. The surgery resident gets his training working alongside surgeon-teachers in emergency rooms and in the operating room.

Wangenstein's approach broke with this tradition. As he viewed the program, surgery residents (or surgery fellows as he calls them) would be trained primarily for jobs as teachers in medical schools. He wasn't too much interested in educating surgeons for general hospital practice.

Degree

Under Wangenstein, the academic surgeon was required to work toward a degree—either an M.S. or a Ph. D.—in the clinical science of surgery. To qualify, he had to do original research, write a dissertation, and pick up foreign language requirements. The program took three to seven years.

First the new surgeon-to-be was oriented to the wards and to patients. But then he would go learn the "how" of surgery and perform research for a year or two in the experimental surgery labs at Minnesota. Later, he'd work at the bench in a basic science lab, such as physiology. Finally, he'd come back to the wards to learn the "when" and "why" of surgery.

Minnesota's critics scoffed at the idea. "A Minnesota passport," they called the new program; other critics described the lab work as "making mice walk up a ladder." But the new concept has survived, and few of its critics would argue with the record.

Scholar

"We're training a new type of surgeon today . . . a scholar, not a mechanic," Wangenstein said last month. And he credits much of the success of the program to his long-time friend, Dr. Maurice Visscher, chairman of Minnesota's physiology department.

Minnesota has not been alone in the training of surgeons, of course. Building on the influence of European surgeons, the late Dr. Alfred Blalock was carrying on the traditions of the great 19th Century surgeon, William Halstead, at Johns Hopkins University. Hopkins graduates were fanning out to start departments at Duke University and in Boston.

But at Minnesota the department was relatively new and there was no tradition to build upon. "It grew up around Wangenstein like a mushroom in the middle of the prairie," comments Dr. Bernard Zimmermann, a Wangenstein protégé now at West Virginia University Medical Center.

When Minnesota's surgical M.S. and Ph. D. programs began in 1917, however, they were born into an atmosphere where research was being stressed. This emphasis came from President George E. Vincent, who later headed the Rockefeller Foundation, and university trustee Dr. William Mayo, a founder of the famous clinic at Rochester, Minn.

II. IN BY DEFAULT

In 1919, Wangenstein stepped into this atmosphere as a new pre-med graduate. The short (5 ft. 7 in.) and eager student had grown up on a farm at Lake Park, Minn., and wanted to become a veterinarian. But his father pointed to ancestral ties to medical science. Ove Wangenstein in Norway had been a translator of Leonardo da Vinci's medical works. Gerhard Armauer Hansen, on his mother's side of the family, had discovered the bacillus of leprosy.

Wangenstein went to medical school, finished in 1922, and wanted to become a surgeon. But the only opening—which carried a \$600 yearly stipend—was in the Minnesota department of medicine. And there was one hitch: He'd have to do some work in the research lab.

Fascination

Reluctantly, Wangenstein began the lab regime and found it fascinating. The next year he was able to transfer to the surgery department and, in 1925, became its forth Ph. D. graduate. There was time to study a year at Mayo Clinic before the university was looking for a man to take over the surgery department.

A committee—in a four-year search—found two surgeons, one from Harvard and one from Hopkins, who journeyed to Minneapolis for interviews. But they could see no future in the drab buildings and labs at the young medical center on the banks of the Mississippi. Today Wangenstein recalls that he won the job by default.

The school financed a year's study in Berne, Switzerland, before giving the 31-year-old surgeon the reins of the department.

Development

The Depression years brought a rough development period for the new department, as did the years of World War II. But in 1945, the school began to flourish as doctors returned from service and wanted to specialize in surgery.

While the department was developing, "The Chief," as his students still call him, came up with a solution to a high-mortality problem in surgery that nobody else was much interested in—obstruction of the bowel. Today, the Wangenstein tube is a byword in hospitals and is credited with saving thousands of lives.

Meanwhile, he did basic research work and technique development in appendicitis, intestinal cancer, and peptic ulcer. Most recently, he has come up with a controversial freezing technique as a treatment for peptic ulcer. This caused quite a stir in the medical world, though it proved somewhat limited in scope and has gone back to the lab.

Dynamo

The Chief has often commented: "I'm just a plumber of the alimentary canal." His protégés describe him differently. "A human dynamo," one says. "The greatest surgical teacher of the century," says another. Either way, by the late 1940s, his department was buzzing with students working in labs and turning out research papers.

The staff began to build up with such men as Dr. Clarence Dennis, a 1940 graduate who was a surgeon and pioneer in heart-lung machine design, and Richard L. Varco, a 1944 graduate, who helped pioneer open heart surgery.

As the focus of surgical education moved from Boston and Baltimore to Minneapolis, so did the interest in working inside the heart

to correct a series of defects that were killing children and adults.

Proliferation

Surgeons needed time, and a heart that was relaxed and free of blood, to perform such surgery. But they first had to find something that would take over the heart's job of pumping blood, and the lungs' function of adding oxygen, while they by-passed the heart.

Dr. John Gibbons at Hopkins got the idea for a heart-lung machine in 1935; in 1953 he built and used one, but his patients' mortality rate was high; the machine still was not perfect. In Minnesota's labs, meanwhile, Dennis was using dogs to develop another version of the heart-lung machine. In March and April, 1951, it was used in two life-saving attempts. But both patients died.

That year, when New York's Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn was looking for a surgeon, it chose Dennis, who has remained there as chief of surgery. (In 1955, he performed the first open heart surgery on the East Coast.)

The departure of Dennis left Wangenstein with a gap in a critical research area. Fortunately, the Chief had a bright, young 1951 graduate of the Ph.D. program—C. W. Lillehei—to take over the dog lab work.

Hard pace

Stanford's Shumway recalls Wangenstein's dedication to his students, and his knack of inspiring others. He says: "It was the old Tom Sawyer thing. He made painting the fence look like fun."

But painting the fence was grueling work. Dr. Herbert E. Warden, another Wangenstein protégé who is now at West Virginia University, recalls: "The research would go from 7 a.m. to midnight, quite frequently. And if you did finish early, you'd always go back to see how the experiment was going, and to give the dogs food and penicillin shots."

Results

But in this atmosphere, the Minnesota school began to record breakthroughs:

In September, 1953, Dr. F. John Lewis led a team that performed the first direct-vision surgery inside the heart. He used a technique called hypothermia—cooling the patient to cut down the flow of and need for blood.

In March, 1954, four Minnesota surgeons hooked a one-year-old patient up to his father, whose heart and lungs took over for both, while open-heart surgery was performed.

In the 11 months thereafter, the Midwest surgeons used this cross-circulation technique in 44 other cases, repairing four types of heart defects that had been untouchable.

In June, 1955, the operating room was enhanced with a new electronic marvel, a Minnesota version of a heart-lung machine. It was a direct result of dog lab research by Lillehei and Dr. Richard L. De Wall.

In August, 1957, the Minnesota doctors inserted the first completely prosthetic heart valve into a New Zealand woman.

III. SPREADING THE WORD

The young surgeons who participated in a number of discoveries soon began to be recruited away from Minnesota. Lewis went to Northwestern University Medical Center in Chicago. De Wall is now at the Cox Heart Institute, near Dayton. Cohen has gone to the University of Manitoba at Winnipeg. Lillehei assumed a new job on Nov. 1, 1967, as professor and chairman of surgery at New York Hospital-Cornell University Medical Center. And he took along 17 members of his research-surgery team.

Exchange

Meanwhile, largely because of Minnesota, the U.S. now can point to about 750 open heart surgery teams; another 500 have

fanned out around the world—including Barnard's group in Cape Town.

Barnard came to Minnesota in 1955 as an accomplished cardiologist who wanted to become a surgeon. He spent almost a year in physiology research and did a tour in the dog labs, where he began research on heart valves. Wangenstein was his adviser, but Lillehei was his primary mentor. He returned to South Africa in 1957 to begin setting up a heart surgery team and to continue his research.

The discourse between heart surgeons—the rapid exchange of technical and scientific ideas—is evident in the decade since. Shumway graduated at Minnesota in 1956 and went to Stanford to continue research work with animals. There he devised a technique by which a heart was taken out of a dog and then stitched back into the same animal and successfully restarted.

Dr. Richard L. Lower of the Medical College of Virginia at Richmond, a student of Shumway, helped in developing the technique. On his way back from a visit to Minneapolis in 1966, Barnard detoured through Richmond to learn the technique from Lower; he used it in the history-making operations last month and this week.

Stimulus

Do these first successful heart transplantations signal a new era in surgery? "Actually," says C. W. Lillehei, "the whole last decade has been a pretty active one. Whether the pace can continue is another question, but it looks pretty favorable." He feels that the body's immunological rejection mechanism eventually will be licked, "for there are better drugs coming."

The 49-year-old Lillehei says that the Cape Town operation is a stimulus to scientists everywhere to pursue their own research work. He feels that the day is fast coming when primate hearts, perhaps even the hearts of calves, will be used on human transplantation surgery.

History

Wangenstein, who can trace some of his medical interest to a magazine called *Breeders' Gazette*, is back in an office on the fourth floor of Minnesota's new medical library. He and his wife Sarah, who is a former editor of the magazine *Modern Medicine*, have launched some joint projects on the history of surgery.

Across the street from The Chief's office in the medical center, the surgery department is now directed by a non-Minnesota man, Dr. John S. Najarian, a specialist in transplant surgery. He moved to Minneapolis this year from the University of California Medical Center in San Francisco.

In the dog laboratory downstairs, Dr. Allen Moberg, a surgery fellow, comments: "I think we're headed in the wrong direction on the transplant rejection problem. We should find a way to mask the antigens of the host in advance, so that the host doesn't recognize the new tissue as foreign." Moberg's view is just the type of thinking that Wangenstein has cultivated at Minnesota—an approach that is leading to miracles of surgery.

TIME TO END COPPER STRIKE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for decisive steps to end the copper strike which has been underway since July 15 and has damaged the

economies of the Western States where copper is produced and the national economy by hundreds of millions of dollars.

Approximately 60,000 workers in the copper industry have been idle for 6 months. Years and years will be required for them to make up their losses even if the final settlement results in substantial increases in pay.

As of January 15, 1968, the 6-month anniversary of the strike, here are estimates from reliable sources of some of its economic effects in my State:

Total impact of strike on Montana's economy.....	\$53,294,410
Per calendar day loss.....	\$288,186
Wages lost to workers.....	\$25,470,448
Average loss per worker.....	\$3,478
Welfare payments made to workers.....	\$5,200
Number of workers' families on food stamps.....	2,350
Workers who left the State of their communities in search of work.....	1,500
Loss in taxes:	
Metal mines tax.....	\$60,000
Montana State income tax....	\$610,000
Federal income tax.....	\$3,600,000

One must remember that my State has a population of only 750,000, and that the losses have had an impact much greater than they would have had in States with more people.

Copper imports are coming in at the rate of \$20 million weekly, or at a rate of a billion dollars annually. For the past 2 or 3 months, the rate of imports is well over twice the corresponding rate last year.

The adverse balance of payments is one of the country's most serious problems. A series of emergency steps were taken recently by the administration to deal with it. Yet, here the copper strike is causing a steady outflow of American dollars, an outflow which will rise steadily as time goes on unless there is an end to this labor dispute. But we are told that there is no emergency which, to my mind, does not fit the facts. In addition to the other factors I have mentioned, there are signs that copper is becoming short in certain areas. There have been newspaper reports that 100 workers have been laid off in a steel company plant near Pittsburgh because of lack of the metal.

This is only the beginning. Obviously, if copper is not in short supply it soon will be and the metal is necessary for munitions manufacture. If imports are stepped up sharply to meet the growing domestic deficit, the balance of payments will be worsened still more.

Also, it seems to me that the suffering affecting the 60,000 copper workers and their families, and the businesses and communities dependent upon their purchasing power constitutes an emergency, one which should not be ignored.

As is inevitable in wage disputes, both sides accuse the other of various derelictions. I am not attempting to pass on the conflicting claims, but, to repeat, I hope the copper workers and the copper industry are not injured because of objectives and ambitions which have little to do with the welfare of the domestic copper industry.

Copper is a world metal and, under ordinary circumstances, the supply is more than the demand. The use of the metal rose sharply in 1964-66 but is down this year. There has been a business slowdown in Western Europe and in Britain and other parts of the free world. Aluminum, stainless steel, and plastics have cut into copper's market. Copper prices have been rising here and abroad because of the strike, but looking ahead, it is obvious that the product will have competition which it must meet. If the Vietnam war ended suddenly, the demand would drop sharply. New mine capacity is being built or will be built in Chile, Zambia, and Peru. These countries, together with the Congo, account for about two-fifths of the world copper output and about 70 percent of total copper exports according to the publication, *World Business*, for November 9, the magazine being a publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York.

This has been a most unfortunate strike, with mistakes being made on both sides. Whatever the final results, they will bode ill for the industry and the men and women dependent on it.

Proposals have been made for some sort of factfinding board appointed by the President. It seems to me that this, in itself, indicates that the use of the machinery created by law to give a cooling-off period to deal with major strikes is called for.

Today marks the end of the sixth month of the copper strike and there is no sign that any progress has been made in that long period which has bankrupted many copper workers.

Now is the time for President Johnson to use the machinery available to his office to work with the copper industry and striking workers to right this national problem. No longer is this an issue concerning only the industry and workers. Because of the effect this conflict is having on our national economy, notably the balance-of-payments deficit, and on the future of the copper industry which can provide many jobs and millions to our gross national product, the President must act now.

I recommend that instead of appointing a factfinding board which would, of course, be subject to political pressures, President Johnson should have high-placed administration officials meet with both sides of this conflict.

Through discussion with labor and management, it is hoped the President would be able to determine what further action is needed to solve this problem. One thing that should be stressed in these talks with the involved parties is the necessity to end this strike now.

MOMENTS OF MAGIC AND HOPE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we all

receive many cards and letters during the holiday season, but this season one card in particular struck me as especially heartwarming because the happiness of memories transcends profound personal tragedy.

The card was sent this past Christmas by Mrs. George Schuyler. The front of the card is a picture of her daughter, Philippa, standing beside the concert grand which she played throughout the world. Inside was a memorial poem by Josephine Schuyler entitled "Philippa's World."

It is important to know that Philippa Schuyler died May 9, 1967, when the helicopter in which she was a passenger crashed into Da Nang Bay. At the time of her death, and this is indicative of her character, she had delayed her departure from Vietnam by 1 day to continue her volunteer work evacuating schoolchildren from Hue to Da Nang.

Miss Schuyler died during her second trip to Vietnam. She was serving as a special correspondent from the Manchester Union Leader, in addition to performing at concerts in schools and hospitals. Her first trip was at the invitation of former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

With so much interest and publicity focused on the social dropouts and misfits in our society—the few who make so much noise—I think it is important to remember a young person such as Philippa.

Here was a young woman who excelled in many diverse areas. She established a brilliant reputation in more than 70 nations during goodwill tours for the United States. She authored several books in addition to her newspaper work and also composed some of the music she played.

Philippa Schuyler is a symbol of the countless young American men and women who follow her lead in bringing hope for the future of man.

I include at this point "Philippa's World":

PHILIPPA'S WORLD

(In memoriam, Christmas 1967)

She was Diana—but fairer,
A muse with a passionate soul,
Though she lived amid violence and terror,
Music and lore were her goal:
She read and believed the old sages,
And collected ancient folk song
To play on all the world's stages
From the Hague to teeming Hongkong.

Her home was always Manhattan—
Though they knew her also in Hue,
Manila, Paris, and Cairo—
Wherever they asked her to play:
She went to Berlin or to Belra,
London, Luaska, or Rome,
Touring to Accra or E'Ville,
To Tokyo, Khartoum or Nome.

They knew her in Brussels and Boston,
Majunga, Juarez and Jos,
In Rio, Rabat, and Luanda,
Lyons, Leon, and Laos:
In Cebu, Ndola and Leo,
Singapore, Saigon and Seoul—
Wherever they had a piano
She played with her heart and her soul.

She traveled by jeep or cycle,
Rickshaw, copter, or jet,
To Amman, Macao or Oslo,
With never a fear or regret
To Kano, to Zurich or Dakar,
She flew in pursuit of her muse—

To Dallas, to Decca, or Davao,
To Beirut, Bonn, or to Bruges,
She brought the beauty of music
While staying on top of the news:
Whether in Louisville or Lisbon,
Leyte, Kumasi or Harar,
In Ibadan, Lome or Cho Lon—
She was always a glamorous star.

From Chile to glacial Iceland—
From the Congo to the old Rio Grande—
She performed in eighty countries
And learned to love ev'ry land,
Bringing them moments of magic
And hope for the future of man.
—JOSEPHINE SCHUYLER.

ONLY AT GREAT PERIL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News today provided much food for thought for those who are seeking to build bridges to the Soviet Union via the increasing of trade proposals. Its editorial, "Look Southward, NATO," briefly outlines Moscow's latest strategy in the Mediterranean in refuting the notion that Russia is mellowing. It is a paradox of our times that, in the face of the past record of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, there still persists a school of thought that holds that this greatest aggressor of recorded history will somehow change into a peaceful regime. The new Soviet policy in the Mediterranean should be, as the News points out, "a warning to the free world that it relaxes its strength and vigilance—anywhere—only at great peril."

I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Daily News,
Jan. 15, 1968]

LOOK SOUTHWARD, NATO

While Western eyes have remained focused on the Iron Curtain and the Communist troops lurking behind it, Soviet Russia has slyly started an end run around Nato's main line of defense.

The route runs through the Mediterranean Sea and the instrument is the growing—and increasingly cocky—Soviet navy.

The Communist aim is nothing less than an effort "to alter the strategic balance by exploiting an area where we are most vulnerable.

Such is the assessment of U.S. Adm. Charles D. Griffin, commander of Nato forces in the Mediterranean and a man in a position to know.

Adm. Griffin has watched the Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean grow from occasional ceremonial visits to a full-fledged and permanent force numbering about 35 ships.

The largest of these is a missile-carrying cruiser. In terms of firepower, the Communist squadron looks like a bathtub flotilla beside the mighty U.S. Sixth Fleet and its two task forces built around huge attack carriers.

But it gives the Kremlin another instrument with which to play at Communism's favorite pastime of fishing in troubled waters, and it would be hard to find more troubled waters than in the Mediterranean.

From the western end, where the pro-West

Kingdom of Morocco and Moscow-leaning Algeria sniff suspiciously at each other, to the eastern shores, where Arabs and Israelis clashed bloodily only months ago, the Mediterranean is aboll.

Only desperate diplomacy kept Greece and Turkey, twin outposts of the Nato line, from leaping at each other's throat over the island of Cyprus a month ago.

That crisis remains unsettled and could still end in conflict that would further weaken Nato's southern flank.

Nibbling away at the Free World has paid Communism its biggest dividends in the Middle East.

After Israel wiped up the sand dunes with various Arab armies in June, a lot of wishful thinkers proclaimed that the Soviet Union would pick up its marbles and quit the Mideast power game. That hope has proved about as vain as the "Russia is mellowing" nonsense.

Far from giving up—or mellowing—the Communists have burrowed even more deeply into the Mideast scene, rearming the Arab hotheads and encouraging their hysterical threats against Israel.

The Kremlin's comeback from the June disaster has been helped by the ability to flex its newly developed naval muscle before admiring Arab eyes.

All of which goes to show that Communism's goal of world domination will change about the time the leopard changes his spots.

Thwarted by Nato from grabbing Europe with a straight-ahead power play, the Soviet Union is poking out in new directions, its evil aims to win. It is acquiring new means to go with its new tactics.

It is a warning to the Free World that it relaxes its strength and vigilance—anywhere—only at great peril.

FINDLEY-UDALL APPEAL TO NATO GOVERNMENTS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President began the new year by announcing plans to curb the freedom of U.S. citizens in order to stem the growing monetary crisis. The measures would impose hardships on friends at home and abroad.

At the very same time, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and I were sending an open letter to him and to the heads of the other NATO nations proposing a way to cure, not merely stem, the monetary crisis in a manner which would expand the freedom of our citizens. In fact, if our recommendations were carried out the freedom and well-being of all NATO citizens would be enhanced tremendously without prejudice to people elsewhere.

We proposed a convention of eminent citizens of each of the NATO nations to "seek agreement that the ultimate goal of the alliance is a federal union government serving all its members."

An essential feature of this new government—indeed the most urgent single part would be a NATO-wide reserve banking system with unified currencies.

The creation of a new level of federal government is necessarily longterm in

achievement but agreement on this as a goal would in itself inspire the needed confidence and would transform our international monetary system from a posture of uncertainty and instability into one of confidence and strength before some uncontrolled chain reaction threatens all that we prize.

No matter how it is dressed up with attractive garments like IMF special drawing rights or central bank swap agreements, the international monetary system will continue to hang by the slender thread of national self-interest until some sort of federal governmental structure brings nations together. No one can accurately forecast the durability of that thread, nor predict with certainty the circumstances or hour when it will break.

The growing instability of the international payments system must not be permitted to trigger a chain reaction like that which followed the devaluation of the British pound in 1931. Such a consequence could contribute, as it did in the thirties, to worldwide economic disorder with grave peril to peace and freedom.

Our proposal is not new. It was first introduced to the House and also the Senate by resolutions in October 1965. Together, these resolutions now have the support of about one-fifth of the entire Congress and almost all of the probable 1968 presidential candidates.

The text of the open letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE 15 NATO GOVERNMENTS

The deepening international monetary crisis and the common danger that it entails causes us to take this extraordinary step of writing this open letter to you. Our purpose is to draw your attention to a proposal which, if acted upon by the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty, or even just part of them, would reduce the danger and reverse the trend to a hopeful, progressive course.

The growing instability of the international payments system must not be permitted to trigger a chain-reaction like that which followed the devaluation of the British pound in 1931. Such a consequence could contribute, as it did in the Thirties, to worldwide economic disorder with grave peril to peace and freedom.

It should be noted that current instability has already impaired world trade.

The reluctance of many central banks to hold dollars as a reserve asset may be traced to their memory of 1931 when much of their capital was wiped out by the devaluation of the key reserve currency. The devaluation of the British pound this past November, despite official assurances that this would not happen, has given them no reason for complacency.

The international value of the dollar, of course, is based in part on the U.S. guarantee to convert dollars into gold as \$35 an ounce, and in part on the size and strength of the U.S. economy, its capital assets and holdings abroad. The guarantee to buy or sell gold at \$35 an ounce is certainly a very important element, and confidence in this guarantee is shaken by the continued high level of the U.S. payments deficits which causes a worsening gold-claims ratio, and by sharply rising U.S. budget deficits which spur inflation.

The United States should undertake fiscal reforms—by ending or reducing the deficits in payments—and these measures, plus temporary bolstering of its gold reserves by various western nations, may suffice to alleviate the present crisis. But experience of the

Thirties is a sobering reminder that even strong currencies and countries whose fiscal affairs are in order can be seriously damaged by a major shuffling of currency values.

Because of this interdependence and the possibility that the United States will not take fiscal "medicine" in sufficient doses, we suggest that all NATO nations give themselves added protection through the political initiative outlined in this letter.

Certainly danger signals abound. Heavy buying of gold reflects, in part at least, a fear that the United States may not have enough gold to fill all claims or that it will devalue.

In the minds of hoarders may be the devaluations of the United States in 1933, Britain, Australia and Belgium in 1949, France in 1959, and Canada in 1962, not to mention the recent devaluations of Britain, Spain, Israel, Denmark and about 20 smaller countries.

Certain parallels between the years just past and those immediately preceding the stock market crash of 1929 can be seen. In both periods relative earnings and yields declined; the growth of stock market credit exceeded the growth of gross national product; private domestic debt mounted; the supply of money, bank credit and the turnover rate of demand deposits expanded rapidly. On the other hand, the United States and the other free world nations have learned much from the Great Depression, and we do not see the accumulation of inventories, the margin buying or other excesses that marked that earlier period. We can take heart from these more favorable signs—but not so much as to let us dismiss any prospect of serious trouble ahead.

We should recall that, even in 1931-32, when electronic communication was still in its infancy, monetary panic spread with great speed. In just 18 months a run on the Austrian schilling spread to the German mark, then to the British pound and to the dollar. The United States suspended all bank payments and in a short time was required to redeem in gold about 80 percent of its short-term foreign claims.

In panic conditions, neither individuals nor governments can be counted on to act with enlightenment, good faith or good will. Self-preservation is the first law of the jungle, and this is no less true of the international monetary "jungle."

Furthermore, while postwar arrangements like the International Monetary Fund and central bank swap agreements have been helpful, they did not prevent the most recent instability. Proposals for strengthening the IMF—debated for many years—recently culminated in the plan for Special Drawing Rights. At best—if and when they come into being—these reserves are a stop-gap measure available only if the financially-healthy nations approve. They leave untouched the basic weakness in international monetary arrangements.

That weakness is the absence of a government for the whole with authority to regulate the system.

If the IMF were a government able to make, enforce and adjudicate laws governing the relations of people using its money—"paper gold" or otherwise—such people would doubtlessly gain faith in the money as they came to trust their new government.

But the IMF is, of course, not a government, and therefore cannot be expected, in itself, to build faith in any paper money it may issue. Whatever faith develops will instead reflect faith in the national monetary policies of the dominant members.

The 13 original U.S. states banished interstate monetary panic by establishing a government for the whole with a unified currency-banking system. Otherwise we would doubtlessly today be reading about payments problems experienced within U.S. borders.

An examination of U.S. Federal Reserve Districts shows how serious this could be.

Many of them at times experience large "payments deficits." If any of them had the authority to devalue its "money" in terms of gold in order to bolster its reserves—and did so—an economic crisis comparable to the Great Depression could ensue, as waning faith in their money spread from district to district and discouraged investment and trading.

The catastrophic international monetary collapse of the Thirties undoubtedly would have been averted if just eight of the highly-developed nations had been joined together under a government for the whole with a unified currency and central bank. These nations, now all members of NATO, are: United States, Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Canada, Belgium and the Netherlands.

A recent study shows these nations together have about \$31 billion in gold—more than enough to cover all the claims held beyond their combined territory. But several are in trouble because of the way the gold is presently distributed. Britain has only a fourth as much as it needs to meet short-term creditors. The United States—now the principal reserve-currency nation—has less than half enough, while Germany has 11 times as much as it needs.

Much of the debt exists within the eight-nation group. For example, of about \$26 billion in claims held against the dollar, \$12 billion—46 percent—is owed to creditors in the other seven nations. If all eight were under a central bank, this "payments problem" would become but internal record-keeping as today within the U.S. Federal Reserve System. Their external debt would then be less than their gold supply. Gold stocks would be more than ample for liquidity needs, and a gold panic would be simply out of the question.

No matter how it is dressed up with attractive garments like IMF Special Drawing Rights, or central bank swap agreements, the international monetary system will continue to hang by the slender thread of national self-interest until some sort of federal governmental structure brings nations together. No one can accurately forecast the durability of that thread, nor predict with certainty the circumstances or hour when it will break.

Even a hopeful step toward the establishment of such a federal structure would in itself ease the worry and nervousness that now plagues international monetary affairs. It might retard or even halt the movement toward devaluation of currencies, and European demands for U.S. gold.

A proposal is now before the U.S. Congress which contemplates such a promising, forward step and which, we believe, would inspire the needed confidence.

Known as the Atlantic Union Resolution, H. Con. Res. 232 and 237, it would establish an 18-member delegation of eminent citizens authorized to convene with similar groups from other NATO nations. Purpose of the convention would be to seek agreement that the goal of the alliance is a federal union government serving all its members. An essential feature of this new government—indeed the most urgent single part—would be a NATO-wide reserve banking system with unified currencies.

The resolution proposes that Former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman serve as co-chairmen of the U.S. delegation and asks that the convention seek agreement on a timetable and interim institutions for achieving the federal goal.

The proposal has received prominent support in all NATO nations and in the United States has such strong bipartisan support that it needs only presidential encouragement to get moving. It is endorsed by more than 20 percent of the U.S. Congress. As co-sponsors of this proposal, we want you to know about the support building in our Congress for such a convention.

The political initiative that the times de-

mand need not take this precise form, of course, and we offer to cooperate in any promising alternative. But we know of no other proposal as ideally suited to meet today's challenges in military, economic and political affairs—as well as in the more restricted but crucial field of monetary policy. It provides a way to act promptly in order to marshal the resources of the free-world community to all of its pressing common problems.

The step it anticipates—the creation of a new level of federal government—is a giant one. But, to us, it is neither unrealistic nor unattainable. A civilization that can photograph planets close-up, pack enough explosive power aboard a single rocket to destroy an entire major nation, and computerize complex industries surely can create a system of government through which the common problems of people throughout the North Atlantic Community—like monetary crises—can be resolved.

We are writing this open letter on the first day of the New Year expressing the hope that you will use your good offices and great prestige to help transform our international monetary system, by the political initiative we have outlined, from a posture of uncertainty and instability into one of confidence and strength before some uncontrolled chain-reaction threatens all that we prize.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.
MORRIS K. UDALL,
Member of Congress.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, D.C.

(Note to editors: This open letter has been directed to the governments of the following countries: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.)

THE SITUATION IN POLAND AND THE WORLD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his annual New Year's speech on January 7, 1968, addressed to members of the Polish Government in Exile, the Council of the Republic of Poland, and representatives of Polish organizations and the Polish community in Great Britain, His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, gave a very effective and penetrating commentary on the situation in Poland and the world. His message follows:

NEW YEAR'S SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND, LONDON, JANUARY 7, 1968

(NOTE.—His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, addressed members of the Polish Government in Exile, the Council of the Republic of Poland, and representatives of Polish organizations and of the Polish community in Great Britain on January 7th 1968, as follows:)

This year is the fiftieth since Poland recovered her independence after more than a century of subjection. True, this period of Polish independence lasted barely twenty years—a very short one in Poland's thousand-year-long history. However, considering all that the Polish nation accomplished during this short time despite the soaring difficulties

to be surmounted, we Poles can rightly be proud of our achievements.

When, on 1st December 1918, Great Britain was the first to recognize Poland's restored independence and Joseph Pilsudski as head of the Polish Republic, Poland had no established frontiers, virtually no Administration, and the Polish Legions were her only armed forces.

Yet, within the space of two years, the Polish nation managed to create such a strong State that it succeeded in repelling yet another Russian invasion and incidentally defended Europe against a fresh attack on the part of Russian imperialism.

This imperialism persists to this day. Whichever the system that prevails in Russia, the prime task of Russian policy is expansion in every direction. It is only the pretext applied in justification of this imperialism which undergoes change. The successive pretexts were the collection of alleged Russian lands, the dissemination of the Russian Orthodox faith, and the unification of the Slavs under Russian rule. The current pretext is the defence of the working masses by the introduction of the Communist system.

But Russia always conducts a cautious policy in order to run the least risk of losses. At present, she is content to stir up conflicts wherever they can harm the democratic countries and the United States in particular as the only country powerful enough to wage war against Russia with a great likelihood of victory.

The war in Vietnam drags on only because the Viet Cong is armed by Russia and kept supplied with ammunition by her. It is clear that Russia's ultimate object is to extend the Communist system and her influences as far as possible to the south, including Australia.

Russia conducts a similar policy in Europe. She has succeeded in subjecting to her influences nine formerly free countries with an aggregate population of a hundred million souls. Unfortunately, Poland is one of these countries.

In this tragic state of affairs, it is some consolation that the people of Poland have submitted neither to Communization nor to Russification. On the contrary, the attitude of the Polish nation in the homeland towards Russia is the same as during the Tsarist occupation, and the Poles live in the hope that a time must come when the world realizes that lasting peace can arise only on the basis of freedom and justice—never on that of force and imperialism.

Hence, those Poles fortunate enough to enjoy the hospitality of countries with a genuine democratic structure should make it their prime task to propagate the truth that a hundred million Europeans are being gravely wronged and that this wrong indirectly affects the nations of all democratic countries obliged to live in constant uncertainty whether Russian imperialism will bring about more wars over and above those now waged in Vietnam, the Middle East and, on a smaller scale, in many other parts of the world.

Apart from wishes for personal happiness, we must wish one another that the present state of affairs end as soon as possible and that the ideals of freedom and justice will prevail in relations between countries; we must labour for the attainment of these ideals and entreat the Almighty that this come to be.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that there are many areas of the world, like Poland, where the cause of liberty has yet to prevail and that we must not relax our vigilance or abandon our struggle until that cause has prevailed and freedom is restored to all captive nations of communism. I join President Zaleski in

the hope that the present state of affairs end as soon as possible and that the ideals of freedom and justice will prevail in relations between countries.

SPECULATION OVER DEVELOPMENTS IN GREECE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since Congress adjourned on December 15 a great deal of speculation has taken place over the developments in Greece. One basic fact that has emerged is the lack of opposition within the country to the Greek Government. I insert into the RECORD as a continuation of my remarks three interesting independent logical editorial commentaries, which I believe effectively interpret the Greek situation: [A guest editorial from the National Review]

COUP-COUP

If ever there was racialism, it is in the liberal insistence that excuses must be made for black nations on the implied ground that they have only just come down from the trees. When the colonels in Ghana or Nigeria throw corrupt and incompetent politicians into jail, moderate men of good will start talking with cautious approval of the need to clean the Augean stables and such. When the Greek military do the same, liberals get all hoity-toity about the fascist betrayal of the nation that bequeathed democracy to the world [disregarding the racist slave-state that was Periclean Athens and also the fact that the present lot are mostly Albanians].

If recent Greek democracy was so hot, why does Karamanlis, universally agreed to be the best Greek P. M. since the war, hang out in Paris? Barry Goldwater doesn't live in Buenos Aires. Above all, why did the people not rise to support Constantine's counter-coup? The king failed not for lack of planning but for lack of willing martyrs for the constitutional monarchy. Of course, the junta shows the hamfisted censorship typical of military men confronted with the printed word. The detention of some comparatively reputable people was bad, but has now been much alleviated. The junta is going thru the respectable motions of working out a constitution and holding a referendum thereon. And there is nothing wrong with their aims of cutting down red tape and corruption in government, the Papadopoulos' specifics seem to be confined to headmasterly pep talks about improving the moral tone.

The truth is that the junta is no worse than the regimes—civil or military—of most politically underdeveloped countries. It is a great deal better for Greece and the west than either a communist regime or a civil war. The wish to see Greece governed by something a little classier is not confined to liberals. But political realities in Greece, as elsewhere, tend to lack that Periclean purity.

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News, Dec. 27, 1967]

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL COMMENTS: CONSTANTINE FAILED BECAUSE PEOPLE WEREN'T INTERESTED

WASHINGTON.—King Constantine's bid to overthrow the military government apparently failed because the Greek people simply weren't interested.

Despite the fact that the Athens regime

has been the whipping boy of self-declared "defenders of democracy" throughout the West, the Greeks themselves seem reasonably satisfied. The military regime has imposed some harsh restrictions and has made some foolish mistakes, but the mood I found in Athens last summer apparently persists. There is stability; there is a promise of political reforms. The Greeks are willing to give the colonels a chance.

Obviously the king must have believed he might succeed otherwise he would not have risked his throne, the future of the dynasty and accepted the responsibility for a possible civil war.

Yet his call to arms was virtually ignored. Some say Constantine and his advisers over-estimated his popularity. Maybe.

It's more likely that they underestimated the faith of the people in this government, or perhaps more accurately—the lack of faith in any return to the parliamentary rule before sweeping constitutional reforms are enacted.

The Greeks are volatile people. It's not conceivable that the government could have scored such a rapid, bloodless and definitive success unless it had the support of the majority. There were no uprisings or skirmishes. Even in the small hamlets and villages where royalty is still held in awe, the king's appeal fell on deaf ears.

Americans, for good reasons, recoil from any kind of dictatorship. In a land with our traditions of free elections and parliamentary government, blessed with educated balanced leadership, it is hard to imagine any need for "strong man" rule.

In South Vietnam, in the midst of war and guerrilla terror, we have pushed the South Vietnamese to the polls five times in the last two years, often at the risk of their lives, to create at least the framework of parliamentary democracy.

But what if such a framework becomes eroded?

Even in politically mature and sophisticated France, democratic processes have been sidetracked for a generation.

And they failed in Greece, not because democracy won't work, but because rival political forces placed ambition ahead of responsibility.

For four years before the April coup, governments in Athens were toppled at the tip of a hat. Corruption was rampant and the Communists were feeding on the growing public disillusionment.

The people had the jitters when I visited Greece in 1966. They remembered the 5-year fight against Communist guerrillas. They did not want another similar experience.

Former Premier Constantin Caramanlis, who went into voluntary exile in 1963, recently cited two causes for the military takeover:

1. Ambitious officers.
2. Bankruptcy of democracy.

"No one can overthrow a healthy regime," he said. "Tyranny is the inescapable consequence of the degeneration of democracy."

"In Greece, democracy was stabbed under a free system, and the colonels only gave it the coup de grace."

Democracy cannot live in Greece without deep reforms, he said.

As prime minister in 1963, he presented parliament a draft for a new constitution. The opposing political parties combined to defeat it.

Caramanlis warned early this month that the overthrow of the military government would not solve anything if it meant only a return to the same political sins.

"This would bring Greece from one anomaly to another," he said.

Apparently the Greek people agreed.

The military government is preparing a new constitution. It is said to contain sweeping reforms. The officers have also promised to restore parliamentary democracy.

These colonels and generals are tough men, but Greece apparently needs strong medicine. The United States may still be able to play a key role in encouraging these leaders to rebuild democracy in the land where it was born.

For eight months Washington has dragged its feet. Time was lost, but it's still not too late. War over Cyprus was avoided because Washington could talk to Athens. NATO was saved.

Now it's time to save Greece.

[From the Hearst newspapers, Dec. 17, 1967]

ROYAL MISTAKE IN GREECE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The dramatic political showdown in Greece this week pretty well substantiates what I felt after visiting there only last month with other members of the Hearst Task Force.

My conclusion then was that the military junta which seized control of the Greek government last April 21 was no bunch of wild-eyed, power-hungry revolutionaries, that they were neither in the musical comedy tradition—nor the Fascist mold.

Instead, the men we met seemed to be sound, capable, sincere people whose motivation simply was to establish an anti-Communist stability to their long-troubled country.

In less than eight months, despite some early and mostly silly mistakes, the junta appeared to have the domestic situation well in hand. They now have proven their grasp by the quick effectiveness with which they nipped the counter revolution attempted by King Constantine. And they proved their generosity by opening the door for Constantine's return from self-imposed exile.

It is important to note that the King's power grab represented no general public uprising and even lacked the military support in depth he counted on. What he did was the act of a somewhat naive, misguided young man who apparently did not know when he was well off.

Throughout their tenure, the junta members had treated the King with the utmost solicitude. They had attempted in all reasonable ways to enlist his full support for their regime and its aims. Constantine's picture, I recall, hung in a place of honor in each of their offices.

Despite all their efforts, despite the fact that they had restored comparative law and order to a land earlier threatened with imminent civil war, the King chose deliberately to reopen that bloody threat.

The irony is that his own planned takeover by military force was done in the name of democracy and because he said he feared what he called a totalitarian regime. It is ironic because the ultimate aim of the junta is precisely to make possible the establishment of a Greek democracy strong enough to survive the looming menace of Communist totalitarianism.

Now I know there are many people who will assail me for my defense of the junta as opposed to a handsome and idealistic young King. But the political problem in Greece is not simple black and white. Nor is it a case of Fascism vs. Communism or Fascism vs. Democracy.

The basic problem is that if a working, new, anti-Communist democracy is to come to the land which gave birth to the name, it will have to come through the efforts of men who are not impractical visionaries but men who understand highly sophisticated political realities.

The fact that the junta seized power in the way it did last April is naturally upsetting to all lovers of democratic practices as we know them. And there is a special horror involved in such takeovers, so far as most of our so-called liberals are concerned, when the takeover is done by men in military uniforms.

But such men can be patriots too, and sometimes they have to take radical measures to meet radical challenges. This is what the junta headed by Col. George Papadopoulos and Brig. Gen. Stylianos Patakos did, as they explained to me in Greece last month. They convinced me they acted to preserve the elements of democracy which were in dire danger of extinction in their homeland.

And their case was based on facts. Just before their April coup d'etat, Greece was split into two major and violently opposing factions—the conservative National Radical Union and the leftist Center Union. A special election had been ordered for May, but no matter who won, civil strife would have been inevitable and the chances for democracy ruined.

I am satisfied that this is utterly true. The same thing was told to members of the Task Force and myself on our recent world tour by diplomats, businessmen and informed leaders wherever we went. Victory for either party in the Greek elections would have meant a bloodbath for the whole country.

Thus the takeover by the junta came just in time to prevent a national tragedy. It was itself mercifully without bloodshed. And it gave Greece a far better government than it could have gotten in any other immediately practical way.

Like most other Americans, I'd like to see the famous "cradle of democracy" get full constitutional guarantees tomorrow. But the first order of business is to establish social order and public confidence. When this has been more fully accomplished, the junta promises, normal democratic processes will be restored—and I believe it.

King Constantine, by his incredibly bungling act, merely rocked a boat which was and is sailing at last toward a long-sought safe harbor. It is another big credit to the junta and its own stability that it was able to stop him, and able to do so without the tragedy of large scale fighting.

I shudder to think what might have happened if the King had succeeded. After the inevitable bloodshed, the extreme right-wing military group whose leaders are notoriously corrupt would have been in charge. Such a group, in turn, would have greatly strengthened public support for the group's natural enemies—the Communists. Neither stability nor democracy would have a chance.

The result of a victory for the King, in a word, would have been a return to the country's former political chaos. And chaos it sure has been, for many years. I recall a businessman in Greece telling me that in the last 50 years he has lived through a total of 19 revolutions or coups d'etat there.

So modern Greece is still far from a politically mature society. Furthermore it bears no similarity to the society of free men who coined the word democracy over 2,000 years ago. Nor does democracy to the people of today's Greece necessarily mean all we would like it to mean.

The important thing is that the majority of the people in that country seem satisfied that the junta is moving in the right direction.

We think it is, too.

Its members have and will make mistakes, but I doubt they ever will make so serious and potentially disastrous a mistake as that of King Constantine.

Meanwhile these men have not yet had time to prove themselves fully.

They must be given that chance, both in fairness and out of consideration of the alternative.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department has acted with proper restraint in its reaction to the situation in Greece in that it has not been stamped in supporting the international denunciation of the Greek Government. It is my hope that

the Department will logically cooperate with the Government of Greece, a faithful NATO ally. We must recognize that the Greek Government does have the substantial support of the Greek people and that it is not a threat to world peace. Its strategic location in the Mediterranean is of tremendous value to the free world. Since much will continue to be said over the situation in Greece, Mr. Speaker, I will do all I can to direct the attention of the Members to the conditions as they actually exist.

THE WYOMING STATE TRIBUNE LOOKS AT THE DRAFT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the recent controversy concerning the reclassification of certain draft-age people drew comment recently from the perceptive editor of the Cheyenne Wyoming State Tribune, in Cheyenne, Wyo.

Writing in the December 28, 1967, issue, Editor James M. Flinchum notes that the draft deferment "is not a constitutional right but an administrative grant of authority" made under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

Mr. Flinchum writes that deferments are sometimes granted in the national interest but "this is a legal prerogative that accrues to the draft board, not to the student." He contends that in the controversy over cancellation of deferments, "General Hershey continues to be right and his detractors, including some of the national news media who have stooped to unbelievable calumnies against this dedicated public servant, continue to be wrong."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial to which I have alluded to be printed with my comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a contribution to the responsible discussion of this issue:

MERE ADMINISTRATIVE GRACE

One of the chief points overlooked in the selective service controversy over cancellation of deferments is that before a deferment is granted for whatever cause, all men eligible for military service through the draft are equals.

Section 1(c) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 says: "The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the armed forces and the reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy."

Thus all men who are eligible for service are obligated to serve two years in the armed forces of the nation and are classified I-A (available for service) unless temporarily deferred by a local selective service board, not to exceed one year at a time, for reasons of the national interest as determined by the selective service system including the local boards.

This deferment is not a constitutional right but an administrative grant of authority made under the law. The basic intent of the selective service act is to provide men for

military service, not to defer them; the latter is merely an optional facet to the principal purpose of the draft.

Assume that we have two selective service registrants, one a student and the other a non-student. The law states that both have equal obligations to serve for two years in the military. The student has no constitutional rights to evade that service or the equivalent thereof; however he may be deferred from such service in the national interest. But this is a legal prerogative that accrues to the draft board, not to the student.

Section 6(k) of the selective service law reads: "No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from training and service, under this title, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist."

The non-student is drafted; the student is exempted, by the board, which considers that his studies are in the national interest because he is a fulltime college student and is doing satisfactory work.

Let us suppose, however, that the college student takes part in activities that include blocking passageways of public buildings on his own campus, as a means of demonstrating against the war or for any similar purpose.

The same draft board which has the authority to grant him a deferment, based on the national interest, has the similar authority to re-classify this individual if it sees fit to do so, by ordering his immediate induction into the armed services because in its judgment his deferment no longer is in the national interest.

The matter of classification is extended to the draft board, not to the courts. Those who argue that the administrative authority extended to the draft system to re-classify and order the induction of any particular selective service registrant because he has not been granted due process, ignores this basic point.

Selective service is not a part of the judicial system of this country; it does not decide rights or wrongs, it does not adjudicate disputes. It proceeds from administrative authority to induct men into the military service, with the added power to make deferments if it sees fit, in the national interest. When it no longer considers that the national interest is being served by a particular registrant's deferment, then it has similar authority to induct him.

Only when it is considered that a registrant may have violated the law by refusing or failing to report for induction as the law provides, does the action shift to the courts, but again with the initiative resting with the selective service system, which may report such an individual to a United States attorney for prosecution under the law for violation thereof.

Those who contend that General Hershey, the national selective service director, is proceeding illegally because he does not grant due process to those who may be re-classified for acts that may be considered against the national interest, ignore this distinction.

No personal right of a draftee is involved, because he is the recipient merely of administrative grace that is extended to him by an agency of the government because in its consideration, it would serve the national interest to so act—not because any particular privilege accrues to the individual because of his draft deferment.

General Hershey continues to be right, and his detractors including some of the national news media who have stooped to unbelievable calumnies against his dedicated public servant, continue to be wrong.

A PLAN TO ENCOURAGE EUROPEAN TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO RESTRICTIONS ON U.S. TRAVEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wis-

consin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today H.R. 14607, a bill to encourage a sharp increase in European tourism in the United States as an alternative to proposed restrictions on American travel outside the Western Hemisphere.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make available to Europeans visiting the United States for the first time travel incentive stamps in a substantial amount, probably around \$100, valid for payments to U.S. airlines, railroads, buslines, car rental companies, and hotels and motels.

Since the stamps would represent a substantial part of the average expenditure by European tourists here—around \$500—they could attract at least an additional 500,000 visitors from Europe in 1968. With some 40 million Western Europeans sufficiently affluent to make travel plans each year, it is ludicrous that America the beautiful currently attracts only 600,000 to 700,000 European travelers a year. Moreover, a large percentage of these present European visitors stay with relatives when here, and thus, welcome though they are, do not contribute very much to our balance of payments.

THE STAGE IS SET

A travel-stamp plan, properly and promptly promoted and advertised, should have every chance of success. The U.S. Travel Service, set up in 1961, is now a going institution, ready to capitalize on a travel-stamp plan. It has established large and successful offices in the key places of Western Europe—London, Paris, Rome, Frankfurt, Amsterdam, and Stockholm. It has successfully promoted package tours to the United States; the "visit U.S. homes" and the "visit U.S. industries" programs; and a whole series of materials and services designed to help the European visitor to the United States have a pleasant stay.

As the President has said, 1968 is the year in which we must achieve dramatic improvement in our balance of payments. Improving our tourism account offers the quickest and easiest path. But in order to have an impact on the upcoming 1968 travel season, the proposed program needs to be started now and carried out vigorously.

The proposal contained in H.R. 14607 provides an expansionist and constructive way of improving our balance of payments, as opposed to the proposed restrictionist head tax on American travelers outside the Western Hemisphere. Provision of incentives for Europeans to visit the United States could yield at least as much improvement in our balance of payments as the head tax on Americans.

THE ASTA LETTER

The American travel industry—transportation, hotels, and other travel-oriented businesses—meeting under the sponsorship of the American Society of Travel Agents in New York on Tuesday, January 9, endorsed the travel-incentive-stamp proposal, and has recommended its adoption to the administration.

I include at this point the text of ASTA's January 10 letter of recommendations to Ambassador Robert M.

McKinney, Chairman of the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Tourism:

AMERICAN SOCIETY
OF TRAVEL AGENTS, INC.,
January 10, 1968.

Ambassador ROBERT M. MCKINNEY,
Chairman, Industry-Government Special
Task Force on Tourism, U.S. Treasury
Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR AMBASSADOR MCKINNEY: The American Society of Travel Agents, Inc. (ASTA) is very pleased to have the opportunity to respond to your invitation to suggest constructive steps for increasing travel and tourism to and within the United States, as an alternative to restrictions on the right of U.S. citizens to travel freely abroad. It is ASTA's view that some of the suggestions which are included in this letter will provide the basis for initiating a more vigorous program by the industry of travel and tourism, thus substantially reducing the so-called "travel gap" portion of our nation's balance of payments deficit.

The recommendations which we submit herewith are based upon an industry-wide conference at which I presided, held in New York City on Tuesday, January 9, 1968, which included officials of air carriers, steamship lines, hotels, tour operators, travel agents and the travel press, among others, all United States corporations.

The meeting was called to seek practical solutions through which we could assist the Administration in correcting the existing travel deficit without resorting to restrictive discriminatory or punitive measures.

On the basis of the meeting convened by ASTA on January 9, 1968, and other discussions held by ASTA officials, we would like to outline the following specific proposals as effective measures to accomplish our common objective:

1. In order to provide a more effective promotional campaign to induce overseas visitors to the United States, the industry representatives unanimously urged that sufficient funds be appropriated to enable the U.S. Travel Service to function productively. The present appropriation of \$3,000,000 is altogether inadequate in relation to the job that is urgently needed to be done and the amount appropriated by other countries in promoting travel and tourism from the United States.

2. We urge that the airlines and the International Air Transport Association together with the proper government agencies establish a substantially expanded concept of reduced directional fares which will encourage overseas travel to the United States.

3. We strongly urged that the Administration and the Congress give prompt and positive consideration to the proposal of Congressman Henry Reuss to establish a system of incentive travel stamps to reduce the cost of visits to the United States from our friends overseas and to encourage such visits through the cooperation of the Federal Government and the travel industry. This proposal which was initially made to your committee by a memorandum of December 22, 1967, has been refined somewhat to assure that it is designed to attract first-time visitors to the United States and that it obtains the necessary government/private cooperation to make the program feasible and successful. We urge that this proposal, if proved administratively feasible, be adopted and implemented.

4. The industry conference urgently recommends that the U.S. government explore and establish machinery to assure the utilization of its counterpart fund reserves, now exceeding \$3 billion so that such inert funds may be converted for use by travelers, tourists and industry to offset the dollar outflow. In order to become most effective in conserving dollars, we recommend that a method be established so that these counterpart funds may be exchanged for the purpose of

their conversion to the currency of other countries.

5. The industry pledges its support, and, where necessary, solicits the cooperation of government to bring about a greatly intensified program of familiarization trips to the United States by foreign travel agents who are the prime generators of travel and tourism.

In addition to the foregoing recommendations which were agreed upon by the participants in the conference, ASTA advised those present that it was undertaking the following programs in order to promote travel to and within the United States:

1. Mobilization of its more than 800 overseas travel agency members in a concerted campaign to promote travel to the United States from their countries.

2. Utilization of the travel-generating energy of the thousands of overseas travel agencies represented in the Universal Federation of Travel Agents Association of which ASTA is a founding member to promote travel to the United States.

3. Implementation of a program enlisting the assistance of many foreign-born United States travel agents in cooperation with carriers and the U.S. Travel Service in creating enthusiasm for Visit U.S.A. ASTA will urge that their frequent visits to their homelands be used for the purpose of addressing travel industry meetings and seminars in order to promote interest in travel to the United States.

4. Since the lack of adequate reception facilities in the United States has constituted a deterrent to foreign visitors and caused adverse comments and retarded the flow of tourist traffic, ASTA, through its local chapters will recruit foreign language students to provide interpreting services for non-group visitors to the United States on a voluntary basis.

5. The Interstate Commerce Commission should be urged to review its current procedures for processing applications for motor bus broker authority by U.S. travel agents and efforts should be made promptly to evaluate and, where appropriate, grant such operating authority thus filling an existing demand for domestic motor bus tours.

6. Prompt consideration should be given to extending tax incentives for U.S. tour promoters to invest additional funds in the development and promotion of tour programs designed to encourage European and other foreigners to travel to the United States.

7. ASTA specifically directs the attention of your committee and the Administration to the fact that it has long pointed to the disparity between the earning incentives which travel agents are offered to sell international travel and those in effect domestically. As a result of an unrealistic schedule of commissions for travel within the United States, travel agencies have been under a disability which makes promotion of domestic tourism unprofitable. Indeed, many travel agencies are required to subsidize their sale of domestic tourism from their earnings on international sales. If travel agency earnings on domestic travel were at least to equal the incentives on international travel, a tremendous sales pool of some 6,000 travel agencies generating and influencing over \$3 billion per year of tourist expenditures would automatically be focused upon greater promotion of domestic tourism.

8. The domestic airlines and the Air Traffic Conference should relax and up-date the requirements which must be met to qualify domestic air tours which are sold through travel agents.

In addition to the foregoing proposals, there are other constructive suggestions which we believe could evolve from further discussions between ASTA and others in the travel and tourism industry and your committee. ASTA pledges its support to all efforts by the government and private industry promptly to undertake programs designed

to stimulate tourism to and within the United States thus making it unnecessary to adopt restrictive proposals to inhibit the right of U.S. citizens to travel abroad.

We will be happy to discuss in detail the above proposals as well as all other aspects of this program which is of such major importance to our industry and our country.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. WEST,
Vice President.

HOW THE PLAN WOULD WORK

Under the proposal, the cost of the \$100 worth of travel stamps—or whatever exact amount was agreed on—would be shared 50-50 by the U.S. Government and the American travel industry. A European visitor would use his travel stamps to help defray his transportation and hotel bills, and the participating U.S. business would then turn in its stamps to the U.S. Treasury for up to a 50-percent recoupment.

There already are numerous U.S. travel concessions: the \$99 unlimited travel in the United States for 30 days and \$165 for 90 days, now offered by Greyhound Corp. and Trans-Continental Bus systems; the 21 days for \$150 now offered by most of the country's feeder airlines; the \$95 for 7 days' unlimited car rental, with a tank of gas, of Avis and National Car Rental; the 15-percent international discount of numerous passenger railroads; and various discounts offered by hotel-motel chains. I would anticipate that these carriers, hotels and motels, would be quite eager to participate in a 50-50 tourist stamp program, since their additional business would come over their break-even point and would represent little additional cost to them—the planes would fly anyway, the rental cars are sitting in the garage, the motel room lies empty. They should be encouraged, in addition, to continue their present concessions, in order to get more than their share of the overall new business that is attracted by the \$100 travel incentive stamp.

With industry ready to bear its share, I would hope that the U.S. Government at the highest level would quickly shift gears and substitute the tourist incentive stamp program for the head tax proposal. The Europeans, official and unofficial, I have talked to would unanimously applaud such a change of policy.

THE PLAN'S ADVANTAGES

Here are some advantages of the tourist incentive stamp proposal:

First. It would improve our balance of payments by at least \$250 million—500,000 additional European tourists to the United States, with an average expenditure of \$500. This would help our balance of payments at least as much as would the difficult-to-administer head tax on Americans. To achieve the balance-of-payments savings from the head tax envisaged by the administration, would require eliminating one-half to two-thirds of U.S. travel to Europe.

Second. It would not violate the traditional American principle of freedom of travel. As President Johnson said, in noting 1967 as International Travel Year:

I urge that we rededicate ourselves to the importance of promoting international good will through travel.

The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized the inherent right of freedom of travel. In a 1958 decision it said:

Freedom of movement across frontiers in either direction, and inside frontiers as well, was a part of our heritage. Travel abroad may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic in our scheme of values.

The purpose of H.R. 14607 is to improve our balance of payments by expanding world travel, rather than by restricting it.

Third. It would avoid risking retaliation and ill will by Europeans. As Morris D. Rosenberg pointed out in his article "Is Freedom of Travel a Taxing Proposition" in the Sunday, January 7, 1968, Washington Post, a head tax or other drastic U.S. restriction on U.S. tourism to Europe is likely to bring about retaliation by European governments and private persons which could cause us to lose even the little benefit for our balance of payments which we now get from European tourism to the United States currently running at 600,000 to 700,000 visitors annually. The proposed tourist incentive stamp envisaged in the bill could not possibly be offensive to Europeans. It violates no commitments in the GATT, or anywhere else. Indeed, it closely resembles the "Eurail Pass" by which European countries grant substantial rail discounts on their government-owned railroads to Western Hemisphere tourists to Europe.

Fourth. It would place no net burden on the Federal budget. The initial U.S. budgetary cost of the proposal would be around \$40 million—\$25 million for the 500,000 additional tourists to be attracted by the travel stamps, and approximately \$15 million for those 300,000 first-time visitors to the United States among the Europeans who, based on past trends, would have visited the United States in 1968 in any event. But the net U.S. budgetary cost will be zero, because the \$250 million to be spent here by the additional European tourists, with the normal multiplier factor, will cause an increase of some \$750 million in our gross national product. The \$75 million of increased revenues from this enlarged GNP would more than offset the roughly \$40 million cost of the subsidy.

The idea of domestic budgetary expenditures to improve our balance of payments has ample precedent. We have been spending \$3 million a year, for example, on the U.S. travel service. Our Export-Import Bank is another example. Still another is the controversial supersonic transport plane, for which we are currently spending several billions domestically in the hope it will have a balance-of-payments payoff after 1975. The President on January 1, 1968, called for spending \$200 million to promote U.S. exports in the future. The advantage of the proposed travel incentive stamp is that its payoff is immediate, and in a year when the eyes of the financial world are on us.

Fifth. It would improve business and reduce hard-core joblessness, without

causing inflationary pressures. The \$250-million infusion of European travel spending into the American economy will fall, not upon overtaxed U.S. resources, but upon the transportation, hotel, and restaurant industry, all of which presently have much underused capacity. Indeed, the proposal would provide jobs, particularly in transportation, hotels and restaurants, for unskilled and semi-skilled workers who are now the most difficult part of our unemployed manpower problem.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 14607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121-2126) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed promptly to institute a program, designed to achieve an immediate improvement in the United States balance of payments, to induce more travel by residents of Europe to the United States by securing agreements from such United States travel-oriented businesses as airlines, railroads, bus lines, car rental companies, and hotels-motels, to participate in a joint government-private tourist incentive travel stamp program under which European residents visiting the United States for the first time will be issued travel stamps which may be used by them to purchase services from any of such participating businesses. Participating businesses may have travel stamps which are issued and used under the program redeemed, as provided in this section, by the Treasury of the United States.

"(b) Businesses participating in the travel stamp program under this section shall accept travel stamps at their face value in payment for services rendered.

"(c) The Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate for the effective and efficient administration of this section, including regulations which shall specify—

"(1) the design of travel stamps and the cash denominations in which issued,

"(2) the number and total cash value of stamps which may be issued to each European resident applying for such stamps,

"(3) the percent amount of the face value of each stamp, not to exceed 50 percent, at which such stamps accepted by participating businesses will be redeemed by the Treasury of the United States and, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, any requirements with respect to the redemption of such stamps that are considered to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States,

"(4) requirements for participation in the program by United States travel-oriented businesses, including those services which are covered, and

"(5) that, as a condition of participating in the program, a business may not accept travel stamps from a visiting European resident in payment for more than 20 percent of the price charged for the services rendered by such business to such resident.

"(d) The Secretary shall, with the cooperation of the Secretary of State, take such steps as are necessary to clear the operation of the travel stamp program with the foreign governments affected. The Secretary of State shall make the facilities and services of the Department of State in Europe available for use in administering the program.

"(e) The Secretary shall promote, advertise, and administer the travel incentive program so as to achieve maximum immediate impact with particular reference to the beginning of the 1968 travel season in May 1968."

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the International Travel Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "except for the provisions of section 8 thereof," immediately after "Act,"

SEC. 4. This Act may be cited as the "Travel Incentive Act of 1968".

THE COPPER STRIKE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in Montana and in the mining States of the West, in the copper fabricating centers of the Middle West and the eastern seaboard, more than 50,000 families are in terrible economic distress by reason of the copper strike that has continued for more than 6 months. The situation is a total collapse of collective bargaining.

As I view it, the copper companies absolutely insist that there will only be collective bargaining on a local basis. For instance, the Anaconda Co. will bargain only at the local level of Butte, Anaconda, and Great Falls cities, and then separately for other communities involved with the company.

On the other hand, the United Steel Workers insist that they will only bargain with the Anaconda Co. on a companywide basis.

Thus there is a tremendous impasse.

Mr. Speaker, children are going without shoes or clothing of sufficient protection against the extreme weather of the copper mining regions. Even Arizona, as well as Montana and Michigan, the Middle West fabricators, and the eastern seaboard, are seeing families of the copper industry in want.

Mr. Speaker, today I wrote a letter to the President and I emphasized some other factors in addition to the tremendous human factor.

I told the President that importation of copper which is resulting from this dispute is contributing to our balance-of-payments deficit of more than \$1 billion a year. In 1965 refined copper was imported at a rate of 2,500 tons a week. Last month imports had risen to 15,000 tons a week. This amounts to a drain of \$20,000,000 each week on our Nation's economy.

I have reported to the President frequently in recent weeks on the sharp rise in copper imports which is damaging to workers and domestic industry.

I told him that I hoped that action will be taken to halt the tremendous volume of copper imports now flooding the Nation.

I urged the President that the prestige of the office of the Presidency be implemented—by appointing at least four boards of inquiry with instructions to encourage negotiations and report to his office on the strike's status and the possibility and methods of settlement. I advised the President that there should be

at least four boards of inquiry, one for each companywide problem. I believe the unions are asking for companywide bargaining rather than industrywide bargaining. I think everyone would be benefited by a companywide inquiry into the activities of each company which is integrated from "mine to the producer." The relationship between the integrated companies and their employees is a primary problem.

Mr. Speaker, by order heretofore granted, I append to this statement, telegrams and communications received only today from Montana on this vital subject:

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 13, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.

Situation going from bad to worse. Copper strike hurting all of the Nation. Please exert all efforts towards ending this strike.

A. A. LONGFELLOW,

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 13, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.

Situation going from bad to worse. Copper strike hurting all of the Nation. Please exert all efforts towards ending this strike.

J. M. THOMPSON, Jr.,

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 13, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.

Save Montana from financial crisis. Use your influence for equitable copper strike agreement.

JOSEPH TUFFNER.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 13, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.

Save Montana from financial crisis. Use your influence for equitable copper strike agreement.

VERNON DIRE.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT., January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Is the Great Society working to eliminate poverty when thousands of people are unemployed and a nationwide copper strike is allowed to last indefinitely without any actions from Washington? Please do all in your power to correct this situation. People are leaving Montana and seeking jobs elsewhere. Many of those remaining are hungry and ill clothed.

HARRINGTON'S CAFE,
BILL HARRINGTON.

BUTTE, MONT., January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please help save Butte, Anaconda and Great Falls by doing all possible for copper strike settlement.

CHARLES G. MCCARTHY.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT., January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Save Montana from financial crisis. Use your influence for equitable copper strike agreement.

MRS. EDWARD MASSEY.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT., January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please help save Butte, Anaconda and Great Falls by doing all possible for copper strike settlement.

ROBERT KING.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT., January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Each day of copper strike hurts Montana irreparably. This situation needs your immediate attention for the sake of all Montanans. Settlement must be fair and rapid.

EDWARD SMITH.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT., January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Each day of copper strike hurts Montana irreparably. This situation needs your immediate attention for the sake of all Montanans. Settlement must be fair and rapid.

S. M. FITZGERALD.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Is the Great Society working to eliminate poverty when thousands of people are unemployed and a nationwide copper strike is allowed to last indefinitely without any action from Washington?

Please do all in your power to correct this situation. People are leaving Montana and seeking jobs elsewhere. Many of those remaining are hungry and ill clothed.

U. & I. CLUB,
ED HORGAN.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Is the Great Society working to eliminate poverty when thousands of people are unemployed and a nationwide copper strike is allowed to last indefinitely without any actions from Washington? Please do all in your power to correct this situation. People are leaving Montana and seeking jobs elsewhere. Many of those remaining are hungry and ill clothed.

HUNTERS NOVELTY SHOP,
CHARLOTTE KILROY.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 12, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Situation going from bad to worse. Copper strike hurting all of the Nation. Please exert all efforts towards ending this strike.

WILLIAM J. BEAUSOLEIL.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 13, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Each day of copper strike hurts Montana irreparably. This situation needs your immediate attention for the sake of all Montanans. Settlement must be fair and rapid.

M. JACOBSON.

ANACONDA, MONT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of my forty five employees and myself I wish to urge the immediate settlement of the copper strike.

Sincerely,

GREGORY SALLESE,
Manager, Albertsons Food Center.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 12, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do everything in your power towards settlement of copper strike.

GOLES GROCERY,
JOHN GOLES.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 12, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Why don't you stop playing politics with big business and unions and play a little politics for the people who had faith in you and put you in office. Don't tell us that your hands are tied because we are tired of hearing that. We also feel that the Taft-Hartley is a change so why not make use of it before we all go broke and have to sell big business.

MARANS GROCERY,
FRANCES J. MARAN.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strike of this duration is disastrous to business all over State. Will force many of us out of business. Please do something.

ELLIS OFFICE SUPPLY,
ELLIS CUNLIFFE.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts to get copper strike in Montana settled would be a big help to all concerned.

PAY N TAKE IT MARKET,
WILLIAM PECK.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts to get copper strike in Montana settled would be a big help to all concerned.

THE BOARD OF TRADE,
JACK CORCORAN,
CHARLES BUGNI.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Rep. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Everyone in Butte is feeling ill effects from the strike. We at the main public market urge you to use any and all facilities available through your office for immediate action towards settlements.

JOHN A. ORIZOTTI,
DAN PIAZZOLA.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

All of Montana suffering from copper strike. Don't let Montana go down the drain.

ADOLPH BUGNI SHANTY BAR.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please use your influence immediately for just and fair rapid settlement of copper strike. Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls are poverty stricken and going bankrupt. U.S. balance of payment all out go for copper.

JIM DES ROSIER PRESCRIPTION
PHARMACY.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Building, Washington, D.C.:
All of Montana suffering from copper strike.
Don't let Montana go down the drain.
DELUXE BAR,
TONY TUBORC.
STEVE KASUN.

BUTTE, MONT.,
January 11, 1968.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do all in your power to bring about negotiations in our copper strike. All Montana is affected but Butte and its people are in trouble. Businesses are being forced to close. Thank you.

CIVIC CENTER GROCERY,
GLADYS GILNETT.

GREAT FALLS PAPER CO.,
Great Falls, Mont., January 9, 1968.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,

HON. LEE METCALF,

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN,

Washington, D.C.

Good morning Montana Congressional delegation.

Returning Saturday morning, January 6th, with Governor Tim Babcock from Edmonton . . . we sat facing each other and among other things discussed what the Governor might do or could do to help bring to the bargaining tables all parties concerned. . . . We the innocent bystanders are not directly involved in this strike . . . such as our own company . . . who are feeling the effects of this prolonged, disastrous strike. Enclosed a marked copy of an open letter by Jack Newman, president, Louis S. Cohn Co., Butte, that speaks for itself. . . . Perhaps this may aid your thinking as we are fully aware that you realize the depth of this problem.

Let's get to the secret ballot box.

Sincerely,

JIM FLAHERTY.

An open letter to: The Montana Joint Bargaining Committee, the Anaconda Co., the American Smelting & Refining Co., the Montana congressional delegation.

We are caught in the middle!

We see human suffering in the affluent society.

We see the balance of payments problem further complicated by domestic purchases of foreign copper.

We see a fiscal crisis in the state of Montana's future that will affect every community in the State.

We see home property values dropping.

We see our customers sustaining operating losses.

We see multi-million dollar investments made by our customers, large and small, depreciating.

Collective bargaining is not taking place!

The public interest is not being looked after!

We urge use of such legislation as exists to implement arbitration or emergency enactment of new legislation designed to avoid industry-labor impasses of this duration.

We make this urgent appeal on behalf of our 2000 retail customers in Montana and for all Montana retailers caught in this squeeze.

LOUIS S. COHN Co.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1968.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the copper strike is now in its seventh month and there does not appear to be any sign of a settlement.

I believe the most serious consideration at the present time is the devastating effect this dispute is having on some 50,000 copper families now feeling the impact of this labor dispute. The recent cold wave did much to dramatize the severity of the current situation. As you know, Mr. President, every state affected by the strike has been plagued by a sub-zero cold-wave in the last few weeks. My state of Montana has been particularly hard-hit.

I have learned of instances where children were forced to remain out of school because their families were unable to afford heavy clothing to protect against the intense cold weather.

The human factor is the most important aspect of this situation, Mr. President, but there are other factors which cry out for an early solution—all of them of national concern.

I'm certain you are aware of the harm the current strike is having on our balance of payments deficit. Importation of copper which results from the strike contributes to the balance of payments deficits by more than a billion dollars a year. In 1965, refined copper was imported at a rate of 2,500 tons a week. Last month imports had risen to 15,000 tons a week and this amounts to a drain of \$20 million a week on our nation's economy.

I respectfully urge that you use the prestige of your office to bring an end to the harmful importation of copper products for not only is it contributing to the balance of payments but it is also contributing to the length of the strike. Further, I again urge the appointment of at least four boards of inquiry with the roles of encouraging negotiations and reporting to you on the status of the strike situation.

I believe there should be at least four boards of inquiry—one for each company-wide problem. The unions are asking for company-wide bargaining, not industry-wide bargaining. Everyone would be benefited by a company-wide inquiry into the activities of each company which is integrated from the mine to the producer. The relationship between the integrated companies and their employees is a primary consideration in this dispute.

The best interest of the Nation, the industries involved and the workers and their families will be best served by an early end to this dispute. I respectfully request your assistance in seeking a solution.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD OLSEN.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE
16TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
ON THE FIRST SESSION OF THE
90TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his 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. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to report to the people of the 16th District of Michigan on my stewardship during the first session of the 90th Congress.

The record established by the 90th Congress, while not up to that of the great 89th Congress, is encouraging. Over 40 major administration proposals were approved. Unfortunately, some of these proposals were watered down and a number of the programs were insufficiently funded.

When Congress convened last January, there were 47 fewer Democrats in the House of Representatives than we had in the 89th Congress. This group had a 75-percent favorable voting record on administration proposals.

In view of this significant loss in support it is understandable that we were not able to accomplish all of our objectives.

Certainly, during 1967 the Congress demonstrated that the American people can meet their commitments both at home and abroad.

We adequately provided for our national defense and also made considerable progress in solving the many domestic problems which beset our country. I supported a majority of the budget cuts of about \$8.3 billion made by the Congress, but opposed those which cut too deeply into essential programs.

For my part, I was kept exceedingly busy by the increasingly heavy volume of my legislative duties.

I continued my service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and the Select Committee on Small Business.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I took a vigorous role in seeking a solution to the railroad labor-management impasse, thus helping to avoid the dire economic consequences of a long, nationwide railroad strike. I also took a most active part in the committee's consideration of legislation aimed at reducing air pollution, improving health care, encouraging the growth of educational broadcasting, and protecting consumers from excessive charges and unsafe merchandise.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, I succeeded in having enacted into law my bill to extend for an additional 8 years the highly important waterfowl wetlands acquisition program. Under this program, the migratory bird fund will receive advances against receipts from the sale of duck stamps to acquire wetlands to be preserved for migratory waterfowl, and for appropriate recreational use.

My subcommittee also completed work on my bill, H.R. 25, to protect and preserve the Nation's shoreline areas. I plan to bring this legislation before the House early this year and am confident it will be enacted.

As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies, I conducted extensive hearings into questionable pricing practices of some drug manufacturing firms, and on the reliability of certain industrial standards. The latter are particularly important for the protection of consumers and small businessmen from unfair standards and shoddy and unsafe materials. Additionally, I actively pressed the Federal Communications Commission to allocate sufficient radio spectrum to meet the communications needs of small businesses and afford our police forces throughout the country the communications systems they need to protect our people from riots and mob action.

I authored and introduced many pieces of meaningful legislation, a number of

which were enacted into law. Among the bills which I sponsored are the following:

H.R. 10, to amend the Clean Air Act to establish strong Federal emission standards and the means of enforcing such standards. Similar legislation enacted into law;

H.R. 25, to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty. Approved by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee;

H.R. 26, to provide medicare coverage for the cost of prescription drugs;

H.R. 480, to extend for 8 years the program for the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl. Enacted into law;

H.R. 484, 485, and 486, to control and prevent various types of pollution on navigable waters;

H.R. 487, 488, and 495, to regulate use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides;

H.R. 491, to prohibit travel or use of interstate commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance. Similar legislation passed House;

H.R. 493, to establish a national scenic rivers system. Similar legislation passed Senate;

H.R. 496, the proposed Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act;

H.R. 1983 through H.R. 1989, H.R. 3290, and H.R. 11263. These measures would liberalize social security disability coverage, require prescription drugs provided under Federal programs to be prescribed on the basis of their generic names, reduce certain social security age requirements, improve benefits for wives and widows, exempt social security payments from taxation, provide medicare coverage for the disabled, and remove inequities under social security which now exist for working wives and widows. Some of these provisions were enacted into law in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1967;

H.R. 2855, to establish a Redwood National Park;

H.R. 3753, to consolidate all water quality and pollution control functions into one agency;

H.R. 4462, to provide a system for the portability of private pension rights;

House Concurrent Resolution 139, to encourage establishment of a United Nations Peacekeeping Force. Enacted into law;

H.R. 5258, to extend the veterans' educational assistance program. Similar legislation enacted into law;

H.R. 6113, to create a Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation;

H.R. 6114, to extend to additional products the protection provided by the Flammable Fabrics Act. Enacted into law;

House Joint Resolution 357, to establish a Product Safety Commission. Such Commission was established;

H.R. 6138, to protect endangered species of fish and wildlife. Approved by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation;

H.R. 6703 and 6704, to enable hospitals to more easily establish joint ventures so

as to reduce costs. I had this almost entirely accomplished administratively;

H.R. 7450, H.R. 7466, H.R. 7467, to provide proper controls over the misuse of firearms and destructive devices;

H.R. 7796, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality to make recommendations to prevent misuse and destruction of the Nation's environment;

H.R. 9511, to protect investors by improved regulation of investment company activities;

H.R. 10481, to establish rules and regulations to insure that television networks are operated in the public interest;

H.R. 11190 and 11191, to establish target range and firearms safety training programs, and to earmark existing firearms excise tax receipts for such purposes;

H.R. 11835, the proposed Riot Prevention and Control Act. Similar legislation passed House;

H.R. 12039, to provide Federal assistance in urban riot and civil disturbance areas;

H.R. 12054, to provide more stringent regulation of cigarette labeling and advertising;

H.R. 12435, to prohibit pay television programs;

H.R. 12654, to establish a Federal Reinsurance Corporation to assure the availability of property insurance in urban areas, particularly in high risk areas;

H.R. 12741, to provide a system of national health insurance;

House Concurrent Resolution 568, to provide uniform fire and police telephone numbers;

House Concurrent Resolution 571, urging that the facilities of the United Nations Security Council be used in an effort to bring peace in Southeast Asia;

H.R. 13919, to provide for abatement of aircraft noise;

H.R. 13953, to establish a program aimed at assuring the safety of natural gas pipelines;

H.R. 14025, to close tax loopholes and bring greater equity to the Federal tax system;

H.R. 14096, to establish penalties for the illegal use and sale of LSD;

H.R. 14228, to expand the anadromous fish development program, particularly in the Great Lakes area; and

H.R. 14548, to establish an Airport and Airways Trust Fund, financed out of a tax on aviation fuels, for the purpose of providing for improved development of public airports and to provide for a more effective air safety program.

Following are some of the major legislative accomplishments of the first session of the 90th Congress:

HEALTH

The Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967 authorizing \$589 million for fiscal years 1968-70 for grants to the States for comprehensive health planning and services, including a \$40 million authorization intended for rat control projects in fiscal years 1968-69. In addition, this law initiates a new program of Federal licensing of clinical laboratories dealing in interstate commerce and establishes a program of grants for research and demonstration to develop

more efficient health services and facilities. This legislation also extends existing law which authorizes grants to States for such health services as the State deems best.

The Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967 providing a total of \$281.8 million for fiscal years 1968 through 1970 for construction of teaching facilities and community centers; staffing; training teachers of the handicapped; and a new program training teachers in physical education and recreation for the handicapped.

The Air Quality Act of 1967, which I coauthored, authorizing \$428.3 million for Federal air pollution control for fiscal years 1968-70. On the opening day of the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 10, a stronger measure than that approved by Congress. My bill would have provided stringent Federal controls over all forms of air pollution sources, including automotive vehicles. Unfortunately, despite my strong opposition, Congress provided for two sets of standards for automotive pollutants—one for California and another for the other 49 States. I believe this procedure will result in costly duplication of administrative procedures and in less effective controls over automotive emissions. Among other things, the law authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in time of imminent and substantial danger to public health from air pollution to seek court injunctions as might be necessary to protect the public health against the continued emission of such pollutants. It also authorizes the Secretary to designate air quality control regions throughout the country; to provide Federal financing for regional control commissions to be established by State Governors; and empowers him to enforce air quality standards in the control regions, if the regional commissions fail to enforce HEW guidelines for air purity. In addition, it provides controls over fuel additives, and Federal support to State agencies for developing uniform motor vehicle pollution control device inspection and emission testing programs.

SENIOR CITIZENS

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1967 providing for an across-the-board increase of at least 13 percent for all social security beneficiaries with an increase in minimum monthly benefits from \$44 to \$55. This is the largest increase in social security benefits in 32 years, but I support even more substantial increases so that our retired citizens may be more fully assured of economic security. This measure also raises the earnings limitations for social security beneficiaries from \$1,500 to \$1,680 a year. It creates a 60-day, lifetime reserve of hospital benefits under medicare, but with the requirement that the patient pay \$20 a day toward the cost of this additional hospitalization. It is estimated that increased benefits during the first full year of the new law will total \$3.6 billion.

Legislation extending the Older Americans Act of 1965 for 5 years, through fiscal year 1972, and authorizing \$43.9 million for research, demonstration, and training programs.

The Age Discrimination Act of 1967 prohibits employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations from engaging in any discriminatory practice in hiring workers between the ages of 40 and 65 because of age. The investigation and enforcement of the provisions of the act are similar to those of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This brings to a successful close the fight begun by me 6 years ago to protect our people from discrimination in employment because of age.

CONSUMERS

The Federal Meat Inspection Act amendments providing strong Federal standards for inspection of meat and meat products, and authorizing a program of Federal-State cooperation to bring State meat inspection systems to a level comparable to the Federal inspection system.

A measure strengthening the 1953 Flammable Fabrics Act to cover all wearing apparel and interior furnishings made of fabric or related materials. It enables the Government to halt manufacturers' sales of goods not meeting standards set by the Secretary of Commerce, and for the first time, covers interior furnishings to provide protection against dangerous materials in drapes, bedding, blankets, upholstery, and other products.

Legislation establishing a seven-member National Commission on Product Safety. The Commission will identify categories of household products presenting unreasonable hazard to consumers, study the effectiveness of existing State and Federal law in controlling such products, and report its findings and recommendations to Congress.

EDUCATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments extending this act an additional 2 years and authorizing larger expenditures than before. In my view, the programs of this act offer the most effective means for overcoming the serious problems facing many of our schools, particularly in urban areas. For this reason, I urged even broader action by the Congress.

The Education Professions Development Act extending title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including the Teacher Corps and a teacher fellowship program, and creating four new teacher-training programs effective in fiscal 1969.

Legislation expanding the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and authorizing \$500 million for fiscal 1969 and \$600 million for fiscal 1970 for grants to States for basic vocational rehabilitation. More than 500,000 persons will be retained under this proposal. In addition, the act authorizes new programs—one, a program of grants for pilot projects to provide vocational rehabilitation for migrant workers; the other, to establish a new national center for deaf-blind youths and adults.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 providing a 3-year extension of the 1960 law authorizing Federal grants of \$38 million for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and broadening it to include grants for educational radio broadcasting. This new

law provides for the establishment of a nonprofit nongovernmental corporation for public broadcasting to strengthen and improve educational radio and television by providing an independent source of funds to produce programs and operate and interconnect stations, and authorizes an appropriation of \$9 million for fiscal year 1968 to finance the activities of the corporation.

Legislation extending for 1 year the period during which the Federal Government can finance the total cost of the interlibrary cooperation programs, State institutional library services, and library services to the physically handicapped. After June 30, 1968, the Federal Government will pay 50 percent of the program costs and State and local governments will be required to pay the remaining 50 percent.

POVERTY

After a long and difficult legislative battle, the Democratic leadership succeeded in gaining approval of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, the antipoverty program. This legislation continues the Economic Opportunity program for 2 years through fiscal 1969, and authorizes \$1,980 million for fiscal 1968 and \$2,181 million for fiscal 1969. It contains a new provision requiring that after February 1, 1969, community action programs shall, except under unusual circumstance, be carried on by local governments. It earmarks \$25 million for a program to feed the hungry, and authorizes a new program of day care centers to assist working mothers.

Authorization of \$200 million for fiscal 1968 and \$225 million for fiscal 1969 providing for a 2-year extension of the food stamp program. This program was initially approved on a pilot basis in 1961 and established on a 3-year basis in 1964. It enables low-income families in both the urban slums and depressed rural areas to purchase Government subsidized stamps which increase their food buying power at grocery stores, and makes available to them something approaching an adequate diet, with resulting improvements to physical and mental health. I was one of the original sponsors of this very worthwhile legislation and played a leading role in its enactment.

The Appalachia Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1967 providing for the continued operation of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and authorizing appropriations of \$715 million for the 4-year period ending June 30, 1971, for the highway program. It also authorizes \$170 million for the nonhighway program.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 providing a first-step raise of 6 percent for 725,000 postal employees and a 4.5-percent increase for 1.3 million classified workers making various adjustments in postal rates. The act establishes a commission on executive, legislative, and judicial salaries, and makes it illegal for Federal officials to hire relatives. In addition, it provides for a second pay increase of 5 percent in July of 1968 for postal employees, and authorizes the President to give classified employees adjustments in July of

1968 to close one-half of the differences between their salary levels and comparable private enterprise salary levels. It further provides for a final phase adjustment for July of 1969 for all Government employees to bring their salaries up to par with private enterprise salaries.

A military pay bill providing for an increase of 4.5 percent in the regular compensation of servicemen, including basic pay, quarters, and subsistence allowance, and for automatic pay raises in the future that would correspond to salary increases for Federal civilian employees.

VETERANS

The Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 giving veterans and their dependents a cost-of-living increase in pension payments, providing full wartime rates of compensation for those injured in Vietnam, and pensions for those who became disabled, as well as higher educational allowances for veterans attending college under the cold war GI bill and a number of new training programs under the law.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The Emergency Food for India Act approving U.S. participation in a multilateral effort to develop a self-help approach to the war on hunger, to assist India to achieve food self-sufficiency, and to help meet India's critical food shortages by providing agricultural commodities and other resources needed for food procurement or production.

The Inter-American Development Bank Act Amendments authorizing an additional U.S. contribution to the Bank of \$900 million over a 3-year period. This is an integral part of the effort to assure success for the Alliance for Progress which was sponsored by President Kennedy.

The Foreign Aid Authorization Act providing an authorization of \$2,674,614,000 for foreign economic aid and military assistance for fiscal 1968.

Legislation extending the Peace Corps and authorizing an appropriation of \$115.7 million for fiscal 1968.

The Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1967 extending the interest equalization tax for 2 more years. This measure is aimed at relieving our serious balance-of-payments deficit by making it more expensive for foreigners to borrow from U.S. sources. The new law also gives the President the authority to eliminate the tax or set it at any level up to 50 percent above the current amount of the levy.

AID TO CITIES

Legislation providing \$10 million for the rent supplement program; \$312 million to get the model cities program underway; \$750 million for urban renewal; \$165 million for water and sewer facilities under the community facility program; \$175 million for the urban mass transit program; and continuance of the low-rent public housing program, including senior citizen housing.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Small Business Act amendments increasing the amount of loans, guarantees, and any other obligations or commitments which may be outstanding

at any one time from the Small Business Loan and Investment Fund, and giving small business investment companies access to more SBA money, and increasing from 10 to 15 years the maturity for regular business loans made for construction of facilities.

JUDICIARY

Legislation establishing a Federal Judiciary Center to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration of Federal courts. The center will study court operations, develop recommendations for the Judicial Conference of the United States, stimulate and conduct training programs for judges and other judicial branch personnel, and provide staff assistance to the Judicial Conference.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The Saline Water Conversion Act authorizing additional appropriations for the saline water conversion program and authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct test bed facilities, and clarifying existing provisions of law relating to the sequence of water conversion facilities to be constructed by the Office of Saline Water.

An act authorizing the Interior Department to participate in the construction of a very large nuclear power and desalting plant in southern California, and providing authorization of \$57.2 million as the Interior Department's share of the \$444.3 million project. The plant is to be built in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and three California power companies. This project offers the prospect of the first large-scale application of nuclear energy to the desalting process, the first large combined power and desalting plant, and the production of an unprecedented volume of commercially competitive desalted water.

DEFENSE

Legislation providing a \$70 billion defense appropriation for fiscal 1968, the largest in our history, to keep our Nation secure at home and abroad.

A measure providing a \$12.2 billion supplemental appropriation supporting military operations in Vietnam through the end of fiscal 1967.

Military construction funds legislation appropriating \$2.093 billion for construction at military installations and construction and maintenance of military family housing.

The Military Selective Service Act of 1967 extending the military draft 4 years and making its provisions more equitable.

U.S. defense needs, as we all know, are immense and they have been magnified because of the requirements of our forces in Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

The overwhelming majority of the Members of the House, both Democratic and Republican, supported the legislative moves designed to assure our country with an unequalled military defense ability. Such strength is essential if we are to see an early end to the painful and costly conflict in Vietnam and convince the Communists that they cannot suc-

cessfully commit aggression upon weak and underdeveloped nations.

Peace in Vietnam is the goal of all compassionate persons. I have done everything possible to contribute to the achievement of this goal and I shall continue to follow this course.

We will be confronted by other priority problems during the second session of the 90th Congress, and must act upon vital, unfinished matters, including the proposed tax surcharge and proposals for tax reform, truth-in-lending legislation, and measures to overcome the growing problem of crime.

I want to assure the people of Michigan's 16th Congressional District that I shall continue to strive in every possible way to provide effective legislative responses to the pressing problems and needs which confront us.

I hope my constituents will contact me at my Washington, D.C., office, at 2452 Rayburn House Office Building, or at the office I maintain in Dearborn at 4917 Schaefer Road, to express their views on matters of interest and concern to them, or to request my assistance on any problem they may have with the Federal Government. Such communications will be given my utmost consideration.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INEQUITIES FOR SERVICEMEN NEED CORRECTION

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills to effect changes in the treatment awarded claims for unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen and Federal civilian employees.

The first involves the difference in the treatment of payments for military accrued leave. Present law requires the mandatory postponement of unemployment compensation benefits for ex-servicemen during the equivalent length of time covered by military accrued leave. Federal civilian employees, however, are exempted from this requirement and are not barred by Federal law from receiving unemployment compensation benefits for the period following the separation from employment to which payments of Federal civilian terminal leave were allocated. Their eligibility is governed by the applicable State unemployment compensation law in the State in which they apply for benefits. Most States disregard lump-sum annual leave payments.

Many servicemen who serve 2 years on active duty often do not, or cannot, use all or even a major part of the 60 days of leave time they are entitled to during their service. They get paid a lump sum instead. In the case of a private, first class, the lump-sum payment for 30 days' accrued leave time would be \$128.70, or a month's pay, less taxes and social security.

If he is not able to locate employment immediately and seeks unemployment compensation, he will find that Federal law now requires him to wait out the 30 days he was paid for as a private, first class. He is not eligible for unemployment benefits until that period has run its course.

My bill would amend the law to provide servicemen the same treatment for military accrued leave as that now provided Federal civilian employees. It is hard to understand how this situation developed in the law, but Congress should put an end to it, especially in view of the far lower pay scale of 2-year servicemen.

This situation was first called to my attention by a constituent, Paul Crocker of Madison, Wis.

The second bill would affect the method used in assigning wages of Federal civilian employees and servicemen. At first, it would appear that existing law favors the serviceman. For unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen Federal military wages are assigned to the State in which the ex-serviceman first establishes a claim for benefits following his last separation from Federal service. On the other hand, Federal civilian wages are generally assigned to the State in which the worker had his last official station in Federal civilian employment prior to filing his initial claim.

The difference in wage assignment frequently complicates administration because an ex-serviceman also may have worked as a civilian for the Federal Government. For example, military personnel may work off-duty hours in a post exchange. This could result in assigning his Federal military wages to the State in which he filed a claim, and his Federal civilian wages to the State in which his last official station in Federal civilian employment was located.

The method of assigning Federal military wages is preferable to that in effect for the assignment of Federal civilian wages. Assigning wages to the State in which a claim is first established achieves substantially greater administrative simplicity. It makes it possible for an ex-serviceman to file a first claim in the State in which he wishes to seek work. His claim need not be processed through relatively cumbersome interstate benefit arrangements and the payments to which he may be entitled are made much more expeditiously.

It seems clear to me that these two conflicts in the law are inequitable to the serviceman and should be corrected.

A technical description of these two bills follows:

DIFFERENCE IN PROVISIONS OF TITLE XV OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

METHODS OF HANDLING LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN TERMINAL LEAVE AND MILITARY ACCRUED LEAVE

The first significant area of difference is in regard to the treatment of lump-sum payments for Federal civilian terminal leave and military accrued leave. Originally, sections 1505 and 1511(f), title XV, of the Social Security Act, provided equal treatment for both types of leave payments. The original requirement postponed both UCFE and UCX benefits for the period following the separation from employment to which payments of

Federal civilian terminal leave or military accrued leave were allocated.

Since Public Law 442, 86th Congress, approved April 22, 1960, repealed section 1505 of the Social Security Act, the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law govern the effect of Federal civilian terminal leave on claims for UCFE benefits. However, section 1511(f) of title XV requires that section 1505, even though repealed with respect to payments of Federal civilian terminal leave, shall continue to apply in connection with lump-sum payments of military accrued leave. This results in mandatory postponement of UCX benefits during the period covered by military accrued leave.

The repeal of subsection 1511(f), title XV, of the Social Security Act would permit the same treatment for military accrued leave as that accorded to terminal leave related to Federal civilian service.

METHODS OF ASSIGNING WAGES TO STATES

Section 1504 of the Social Security Act requires that Federal civilian wages be generally assigned to the State in which the worker had his last official station in Federal civilian employment prior to filing his initial claim. Exceptions are made (1) when the individual worked in employment subject to the unemployment compensation law of the State in which he is living when he makes his initial application for USFE benefits, provided such State is not the State of his last official station, and (2) when his last official station was outside the 50 States or the District of Columbia. In such cases, his Federal civilian wages are assigned to the State in which he is living when he initiates a claim. For UCX purposes, Federal military wages are assigned to the State in which the ex-serviceman first establishes a claim for unemployment benefits following his last separation from Federal military service.

The difference in wage assignment frequently complicates administration because an ex-serviceman also may have worked as a civilian for the Federal Government. For example, military personnel may work off-duty hours in a Post Exchange. This could result in assigning his Federal military wages to the State in which he filed a claim, and his Federal civilian wages to the States in which his last official station in Federal civilian employment was located.

It is the Department of Labor's position that the method of assigning Federal military wages is preferable to that in effect for the assignment of Federal civilian wages. Assigning wages to the State in which a claim is first established achieves substantially greater administrative simplicity. It makes it possible for an ex-serviceman to file a first claim in the State in which he wishes to seek work. His claim need not be processed through relatively cumbersome interstate benefit arrangements and the payments to which he may be entitled are made much more expeditiously.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON CONTINUES TO CLIMB IN THE POLLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess period, the latest Gallup and Harris polls were released and show President Johnson ahead of his potential Republican rivals this year.

The Gallup poll showed the President leading his closest rival, Richard Nixon, by 46 to 41 percent. In December, this lead was 47 to 43 percent—so the President appears to be pulling away.

The Harris poll shows the President leading Nixon by 50 to 41 percent; Governor Rockefeller by 41 to 37 percent; Governor Romney by 49 to 36 percent; and Governor Reagan by 51 to 37 percent.

The Harris poll declares:

The results show Mr. Johnson riding a new crest of popularity that would make him the favorite if the election were held now.

We Democrats can take heart with these results, for they clearly demonstrate that the American people will continue to support a President and a party that keeps its commitments at home and abroad.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the results of the latest Gallup and Harris polls:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1968]
THE GALLUP POLL: "PEACE PARTY" VOTE PUT AT 9 MILLION

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., January 6.—The decision of Sen. Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota to run against President Johnson as a "peace" candidate in the New Hampshire primary March 12 raises two important questions: What is the potential strength of an independent peace party?—and—What effect would such a party have on the support for other potential presidential candidates?

To answer these questions a national "test election" was run, matching McCarthy against President Johnson, Richard Nixon (the top choice of both the Republican Party "pros" and the rank-and-file) and former Gov. George Wallace of Alabama, a probable third party states' rights candidate in this year's race.

The results show the following:

1. If a national election were held today with these four candidates, an independent peace party headed by McCarthy would draw the support of about 12 per cent of the voters.

McCarthy has said that he does not intend to start an independent third party, but the results are nevertheless an indication of the popular support for such a movement. This figure of 12 per cent translates into approximately 9 million voters, based on the vote turnout in the 1964 presidential election.

2. An independent peace party would hurt both the Republican and Democratic Parties about equally in a contest that includes George Wallace.

3. Wallace's strength is not materially affected with the entry of a peace party candidate. He continues to get about the same proportion of the national vote as in earlier trial heat races against the President and Nixon.

4. Mr. Johnson emerges with a substantial lead over the field of four, but falls at the same time to win an absolute majority vote.

The inclusion of Wallace in a race with Mr. Johnson and Nixon hurts the Republicans more than the Democrats. This is due primarily to the fact that Wallace shares much of the anti-Johnson vote in the South with Nixon. The addition of a peace party candidate to the contest does not offset this Democratic advantage.

A national sample of adults in 310 localities was asked this question:

"Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If Richard Nixon were the Republican Candidate and Lyndon Johnson were the Democratic Candidate and George Wallace of Alabama were the candidate of a

third party and Sen. Eugene McCarthy ran as a 'peace candidate' which one would you like to see win?"

Here are the national results for likely voters, based on the assumption that all four men are entered in the race in all 50 states:

	Percent
Johnson	39
Nixon	30
McCarthy	12
Wallace	11
Undecided	8

A subsequent question limiting the race to President Johnson and Nixon showed Mr. Johnson with 46 per cent. Nixon with 41 per cent and 13 per cent undecided.

A December report showed Mr. Johnson with a comparable lead over Nixon, 47 per cent to 43 per cent, with 10 per cent undecided.

Following is the pattern of support for each of the four test candidates:

[In percent]

	L. B. J.	Nixon	Wallace	McCarthy
All voters.....	30	30	11	12
Men.....	38	33	13	9
Women.....	40	27	10	14
21 to 29.....	34	31	10	17
30 to 49.....	42	29	12	10
50 and over.....	38	33	10	11
East.....	47	26	3	16
Midwest.....	35	36	8	12
South.....	31	28	29	7
West.....	47	29	7	11
Republicans.....	13	65	8	9
Democrats.....	62	9	11	12

Note: The undecided category has not been included in the above table. The percentages for each group therefore do not add to 100 percent.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 8, 1968]

HARRIS SURVEY: PRESIDENT TOPS GOP FIELD IN POLL

(By Louis Harris)

Only two months after a Harris survey showed that all four of the leading Republican presidential contenders could defeat President Johnson, a special survey completed Dec. 21 shows Mr. Johnson riding a new crest of popularity that would make him the favorite if the election were held now.

Here are the key findings of a cross-section of 2003 households:

Although Gov. Nelson Rockefeller ties Mr. Johnson 43 to 43 per cent in a two-way race, when former Gov. George Wallace is added to the list, the President takes the lead over the New York Republican 41 to 37 per cent, with Wallace receiving 12 per cent. In October, Gov. Rockefeller led Mr. Johnson by 52 to 35 per cent.

Against Richard M. Nixon, Mr. Johnson has now opened up a 50 to 41 per cent edge. This represents a three-point gain for the President in three weeks and a nine-point rise in two months.

Mr. Johnson runs ahead of Gov. George Romney by 49 to 36 per cent, up two points in three weeks and 12 points in eight weeks.

Gov. Ronald Reagan trails the President 37 to 51 per cent, a slippage of nine points in eight weeks for the California Republican.

The results indicate that Wallace is gradually picking up strength. With the undecided vote out, Wallace's indicated vote today would be 14 per cent of the electorate nation-wide. He is now a clear second in the South, moving up on Mr. Johnson. However, the votes the Alabamian would receive in the South are mainly those that went for Barry Goldwater in 1964. The net effect of his candidacy would be to take votes away from any Republican, including a moderate.

By comparing the Johnson vote today with last October, the key swing areas begin to emerge. On a regional basis, the Midwest

and the West are most susceptible to change. The upper-income and college-educated groups show the greatest changes of any, and are sensitive both to the war in Vietnam and the issue of racial peace and progress at home. The big cities, edgy over the prospect of racial turmoil, are also pivotal. Voters who are Catholics, largely committed to see the war through in Vietnam, are also subject to wide swings. Finally, young people under 35, also sensitive to the race and war issues, will be a major battle ground.

Fundamentally, these latest results point up the tenuous hold of the Democratic Party on its former bastions in the big cities, among Catholic voters, and in the South. All in all, as much as one voter in three has been shaken loose from his traditional political moorings.

Here are the latest standings compared with those in October:

(In percent)

	December	October
L. B. J. versus Rockefeller versus Wallace:		
Johnson.....	41	35
Rockefeller.....	37	45
Wallace.....	12	10
Not sure.....	10	10
L. B. J. versus Rockefeller:		
Johnson.....	43	35
Rockefeller.....	43	52
Not sure.....	14	13
L. B. J. versus Nixon:		
Johnson.....	50	41
Nixon.....	41	48
Not sure.....	9	11
L. B. J. versus Romney:		
Johnson.....	49	37
Romney.....	36	46
Not sure.....	15	17
L. B. J. versus Reagan:		
Johnson.....	51	41
Reagan.....	37	46
Not sure.....	12	13

THE POST OFFICE MUDDLES THROUGH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer has aptly described the Post Office as "a 19th-century success." In an excellent article the Observer notes that despite buildings, equipment, and techniques that are largely outmoded, the postal service is delivering the mail faster than ever before. But unless there are changes—unless the postal service can close the technological gap—postal paralysis is virtually inevitable. Fortunately, significant changes are being made and the Observer article outlines what the postal service is doing under the vigorous and progressive leadership of Postmaster General O'Brien to give the Nation a truly modern mail delivery system. With permission I insert the Observer article in the RECORD:

THE POST OFFICE MUDDLES THROUGH

DETROIT.—They were lined up 20 deep at some post offices, buying stamps, sending bundles, looking up ZIP codes, asking questions.

This was the moment of agony for the U.S. Post Office Department—the week before Christmas when the creaky wheels of the world's busiest postal system bend under 2 billion pieces of mail, almost twice the load of a normal week.

And yet it went by, here as elsewhere in the nation, with hardly a hitch. "We're in better shape this year than ever before," reported Detroit's white-haired postmaster, Edward L. Baker. And at a special Christmas communications center in Washington, a postal official summed up the situation for the nation: "This thing gets easier year by year."

Maybe that doesn't sound remarkable. But it doesn't jibe with the predictions of doom that emanate periodically from the Post Office Department in Washington. Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien says the mails are in a losing "race with catastrophe," and that unless basic changes are made "the future will be bleak for mail service."

THE SPECTER OF DISASTER

Post Office television plugs, depicting harried postal workers being buried beneath an avalanche of letters, raise the specter of a nationwide mail breakdown. And for the skeptical there's the memory of the Chicago mail jam of October 1966, when an overworked plant and an understaffed work force managed to pile up 10,000,000 pieces of undigested mail in one week end.

Well, the fact is that—occasionally maddening delays notwithstanding—mail service is faster than ever (not necessarily better, but faster), and the postal system is better able to cope with the demands placed on it today than ever before.

What makes this situation ironic is that the nation's 700,000 postal workers are called upon to move half the world's daily volume of mail using techniques barely changed since the days of Ben Franklin. Visit almost any post office today and you'll see rows and rows of men and women atop stools stuffing letters into pigeonholes, in the re-enactment of a primitive ritual that dates back hundreds of years.

THE O'BRIEN RECORD

But things are changing, and the man responsible for the biggest changes is the man most pessimistic about their long-range efficacy: Lawrence F. O'Brien. In little more than two years as head of the postal service he has:

Turned his back on the agency's ingrown promotion policies, assembling a management staff drawn from the board rooms of industry and the war rooms of the Pentagon. "We're trying to make up for 20 years of technological neglect," says pipe-smoking Dr. Leo S. Packer, formerly an engineering manager at Xerox Corp. and now head of Mr. O'Brien's fastest-growing bureau, research and development. Postal chiefs are applying systems-analysis techniques to the mail service and experimenting with "new delivery systems," including facsimile transmission, to cut down mail time.

Begun a \$300,000,000 crash mechanization program designed to take mail processing out of the horse-and-buggy era and reverse the traditional policy of trying to resolve postal problems by hiring more workers. By next July, there will be twice as many pieces of step-saving mechanized equipment as there were two years ago. Among them: 30 ZIP code-reading optical scanners (\$100,000 each) that "pigeon-hole" 30,000 letters an hour and a \$33,000,000 computer complex that will tell authorities in the 75 largest post offices how much mail they can anticipate and how to route it to avoid bottlenecks.

Reduced pressure on the system—and the prospect of paralysis—by introducing such concepts as the "early-warning system," under which large mailers alert postal authorities to future mailings, and local "mail-users councils," whose 23,000 business members are presorting, by ZIP code, their mail in exchange for a pledge of faster service. One sign that Mr. O'Brien's appeals for co-operation by mail users are paying off: This year three-fourths of all mail will be ZIP-coded to its destination, though only a third of it

need be by law. And ZIP-coded mail, by eliminating the need for multiple handlings, is the biggest time-saver in post office history.

To be sure, everybody has complaints about postal service, particularly around Christmas time. And a tour of Detroit's highly mechanized post office, among the most modern in the nation, helps explain why.

PRIORITY FOR VIETNAM

Americans shipping goodies to the troops in Vietnam, no matter where they live in the United States, can go to sleep fairly confident their packages will arrive the next day in San Francisco, for immediate relay to Southeast Asia. That's high priority. But a Christmas package from one Wayne, Mich., family to another in the same town became undone and waited six days or more in Detroit's post office to be patched up. That's low priority.

A lot of those Christmas cards arrived smudged or dirty because the conveyor that speeds them from sack to sorter periodically spills its overflow onto the floor, where it is not always immediately picked up.

And a man in Madison Heights, Mich., awaiting his copy of the latest issue of the New Republic, can stop waiting. It won't arrive. The cover, addressographed with ZIP code, got detached in processing. It was last seen being stomped on, inadvertently, by a mail handler here.

But it should be stressed that such slipups, though common to all post offices, affect only a fraction of the mail. Studies here, for example, indicate that less than 2 per cent of all packages are damaged, and most of those require no more than a piece of tape or some twine to repair.

MEMORIES OF DAMAGE

The memory of parcels broken and mail delayed is what lingers in the minds of most Americans, along with the noon-hour lines at almost any downtown stamp or parcel-post window, and the fading memory of twice-a-day delivery, which ended, probably forever, in 1950. Yet statistically, it is demonstrable that the mails are speedier than ever. Today most first-class mail traveling more than 215 miles goes by air, on a space-available basis. As a result, Mr. O'Brien's tables show that coast-to-coast letters are getting delivered in two days, and 25 states are receiving overnight delivery on almost all first-class mail.

This track record must be regarded as little short of remarkable when you consider what Mr. O'Brien is up against.

Postal officials predict that mail volume will increase 75 per cent over the next 20 years. It is expected to total 83 billion letters and parcels this year, or an average of 415 for every American (compared with 365 per person when Mr. O'Brien was appointed in November 1965).

Yet today's postal service is based on the Nineteenth Century concept of an independent post office for every city, town, or village in the nation. There are today 33,000 post offices and 11,000 branches and stations, most of which can be justified neither by considerations of optimum service nor economy. But the Postmaster General is powerless to alter the system and Congress, which has the power, chooses not to.

CONCENTRATION OF VOLUME

Most mail, of course, is handled at a relatively few post offices. The 75 largest, in fact, process more than 50 per cent of the nation's total volume. But most of these post offices were built before World War II when there was only a third as much mail. They are not laid out for efficient mail flow, and their floors are often too weak to support the modern machinery from which productivity gains can come.

Moreover, most of them are near railroad depots in central cities. That made sense when 10,000 trains a day transported most of the mail. But today there are only 700

daily mail-carrying trains left, and central cities are clogged with traffic. So getting the mail to airports or superhighways frequently involves bumper-to-bumper delays. To modernize the postal plant would cost \$1 billion a year for five years, estimates Mr. O'Brien. This year he asked for and got \$300,000,000.

Then there are the 700,000 postal workers. They are represented by no fewer than 14 unions, most of them powerful and all of them concerned, understandably, with job security at a time when the post office's greatest economies can come from man-replacing mechanization. Postal union chiefs are worried about other things as well. Low pay, for example: Even with a recently enacted wage hike, postal workers will earn less, on the average, than firemen, policemen, or bus drivers.

"We're losing the good-caliber postman, the kind who was almost part of the families along his route," moans Vice President James H. Rademacher of the National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO. "The people who join the postal service now often are those waiting for better jobs to come through."

Mr. O'Brien blames these woes on what he euphemistically terms a "restrictive jungle of custom and legislation," meaning that the basic decisions about how to run the postal service and who will run it locally are out of his hands. Congress sets postal rates and postal pay scales, while saddling the postal system with increasing "public-service" chores that swell the deficit (currently \$1.2 billion). Federal regulatory agencies set transportation rates to carriers. Postmaster-ships, though less of a political plum than they used to be, are still decided by patronage, not promise. And hallowed tradition, entombed in labor-management contracts, inhibits postal supervisors from exercising such basic managerial rights as transferring workers from one city (or even one post office) to another.

Quips Mr. O'Brien: "If we ran our telephone service this way, the carrier-pigeon business would have a great future." The way Mr. O'Brien would prefer to run the mails would be to scrap the present system and start again. He proposes removing the Post Office from the President's Cabinet (i.e. from politics) and turning it over to a new Government corporation modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Replacing the present board of directors (the 535 members of Congress) would be a small panel nominated by the President and confirmed by Congress. Congress would specify what services should be performed and what percentage of costs revenues should cover. Then the corporation would set rates on its own, and Congress would make up the difference.

Such a change presumably would free the department from the "restrictive jungle of custom and legislation" because the corporation would make all the basic executive decisions, following broad congressional guidelines. It would also, in theory at least, solve the problem of financing modernization: The corporation would float bonds to provide a fund for capital investment; the fund might even be made self-amortizing through rental income.

A COMMISSION STUDY

Five days after Mr. O'Brien announced his proposal last April, President Johnson appointed a Commission on Postal Organization, made up mainly of business leaders and headed by Frederick R. Kappel, former board chairman of American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Its mandate from the President is to undertake "the most searching and exhaustive review ever undertaken" of the Post Office's structure and organization, and from all indications it is doing just that.

With its report not due until April, it is hard to predict what the panel will recommend. But it is worth noting that the corporation plan has aroused no great enthusi-

asm in Congress. What Mr. O'Brien has in mind is to make the postal service a model of efficiency. To most lawmakers, it seems sufficient that it deliver the mails with reasonable dispatch.

Mr. O'Brien seems to be doing that and a lot more. He has begun the first college recruiting program in post-office history to train future executive talent. The Post Office will open a training institute outside of Washington next month to develop the skills needed to operate its increasingly complex machinery. And he is squeezing more funds than was once thought possible out of Congress, most of it for research and modernization.

ZIP code has postponed the threatened overload on the system for several years, by most estimates. New breakthrough are imminent. Mr. O'Brien has compared the adaptation of optical scanning devices—machines that can read ZIP codes and sort letters automatically—to the placing of dials on telephones. Without the dial every man, woman, and child would now have to be playing operator to get all the calls through. Similarly, without mechanization, everyone would be delivering his own mail in another 35 or 40 years.

It may be that by his own modernization program Mr. O'Brien is knocking down his own credentials as a soothsayer.

—MARK R. ARNOLD.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR—THESE FOUR CONVENTIONS SHOULD BE RATIFIED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Resolution 1020 expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify four human rights conventions to assure our effective participation in the celebration of International Human Rights Year.

I am sponsoring this resolution for myself and on behalf of the following Members of the House: Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Hon. EDITH GREEN, Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hon. THOMAS M. REES, Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Hon. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, Hon. JACOB H. GILBERT, Hon. JAMES H. SCHEUER, Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Hon. DANIEL E. BUTTON, and Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN.

The four conventions which have been submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations are:

First. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide unanimously recommended by the United Nations General Assembly for ratification by member states on December 9, 1948. Seventy-one nations have approved the Genocide Convention.

Second. The Convention Concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 40th session at Geneva, June 25, 1957. The Forced Labor Convention has been approved by 79 nations.

Third. The Convention on the Political Rights of Women adopted by the

United Nations General Assembly on December 17, 1952. Fifty-five nations have approved the Political Rights of Women Convention.

Fourth. The Convention Concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right To Organize adopted by the International Labor Conference which closed on July 10, 1948. Seventy-six nations have approved the Convention on Freedom of Association.

Mr. Speaker, these four conventions all relate to basic human rights—that is why I am constrained to ask—"How can the United States effectively participate in the celebration of International Human Rights Year—1968—without first demonstrating to the nations and the peoples of the world that we approve these conventions?"

The House of Representatives should express its sentiments on this important question. It is the other body which has the constitutional responsibility for ratifying treaties, but after 19 years of inaction, I believe the House should go on record supporting these conventions.

Mr. Speaker, with permission I place in the RECORD at this point the full text of the resolution which I have introduced today:

H. RES. 1020

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has designated 1968 as "International Human Rights Year;" and

Whereas the United States has not ratified the Genocide Convention, the Convention Concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor, the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, and the Convention Concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right To Organize; and

Whereas the aforementioned conventions establish universal minimum standards of human rights; and

Whereas United States ratification of the aforementioned conventions is a means for effective participation by the United States in the celebration of International Human Rights Year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should—

(1) ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide unanimously recommended by the United Nations General Assembly for ratification by member states on December 9, 1948;

(2) ratify the Convention Concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor adopted by the International Labor Conference on June 25, 1957;

(3) ratify the Convention on the Political Rights of Women adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 17, 1952; and

(4) ratify the Convention Concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right To Organize adopted by the International Labor Conference which closed on July 10, 1948.

The people of the United States like all people of good will throughout the world, condemn the suppression of the spiritual and cultural life of any people. There can be no doubt that any government which pursues a program calculated to break the will of a people not only violates fundamental human rights but also acts contrary to the guarantees of international and moral law.

Since the founding of our Nation—the United States has been the leader

amongst nations and the guiding light in efforts to create a new moral order, dedicated to the advancement of human rights.

The Genocide Convention, unanimously approved by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1948, was in great measure, a product of U.S. initiative and legal concepts.

The United States was among the first 20 nations to sign the convention; however, for more than 19 years since that time, the Genocide Treaty has been gathering dust on the shelves of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the following nations have approved this convention:

Afghanistan	India
Albania	Iran
Algeria	Iraq
Argentina	Israel
Australia	Italy
Austria	Jordan
Belgium	Laos
Brazil	Lebanon
Bulgaria	Liberia
Burma	Mexico
Byelo Russia	Monaco
Cambodia	Mongolia
Canada	Morocco
Ceylon	Netherlands
China	Nicaragua
Chile	Norway
Colombia	Pakistan
Congo (Democratic Republic of)	Panama
Costa Rica	Peru
Cuba	Philippines
Czechoslovakia	Poland
Denmark	Republic of Korea
Ecuador	Republic of Vietnam
El Salvador	Rumania
Ethiopia	Saudi Arabia
Federal Republic of Germany	Sweden
Finland	Syria
France	Tunisia
Ghana	Turkey
Greece	Ukraine
Guatemala	U.S.S.R.
Haiti	Upper Volta
Honduras	Uruguay
Hungary	Venezuela
Iceland	Yugoslavia

Seventy-one nations, including the Soviet Union, have approved the Genocide Convention. It is shameful that the United States has failed to approve the Genocide Convention. Without such approval we do not have the means to effectively protest the oppression of a people—whether it be the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union, the Catholics in the Congo, or the Buddhists in Vietnam.

The treaty is certainly in the interest of humanity and it is inconceivable that it has not been approved by the United States. Our Nation—with its long history of moral and spiritual leadership in alleviating the plight of oppressed peoples—must continue to encourage principles of justice and human dignity.

One way to accomplish this purpose is for the other body to ratify the Convention on Genocide and erase the stain of ambiguity that has adversely characterized American handling of this important treaty.

One would imagine that there would be no opposition in the United States to the terms of this treaty—to a policy outlawing deliberate and intentional extermination of any body of people. A host of mythical reasons have developed to

rationalize our failure to assert what Secretary of State Rusk referred to as the "moral leadership" of the United States among the family of nations. Some of these mythical reasons are: the delicate balance of Federal-State relationships; the jealous prerogatives of our sovereignty; and the anxiety of some Southern lawyers who suggest a conflict with the language of the Constitution. That is why I have taken this time to point out that none of these myths can justify our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention.

The Genocide Convention has been ratified by 71 nations yet the problem of genocide continues in the world today—even among some of those nations who have signed the pact. Of particular significance is the Soviet Union.

There appears to be no question that the Soviet Union—one of the signatories to the convention—has as its policy the restriction of the practice of religion. This policy of religious discrimination is particularly pronounced against Soviet Jewry to the point where it amounts to a policy of spiritual genocide.

The United States has protested this policy toward Soviet Jewry as violative of human rights and contrary to the asserted policy of the Soviet Union. But how can we justify our opposition to Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens when we have yet to ratify the Genocide Convention?

We are powerless to invoke the terms of the convention against the Soviet Union because we are not a party to it.

The Convention Concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor, adopted by the International Labor Conference on June 25, 1957, has been signed in behalf of 79 nations.

The adoption of the convention by the International Labor Conference was the result of their earnest consideration of the problem of forced labor and their consideration of action.

At the 40th session of the International Labor Conference in 1957 the Committee on Forced Labor considered the draft of an international instrument concerning forced labor. The Committee submitted a draft convention to the General Conference with a report and the General Conference adopted the draft convention in June 1957. The U.S. delegations actively participated in the discussions regarding the draft convention, which was adopted by a vote of 240 to 0. As a member of the International Labor Organization, the United States has assumed obligations set forth in the ILO constitution.

In a letter to the President on July 18, 1963, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated that the subject matter of this convention was wholly within the Federal competence under the 13th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, that there was neither Federal nor State power validly to impose forced labor as a punishment for a legal strike, and that, with regard to illegal strike activities, any such punishment would only come about "as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted"—quoting from the 13th amendment.

The revised coordinated view that the

convention is appropriate for ratification was reached after such study by the following departments: Justice, Interior, Navy, and Labor. The Department of State was consulted in connection with the formulation of this view.

In view of the continuing importance of this subject in international relations and the leading role which the United States must continue to play in the United Nations activities and more specifically in the International Labor Organization on the subject of forced labor, it would then follow that this matter deserves the advise and consent of the Senate and approval of the convention.

The Convention on the Political Rights of Women, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1962, has been approved by 55 nations.

U.S. representatives participated in all phases of the drafting and the Federal Government was represented on several of the committees who actively and favorably urged the adoption of the draft convention.

The substantive provisions of the convention provide that women shall be entitled to vote in all elections on equal terms with men and without discrimination; that they shall be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law and that they shall be entitled to hold public office and exercise all public functions established by national law.

No substantive legal questions are involved in the United States becoming a party to this convention. Article I, relating to the rights of women to vote, merely reflects the principle established by the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The eligibility of women to be elected and to be appointed to public office has long been recognized in law and practice in the United States. Why should we not support the world effort to have the same principle adopted by other nations?

Of course, the first objective of this convention was to encourage equal political rights for women in all nations. However, one way to make the mass of mankind see the significance in this simple matter of right and justice is to exercise our approval of this convention.

Speaking before the General Assembly, the late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

In the United States, and in most countries today, women have equal suffrage. Some may feel that for that reason this convention is of little importance to them . . . but its significance reaches far deeper into the real issue of whether in fact women are recognized fully in setting the policies of our governments . . . if we are honest with ourselves, we know that all countries have a long way to go on these matters.

Following public opinion and acting with a true sense of statesmanship, the United States should continue to help nations change from what they are into what they ought to be.

The Convention Concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right To Organize adopted by the International Labor Conference in July 1948 has been approved by 76 nations.

The convention affirms the guarantees

provided under the first, fifth, 10th, and 14th amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

In a letter to the President, Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, expressed the coordinated view of the following agencies and departments of the Federal Government: State, Justice, Interior, Navy, Labor, and the Federal Security Agency.

The subject matter of the convention is of fundamental significance in the field of international regulation of trade unions because it guarantees, to both workers and employers alike, the basic right of freedom to establish and to join organizations of their own choosing.

Each member of the International Labor Organization would undertake all necessary and appropriate measures to insure that workers and employers may exercise freely the right to organize.

Workers' and employers' organizations should have the right to establish and join federations and confederations and any such organization, federation, or confederation should have the right to affiliate with international organizations of workers and employers.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting House Resolution 1020 and in making our views known to the other body. The ratification of this important pact will arm the United States with the international procedures to condemn the suppression of physical, spiritual, and cultural life throughout the world.

It will help us defend and protect the basic human right of survival. As Secretary of State Rusk said in 1950 as the then Deputy Under Secretary of State, testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, ratification of the Genocide Convention would "demonstrate to the rest of the world that the United States is determined to maintain its moral leadership in international affairs and to participate in the development of international law."

It is the responsibility of the U.S. Senate to give its advice and consent to the President in connection with treaties. In this case, however, the Genocide Convention has been pending for 19 years without Senate action and the other conventions have also been pending for a period ranging from 10 to 20 years. For that reason, I have introduced a House resolution to express the sense of the House in support of these treaties.

THE CRISIS AND CHALLENGE OF CRIME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the first session of the 90th Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 1, to provide for a joint congressional committee to investigate all aspects of crime, which I believe is one of

the most challenging problems facing our people today. Sixty of my colleagues in the House have joined me in this legislation, and over 24 Senators have introduced companion bills in the Senate.

I pledge to make a special effort to have this legislation enacted during this session of the Congress, so we can make a major and thorough attack upon every phase of crime now plaguing our country, and to try to develop legislation which will give the people of our country a feeling of safety in their homes, offices, businesses, and on the streets and highways of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that the citizenry of this country have not sat idly by and listened to the recent statistics stating that crime is on an increase all over this country. The Dade County Bar Association, which I am a member, held a crime control conference in Miami on December 18. We were honored to be afforded the distinguished honor of having addressed this conference, the Honorable Earl F. Morris, president of the American Bar Association. Mr. Morris is known throughout the country as a distinguished attorney and a noted expert in the field of crime and crime prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked to insert, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the excellent speech by Mr. Morris before the Dade County Bar Association's crime control conference in Miami, entitled "The Crisis and Challenge of Crime." I urge all my colleagues and those Americans interested and concerned with this frightening problem to read this splendid speech, which follows:

THE CRISIS AND CHALLENGE OF CRIME

(Address by Earl F. Morris, president, American Bar Association, before Crime Control Conference, Miami, Fla., December 18, 1967)

When I received President Hall's very kind invitation to speak at this luncheon, I gladly accepted for three reasons: first, it is indeed a pleasure for me to come to beautiful, warm Miami, far away from the cold winter climate of Columbus and Chicago even if it be for only a day; a second and more important reason is that the American Bar Association is concentrating a major portion of its activity this year on the prevention and control of crime; and third, frankly, I was curious to see what could be accomplished when a large and influential county bar association, in concert with interested lay and legal organizations, convened a crime control conference.

All of my expectations have been fulfilled: the weather is magnificent; this forum gives me an excellent opportunity to talk about the crisis—and the challenge—with which crime confronts our nation; and the program that you are presenting, and the large attendance of obviously enlightened and enthusiastic participants that you have attracted, attest to the significant contribution being made by the Dade County Bar Association, the Kiwanis Clubs of Dade County, the Florida Bar, the Florida Criminal Defense Attorneys Association, and the Crime Commission of Greater Miami in the attack on lawlessness.

If anyone doubted that crime in all forms is the most pressing domestic problem facing our nation today, the wave of riots in recent months with their attendant looting, arson and murder; the continued pervasiveness of organized crime; the steadily increasing

crime rate; and the constant rise in juvenile delinquency have erased all argument about the primacy and immediacy of the crime problem. If more were needed, the latest FBI report released last week furnishes it in abundance. The clipping I hold in my hand tells the alarming story—crime in the first nine months of 1967 has increased 16% over the same period in 1966 and, if this rate prevails for the last three months of this year, the increase in 1967 will have been the highest annual increase in crime in a decade.

While the cold statistics of crime are frightening, when we think of crime in human terms, in terms of people, when we realize, for example, that some kind of crime strikes one in every five families each year; that one boy in six will be brought into juvenile court for a nontraffic offense before he is 18; that one arrest in three is of a person under the age of 21; and that your risk, and my risk, of becoming a victim of a crime has risen 48 per cent since 1960, the fact of crime is truly staggering.

But what, you might ask, can I do about it? In this complex and rapidly changing society, what can I do to make a meaningful contribution to the solution of a problem so extensive as crime?

What is needed is the development of a monumental dedication to the job of cutting through public apathy and educating the citizenry to the threat that confronts us. What is needed is the type of leadership that can best be provided by lawyers and judges and laymen such as you.

What is needed is sufficient interest by each of us to "get involved", to participate in this enormous task, and by so doing to make a significant contribution to the task that confronts us.

The American Bar Association recognized part of its obligation in the war on crime some three years ago, when it launched a project to promulgate minimum standards for the administration of criminal justice, an endeavor which has been called "the most important in the field of judicial administration" undertaken in our time. Seven draft reports with proposed minimum standards—those on fair trial-free press, providing defense services, pleas of guilty, speedy trial, post-conviction remedies, appellate review of sentences, and joinder and severance—have been issued, and it is expected that about eight more will be published during 1968. By "minimum" standards we mean, of course, criteria which are desirable within the realm of what is practicable and feasible in order to promote more effective law enforcement, to safeguard the constitutional rights of those persons suspected and accused of crime, and to insure the adequate protection of the public.

Last February, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice issued its report, appropriately entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society". In addition to being an extraordinary study of the breadth and diversity of crime, the report contains more than two hundred recommendations for its prevention and control.

It is not difficult, as one reads the report, to envision the role of the lawyer and the organized bar in the war on crime, and it is equally clear that every interested citizen and civic group can fulfill a vital part in this effort.

With respect to the role of the bar, I suggest that lawyers have a dual responsibility. Lawyers possess particular expertise concerning the recommendations for improvement of the administration of criminal justice, and our first task is to bring these to fruition. Our second obligation is to give leadership to broad public involvement in the attack on crime.

When the Commission says, "The criminal court is the central, crucial institution in the criminal justice system", it means that

all efforts to conquer crime will go for naught if the courts—"the institution around which the rest of the system has developed and to which the rest of the system is in large measure responsible"—if the courts do not administer justice efficiently and effectively.

The Commission recommends that we strive to bring to reality the essential steps for modernization of our courts: centralization of the administrative control of the courts; unification of the local court system; abolition or overhaul of justice of the peace courts; substitution of judicial for legislative rule-making power; improvement of methods of judicial selection and tenure; and establishment of a system for discipline and removal of incompetent or incapacitated judges.

I understand that Florida has already instituted several of these reforms, but more remains to be done. The judicial article of the proposed new State Constitution, drafted by the Florida Constitution Commission, provides for some of these measures, but effectual court reorganization results from action by a determined bench and bar, an enlightened legislature and an interested and militant citizenry.

The Crime Commission's proposals with regard to the courts go beyond matters of broad judicial reform. In order to effect improvement in criminal courts, it proposes ball reform, regularizing of the process known as "plea bargaining", improvement of the prosecution function, and establishment of assigned counsel and public defender systems.

If the minimum standards and the recommendations of the Crime Commission are to be implemented—and I sincerely hope and trust that they will be—it must be done in large part at the state and local level. The Commission has said:

"Almost every recommendation in this report is a recommendation to state or local governments, the governments that by and large administer criminal justice in America."

The kind of leadership to which I have referred—the moral guidance and intellectual suasion to get things done—will be necessary on the part of bar associations, individual lawyers, and citizen leaders to urge legislatures and courts to adopt these standards and to implement these recommendations.

As I earlier said, the American Bar Association has made the war on crime the primary thrust of our program for the current year, and I have appointed a Special Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, whose mandate is to guide the efforts of the Association in this struggle and to stimulate state and local bar associations to like endeavors.

Part of our work on a national scale includes the backing of appropriate federal legislation. We have given, and continue to give, our enthusiastic and active support to the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, the Firearms Control Act, the legislation to combat juvenile delinquency, all of which were recommended in principle by the Crime Commission. It has been a source of deep concern to our Association that this legislation is still languishing in the lap of the Congress and we sincerely hope that action will be taken shortly after Congress reconvenes.

As to the latter part of our committee's mandate, we have initiated two projects which should encourage state and local bar associations throughout the nation to increase their efforts in the crime field.

I have written to the president of every state bar association and this week will write to every large local bar association, telling them of the current ABA program and urging them, if they have not already done so, to make the attack on crime one of the

major phases of their activity. Your State Bar has already embarked upon a challenging program. Congressman Fascell recently included in the Congressional Record a copy of Bill Simmons' November President's Page from your Bar Journal in which Bill tells of the Florida Bar's Special Committee on Crime Control and of the like committee that has been appointed by the Dade County Bar Association. My heartiest congratulations to both Associations on getting underway and all of us will watch your accomplishments with interest.

In examining recent applications for the ABA Award of Merit, given to bar associations for outstanding activities, we found that several included programs in the crime field. We are now compiling a résumé of those activities to be sent to bar associations in an attempt to show them what can be accomplished at the local and state level. For instance, this conference that you are holding today, a similar conference sponsored by the State Bar of Michigan, and a Wichita Bar Association project to provide lawyers as lecturers in schools on such subjects as destruction of school property and the unlawful operation of automobiles are all excellent examples of the kind of constructive activity in which bar associations can engage.

Let there be no mistake about the fact that crime surrounds and plagues us no matter where we live and that nowhere is there room for complacency. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports, the crime rate in Florida in 1966, as compared to states with similar population, is higher than the crime rate in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Indiana and North Carolina; and Dade County had a higher crime rate than Atlanta, Dallas, Kansas City and Seattle. As a matter of fact, the crime rate in the Miami area was higher than that of several larger cities, such as Chicago, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. Just as none of us are immune to crime, none of us can avoid the obligation to attack lawlessness in every possible way.

While there is much that lawyers and the organized bar can and should do to improve the administration of justice, it is abundantly clear that neither the bar nor the police nor any other segment of the citizenry can alone provide the solutions. An aroused public, willing and able to take the steps necessary to prevent and control crime, is essential to the task. The responsibility for action lies with every citizen.

The Justice Department's current campaign to remind drivers to lock their cars and take their ignition keys with them; the effort in some cities to better understand the problems and functions of law enforcement agencies; the attempt in other cities to organize citizen anti-crime crusades—these are but a few of the simple, yet effective, ways in which all of us, as citizens, can participate in the attack on crime.

If we all join in this crusade against crime, we are limited only by the Atlanta, Dallas, Kansas City and Seattle. As a matter of fact, the crime rate in the Miami area was higher than that of several larger cities, such as Chicago, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. Just as none of us are immune to crime, none of us can avoid the obligation to attack lawlessness in every possible way.

While there is much that lawyers and the organized bar can and should do to improve the administration of justice, it is abundantly clear that neither the bar nor the police nor any other segment of the citizenry can alone provide the solutions. An aroused public, willing and able to take the steps necessary to prevent and control crime, is essential to the task. The responsibility for action lies with every citizen.

The Justice Department's current campaign to remind drivers to lock their cars and take their ignition keys with them; the effort in some cities to better understand the

problems and functions of law enforcement agencies; the attempt in other cities to organize citizen anti-crime crusades—these are but a few of the simple, yet effective, ways in which all of us, as citizens, can participate in the attack on crime.

If we all join in this crusade against crime, we are limited only by the breadth of our talents, the scope of our abilities, and the extent of our determination—and conferences such as this in which you are engaged today are an encouraging beginning toward what we must do. The test of effective action, however, is "where you go from here." I sincerely hope that there will be a vigorous and meaningful "follow-up" to this most auspicious start. The Crime Commission has said:

"Controlling crime in America is an endeavor that will be slow and hard and costly. But America can control crime if it will."

Let our response to this challenge be worthy of the depth of the problem and of the urgency of its solution.

HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the United Nations and President Johnson have designated this year as the "International Human Rights Year." While the United States has ratified the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, four more conventions, that establish universal minimum standards of human rights, remain for approval by our Nation. These conventions seek nothing for the whole of the peoples of the world that is not already the birthright of every U.S. citizen, and their ratification would not require any implementing legislation but would simply represent an affirmation of our genuine desire to universalize those rights which now exist in our land.

The observance of these conventions in other parts of the world would contribute significantly to the sum total of human freedom. We should have been among the first to approve these international provisions for human dignity, especially since our own Declaration of Independence proclaims "certain unalienable rights" as the heritage of "all men." The moral strength of this Nation as a world leader is bound up in our support for the rights and freedoms of other peoples. It is, therefore, in our own interest to support the ratification of the remaining human rights conventions. President Kennedy stated in his message submitting these treaties for approval in 1963:

The day-to-day unfolding of events makes it even clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the peoples of other nations.

President Kennedy believed devoutly that human rights and peace are intimately related and historically interdependent. He stated this relationship so very well in his magnificent American University speech when he asked:

And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights?

The ratification of the human rights conventions in this year would help to strengthen the United Nations and would be a significant step toward making world peace a reality.

As recently as this past October, President Johnson reminded us that "American ratification of these conventions is long overdue." In an address then, he pointed to his hope in proclaiming 1968 to be "Human Rights Year" by saying:

It is my continuing hope that the United States Senate will ratify these Conventions. This would present the world with another testament to our Nation's abiding belief in the inherent dignity and worth of the individual person. It would speak again of the highest ideals of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that President Johnson's and President Kennedy's desires will become the hope of all the citizens of the world in this International Year of Human Rights. I believe that our support of these conventions is a necessary contribution to the hopes of mankind and to the peace of the world. I will have President Kennedy's letter of July 22, 1963, requesting ratification of three of the human rights conventions, printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks, along with President Johnson's proclamation of October 11, 1967, designating this the "Human Rights Year."

Today, I am cosponsoring a resolution in order to express the sense of the House of Representatives on the importance of U.S. ratification of these human rights conventions during International Human Rights Year. I hope that my colleagues in the House will give serious attention to this important matter.

The letters referred to follow:

[Office of the White House Press Secretary,
July 22, 1963]

The White House made public today the following letter from the President of the Senate:

JULY 22, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have today transmitted to the Senate three conventions with a view to receiving advice and consent to ratification. These are:

1. The Supplementary Convention to the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, prepared under the direction of the United Nations in 1956, to which 49 nations are now parties.

2. The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor, adopted by the International Labor Organization in 1957, to which 60 nations are now parties.

3. The Convention on the Political Rights of Women, opened for signature by the United Nations in 1953, to which 39 nations are now parties.

United States law is, of course, already in conformity with these conventions, and ratification would not require any change in our domestic legislation. However, the fact that our Constitution already assures us of these rights does not entitle us to stand aloof from documents which project our own heritage on an international scale. The day-to-day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the peoples of other nations.

These conventions deal with human rights which may not yet be secure in other countries; they have provided models for the drafters of constitutions and laws in newly independent nations; and they have influenced the policies of governments preparing to accede to them. Thus, they involve current problems in many countries.

They will stand as a sharp reminder of world opinion to all who may seek to violate the human rights they define. They also serve as a continuous commitment to respect these rights. There is no society so advanced that it no longer needs periodic recommitment to human rights.

The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny. Accordingly, I desire, with the constitutional consent of the Senate to ratify these Conventions for the United States of America.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

"HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK AND HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR"—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The year 1968 will mark the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations—an historic document of freedom that expresses man's deepest beliefs about the rights that every human being is born with, and that no government is entitled to deny.

The United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year. It has invited its members to intensify their domestic efforts to realize the aims of the Declaration.

Every American should remember, with pride and gratitude, that much of the leadership in the drafting and adoption of the Declaration came from a great American, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. She was our first representative on the UN Commission on Human Rights.

Today, October 11, would have been her 83rd birthday. With the inspiration of her humanitarian concern still before us, I call the attention of our people to the Declaration she helped to author.

To Americans, the rights embodied in the Declaration are familiar, but to many other people, in other lands, they are rights never enjoyed and only recently even aspired to.

The adoption of the Declaration by the United Nations established a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations. These principles were incorporated into Human Rights Conventions, to be ratified by the individual nations.

American ratification of these Conventions is long overdue. The principles they embody are part of our own national heritage. The rights and freedoms they proclaim are those which America has defended—and fights to defend—around the world.

It is my continuing hope that the United States Senate will ratify these conventions. This would present the world with another testament to our Nation's abiding belief in the inherent dignity and worth of the individual person. It would speak again of the highest ideals of America.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, in honor of the ratification of the American Bill of Rights, December 15, 1791, and in honor of the adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948, do hereby proclaim the week of December 10 through 17, 1967, to be Human Rights Week and the year 1968 to be Human Rights Year. In so doing, I call upon all Americans and upon all Government agencies—federal, state and local—to use this occasion to deepen our commitment to the defense of human rights and to strengthen

our efforts for their full and effective realization both among our own people and among all the peoples of the United Nations.

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

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SIGNS INTO LAW THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during the recess period I had the honor of attending signing ceremonies at the White House when President Johnson signed into law an act prohibiting age discrimination in employment.

As the House sponsor of this important legislation, I agree with the President that:

Although there are now 52 million Americans between the ages of 40 and 64, half of all jobs were closed to workers over 55, and one-fourth of all jobs were closed to workers over 45.

Obviously, such statistics demonstrate the waste of valuable human resources and cruel and senseless discrimination against potential wage earners who are fully capable of long years of productive service to American industry.

This legislation will give these men and women a fair chance to be productive and useful citizens. As the President noted:

When improper age discrimination does occur, the act requires conciliation and persuasion. If voluntary compliance cannot be arranged, it permits court action. The act also calls for research and education to melt the misinformation and unconscious bias toward older workers that still exists today.

This act, in the President's words, "gives the vital part of our labor force between 40 and 65 a better chance to go on working productively and gainfully. The country will gain as well—from making better use of their skills and experience."

I include in the RECORD the text of the President's remarks at the signing of S. 830:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING S. 830, AN ACT PROHIBITING AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

During my four years in the Presidency, I have fought discrimination in employment in all of its ugly forms with every power of my office.

In 1963, Congress passed the Equal Pay Act, prohibiting wage discrimination on the basis of sex for workers covered by federal minimum wage standards.

A year later, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed job discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

That historic act also directed the Secretary of Labor to study another problem of employment discrimination—one which had

long been ignored, and about which little was known. It was the noxious practice of discrimination because of age.

The report of Secretary of Labor showed that, although there are now 52 million Americans between the ages of 40 and 64, half of all jobs were closed to workers over 55, and one-fourth of all jobs were closed to workers over 45.

It showed that workers 45 years old and older made up half of this country's long term unemployed, and over one-fourth of all the unemployed.

It showed that, of the billion dollars in unemployment insurance paid out each year, three-fourths went to workers 45 or over.

It showed that, although Americans are now living longer and enjoying better health than ever before, older workers were often barred from jobs that could be performed efficiently by workers of any age.

Those figures added up to a senseless and costly waste of human talents and energy. They showed that men and women who needed to work—who wanted to work—and who were able to work, were not being given a fair chance to work.

The need for national action was clear. In my message to Congress in January of this very year, I recommended the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. Yesterday I signed that Act.

Its basic purpose is to outlaw discrimination in employment against persons 40 to 65 years of age. It makes proper allowance for cases where age is a bona fide qualification for employment.

This act does not compel employers and labor unions and employment agencies to choose a person aged 40 to 65 over another person. It does require that one simple question be answered fairly:

Who has the best qualifications for the job?

When improper age discrimination does occur, the act requires conciliation and persuasion. If voluntary compliance cannot be arranged, it permits court action. The act also calls for research and education to melt the misinformation and unconscious bias toward older workers that still exist today.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 gives the vital part of our labor force between 40 and 65 a better chance to go on working productively and gainfully. The country will gain as well—from making better use of their skills and experience.

This is humane and practical legislation. The Congress acted wisely in passing it and I am proud to sign it.

This measure joins more than 50 other humane legislative proposals written into law during the first session of the 90th Congress.

THE HELPING HAND CLUB

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there are in existence, throughout our entire country, many well-known service organizations that do an excellent job in assisting those persons who, for some reason, are unable to help themselves. We hear a great deal about those organizations which are nationwide organizations, but I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues one such group that operates in my State of Alabama.

The Helping Hand Club of Anniston

was formed on May 4, 1953, and since that time has assisted numerous persons who have had unfortunate circumstances.

The action of the Helping Hand Club in assisting an Anniston resident, who was recently wounded by a sniper, is indicative of the type of work this group does. An Anniston radio, WDNB, recently carried an editorial pointing out the work of the Helping Hand Club in assisting Mr. Donald Greenwood. I would like to include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

WDNB RADIO EDITORIAL, DECEMBER 20, 1967

When Willie Brewster was murdered two and a half years ago, the citizens of Anniston were aroused and angered. And rightly so. Willie Brewster was a Negro, and his killer was white. Over \$20,000 was raised as a reward to apprehend the victim's killer. It was a noble and good thing to do.

But something happened a little over a month ago that so closely parallels the Brewster case, it cannot be ignored. On November 18, Donald Greenwood was shot in the back of the neck.

What's the connection? Well, both of the victims were shot in the back—a cowardly thing anyway you look at it. Brewster was in critical condition for several days and then died. Greenwood was in critical condition for over a week, and will live, but is expected to be paralyzed from the neck down for the rest of his life. Greenwood is white. His alleged attacker is Negro.

We do not here state that citizens should rush to Greenwood's aid simply because he was attacked by a Negro. On the contrary, we are sure our Negro citizens are just as appalled as are we. When a fellow human being is struck down in this uncivilized manner, it should arouse all of us, whether the victim is white, black or yellow, or regardless of what is the race of his attacker.

The Helping Hand Club of Anniston is trying to help young Greenwood. Some \$1,200 has been raised in the past three weeks. Donald Greenwood is only 24 years old. He had no insurance. He has a wife and two small children. He is in Stringfellow Memorial Hospital and requires around the clock nurses. He needs our help, and we should give it to him.

PROPOSED BILL ON NATURAL GAS PIPELINES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that during this session the House will pass legislation requiring stringent safety regulations over natural gas pipelines, an area of deep concern to me and many others.

There are two major pipelines in Middlesex County, N.J., and three others in northern New Jersey. In addition to these and others, applications were filed last year to build a new 42-inch natural gas line from North Brunswick through East Brunswick, Sayreville, Madison Township, to the Raritan Bay. This project concerns me very much.

Presently, the Federal Power Commission has powers over safety standards,

but it is evident to me that these standards are not adequate. Therefore, I am joining several of my colleagues in co-sponsoring a bill that would provide the U.S. Department of Transportation with authority over natural gas pipelines.

This proposal would vest powers in the Department of Transportation Secretary applicable to the "design, installation, inspection, testing, construction, extension, operation, replacement, and maintenance" of gas pipelines.

It would provide criminal penalties of \$5,000 or 1 year in jail for a knowing violation of gas safety regulations, with punishment increased if death or bodily injury results.

I hope that such a proposal would "tighten up" legislation now before the House Judiciary Committee by requiring the Department of Transportation to hold full hearings before prescribed regulations could be waived.

Under other legislation being considered, the Department of Transportation Secretary could provide for waiver without this extra safeguard, possibly opening the door to a rule of exception.

Mr. Speaker, I well remember the natural gas pipeline explosion in Louisiana in 1965, when 17 persons were killed. If this legislation is passed, similar disasters could be prevented.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—A LEADER FOR ALL OCCASIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Max Lerner, the well-known columnist and critic, has caught the essence of Lyndon Johnson's leadership in a recent article published in the Boston Herald Traveler.

Lerner describes the President in a series of impressive roles journeying around the world—"as a mourner for a friend who had been Prime Minister; as the head of a pacific power conferring with Asian heads of state; as a father come to hearten and sustain his soldier sons in Vietnam; as a Christian conferring with the Pope in Rome on ways to bring peace; as an enlightening traveler giving imaginative visual reality to America's global burdens and duties."

Here is the essence of the President in the many duties which he must perform.

And here is the impressive dimension of his performance. He has carried out these multiple and burdensome roles with vigor, imagination, drive, commitment, and success.

No one can doubt—whatever his party—that we have a full-time President in the White House, a man who devotes the totality of his mind and body to the service of his country.

Lyndon B. Johnson has shown—and continues to show us and the world—that he is a leader for all occasions. He knows the burdens of leadership and he

is willing to carry them. But he knows they cannot be borne alone. He must have the people with him.

I submit that many of President Johnson's most recent decisions—from restriction on American investment abroad, to standing a middle course in the Vietnam war, to his fight for the American consumer—are the hallmark of a man who is not afraid to make the hard decisions, the unpopular decisions, the unpalatable decisions of State.

Let us remember when we begin to evaluate our President and his future opponents, that a man shows us his real qualities in the way he makes the tough decisions—not in the way he makes the easy ones.

For myself, I am proud that we have a President who is not afraid to act on behalf of what he believes to be the best interests of America and the best interests of free people throughout the world.

I insert in the RECORD a Max Lerner article on the President entitled "Johnson Performance Impressive":

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Jan. 2, 1968]

JOHNSON PERFORMANCE IMPRESSIVE

(By Max Lerner)

WASHINGTON.—At the year's turning, Lyndon Johnson has ended it not with a whimper but with a bang—with a performance, from Melbourne to Korat to Cam Ranh to Karachi to Rome to Washington, impressive for sheer political virtuosity.

Here was the President in an impressive succession of roles; as a mourner for a friend who had been prime minister; as the head of a Pacific power conferring with Asian heads of state; as a father come to hearten and sustain his soldier-sons in Vietnam; as a Christian conferring with the Pope in Rome on ways to bring peace; as an enlightening traveler giving imaginative visual reality to America's global burdens and duties.

This was Mr. Johnson as virtuoso, a political man showing himself to advantage as a contemporary leader. Who can doubt that he was campaigning, too? Campaigning in a double sense: to overcome the spreading doubts about the war and to present a united front to the world; and to counter the dump-Johnson movement inside the Democratic Party. I suspect that Sen. Eugene McCarthy has discovered to his dismay just how formidable a campaigner Mr. Johnson can be while he is discharging his day-to-day functions as President.

Doubtless much of this is due to the nature of the Presidency and the resources it commands. "Go fight city hall," the East Side immigrants used to say. "Go fight the White House" might be the present despairing cry of the President's enemies in both parties. Yet while Mr. Johnson has the Presidency as his weapon, which of his opponents today could use it with the lethal skill he has shown? A man must eat and drink and sleep as a political tactician; he must dream tactics, to be able to turn an accidental event (like the memorial services at Melbourne) to his purposes.

I am not denying the sincerity of Mr. Johnson's grief at Prime Minister Holt's death, nor of his wish to visit the soldiers in Vietnam, nor of his desire to talk peace with the Pope. I merely point out how artfully the pieces of his sincerity fit together into an overall pattern that makes his domestic position and his world standing somewhat more secure after the trip than before it. There lies the great art of being a political man.

From whatever angle you view him, this is one of the most complex men ever to have

occupied the presidential chair. You think you have him figured, and suddenly you find how wrong you were. You think he is through, and you write off his chances of getting reelected, and back he pops as the most formidable figure of all the candidates in both parties.

In his basic domestic thinking he is a traditional Democratic liberal, with a liberalism very much like that of Harry Truman, going back to the source from which both of them have taken it—Franklin Roosevelt. It is a bread-and-butter, housing-and-education liberalism. One thinks of Maury Maverick's definition of liberalism: "freedom plus groceries." That was the theme to which he kept returning in his TV conversation at the White House. He will use it in his 1968 campaign, just as Mr. Truman used it 20 years earlier in the 1948 campaign. He hasn't refurbished it much, except for applying it to the anti-poverty and civil rights causes and some extra emphasis on the education breakthrough. It isn't a sophisticated liberalism, as witness his belief that the Negro-white hatreds will yield to the creation of more jobs in the ghettos.

In his foreign policy he has marked time on Europe, made mistakes on Latin America which he later corrected, continued the basic Kennedy position on trying for agreements on nuclear weapons—and put all his political stakes on his decision on the Vietnamese war. It was a decision with a high calculated risk. Personally he has stuck it out, but whether the war will prove politically disastrous to him depends on how it goes in the next 10 months, and that, in turn, depends on whether he can heal the deep war split inside America and persuade the nation to stick it out.

He has at least a few things going for him. One is the boomerang effect of some of the excessive hate-Johnson exhibitions. A second is the underdog support he is getting from Dwight Eisenhower on the war. Another is the growth of mood in the nation, which will give Mr. Johnson the middle-ground position for which he has always maneuvered.

Above all there is the fact of his being a knowledgeable skillful political man who knows what he wants and is unlikely to be turned aside from it by anyone in sight today, whether Democrat or Republican.

PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE RELIEF OF LT. COMDR. ARNHEITER AND CAPT. RICHARD G. ALEXANDER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, On November 20, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Capt. R. G. Alexander, commanding officer of the battleship *New Jersey*, to the Secretary of the Navy on behalf of Lt. Comdr. Marcus A. Arnheiter, a career naval officer who was relieved of his command of a warship on active duty, in a highly unorthodox manner.

Captain Alexander had followed the Arnheiter case closely and after reviewing the background he concluded that a full investigation was warranted. He

urged the Secretary of the Navy to conduct such a review.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Alexander has a distinguished record as a qualified and dedicated naval officer.

I was shocked last week to read in the newspaper that Captain Alexander had suddenly and unexplainedly been relieved of his command of the U.S.S. *New Jersey* and had been reassigned to an obscure desk job in Boston, Mass.

Mr. Speaker, if the Navy's arrogance in the Arnheiter case is disturbing, its unexplained firing of Captain Alexander is an appalling insult to the American people.

I am today introducing a resolution proposing the creation of a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the relief of Lt. Comdr. Marcus Arnheiter and Capt. Richard G. Alexander. I hope that my distinguished colleagues will join me in support of this resolution:

H. Res. 1019

Whereas Captain Richard G. Alexander has established a distinguished record as highly qualified and dedicated officer in the United States Navy; and the Navy recognized Captain Alexander's ability by naming him Commanding Officer of the battleship United States ship *New Jersey*; and

Whereas Captain Alexander out of a sense of duty and conscience publicly rallied to the defense of a fellow officer Lieutenant Commander Marcus A. Arnheiter, whom he felt has been unfairly treated by the Navy, and at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, presented his opinions on the Arnheiter case, preparing a detailed brief requesting justice for his fellow officer; and

Whereas Captain Alexander presented his views to the Secretary of the Navy only after being invited by the Secretary to do so; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy was so interested in having Captain Alexander's opinion that he went so far as to send his own plane to bring Captain Alexander to Washington; and

Whereas, as a direct result of his speaking out, Captain Alexander was shortly thereafter summoned again to Washington and relieved of his command of the United States ship *New Jersey*; and

Whereas the Navy has refused to provide either a fair and objective hearing for Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter; or any explanation for Captain Alexander's peremptory dismissal; and

Whereas the Navy appears determined to punish and silence all who dare to disagree with its decisions, no matter how unjust they may be; and

Whereas these arrogant actions are a stain on the honor of the Navy and a threat to the morale of its officers, while at the same time terminating the useful careers of two distinguished young officers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts and circumstances leading up to the relief on March 31, 1966, of Lieutenant Commander Marcus A. Arnheiter, from the command of the United States ship *Vance*, and the relief on January 5, 1968, of Captain Richard G. Alexander from the command of the United States ship *New Jersey*, in order to determine whether

justice was done to both officers, and to insure that a complete report is made to the American people.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the District of Columbia, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), until January 24, 1968, on account of official business.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through January 31, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), through January 24, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MEEDS (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29 on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McCLURE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), through January 29, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), through February 9, on account of official business.

Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), through January 22, on account of official business.

Mr. CEDERBERG (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), until February 2, 1968, on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through January 24, on account of official business.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through January 19, on account of official business.

Mr. GROVER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the period January 15, 1968, through January 22, 1968, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the period January 15, 1968, through January 22, 1968, 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. REUSS, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLSEN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. REUSS in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KARSTEN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. MIZE in two instances.

Mr. LAIRD in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. RUMSFELD in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK in five instances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. TENZER in five instances.

Mr. PHILBIN in four instances.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1292. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of factors for use in apportioning funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(b)5, title 23, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 199); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1293. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, transmitting the annual report on the policies and operations of the Council covering the period July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967 (H. Doc. No. 200); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting the text of ILO Recommendation No. 126 concerning the vocational training of fishermen adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 50th session, at Geneva on June 21, 1966, also the texts of ILO Convention No. 125 concerning fishermen's certificates of competency and ILO Convention No. 126 concerning accommodations on board fishing vessels (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

1295. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1967, for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered printed.

1296. A letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D.C., transmitting the proceedings of the 49th annual national convention, held in Boston, Mass., on August 29-31, 1967 (H. Doc. No. 203); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1297. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements for the use of foreign currencies for the months of November and December 1967, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1298. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of exemplary rehabilitation certificates for the calendar year 1967, pursuant to Public Law 89-690 to the Committee on Armed Services.

1299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-540; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), Blackhawk-Kickapoo, Wis., Cross Creek, Kans., Garrison Creek, Okla., Mustang Creek, Calif., Old Town Creek, Ala., and Tesnatee Creek, Ga., each plan involves a structure which provides not more than 4,000 acres-

feet of total capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), Cahulga Creek, Ala., Cameron-Creole, La., Central Madison, La., Elk Twomile Creek, W. Va., West Fork Bayou Lacassine, La., and West Fork Mayfield Creek, Ky., each plan involves a structure which provides not more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1302. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to 45 Stat. 1222, 16 U.S.C. 715b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1303. A letter from the Deputy Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of research facilities, grants executed and disbursements for the fiscal year 1967, pursuant to Public Law 88-74; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1304. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the 17th annual report of the Director for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1305. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the grade of major, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1967, pursuant to section 301(g) of title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1306. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of the number of officers above the grade of lieutenant commander, or equivalent, entitled to receive incentive pay for flight duty, and the average monthly incentive pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to the provisions of section 301(g) of title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1307. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of construction projects required to accommodate the relocation of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve aviation activities from the obsolescent Naval Air Station, Grosse Isle, Mich., pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and pursuant to authority delegated to me by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1308. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installation and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July-October 1967, pursuant to the provisions of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1309. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the statistical supplement to the 1966 Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1310. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1967, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1311. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued from September through November 1967 in connection with exports to Yugoslavia and to Hungary, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967 and to the Presidential De-

termination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1312. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 24th semiannual report for the period ending June 30, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of disposals of foreign excess property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to Public Law 81-152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1314. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report of the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1315. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1967, Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, pursuant to (38 U.S.C. 4207); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1316. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on need to improve internal audit in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1317. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on possible savings available by sending men to Near East Armed Forces examining and entrance station, Selective Service System; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1318. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on reduction of heating costs at military bases available through conversion of manually operated furnaces, Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1319. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on need for improved procedures to minimize overpayments of non-service-connected disability and death pensions, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1320. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on significant savings possible if rural mail carriers use Government instead of personal vehicles, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1321. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of loans to grazing associations, Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1322. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of more effective Federal action needed to meet urban renewal rehabilitation objectives in Cleveland, Ohio, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1323. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunity for savings by consolidating photographic operations at the John F. Kennedy Space Center and the Air Force Eastern Test Range, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1324. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunity for economies under guardianship program, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1325. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunities for American-flag ship operators to use U.S.-owned excess foreign currencies and the effect on the balance

of payments and budget deficits, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1326. A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, transmitting the Annual Report of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 28 Stat. 603; to the Committee on House Administration.

1327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 11th annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to 70 Stat. 105; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1328. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Majestic Hotel Co., Hot Springs National Park, Ark., for the period January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1972, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1329. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with J. Dolman Robinson and Helen B. Robinson to continue to operate the Rainbow Forest Lodge in Petrified Forest National Park, Ariz., for the period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1977, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Mrs. Louise M. Bertschy to continue to operate the Triangle X Ranch for the public in Grand Teton National Park from January 1 through December 31, 1968, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1331. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 22d annual report of operations under the Federal Airport Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1332. A letter from the Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of the Program Review Committee for the Nurse Training Act of 1964, pursuant to title VIII of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1333. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year 1967; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1334. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report showing information on the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, financial statements of proceeds derived from licenses issued by the authority of the Federal Power Act, and the names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission during the same period, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1335. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of October 31, 1961, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1336. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1337. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of positions allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 in the Leg-

islative Reference Service, pursuant to the provisions of section 5114 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1338. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report concerning scientific or professional positions in the Department, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 3104; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1339. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report with respect to scientific and professional positions in the Library of Congress, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3104(c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1340. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report indicating that no positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 were allocated to or placed during the 1967 calendar year, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1341. A letter from the Director of Personnel, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of scientific and professional positions established, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3104(c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1342. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Jupiter Inlet, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, it is also in response to a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, adopted November 8, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1343. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 25, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

1344. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Economic Development Administration for the year 1967, pursuant to Public Law 89-136; to the Committee on Public Works.

1345. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 34th annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Public Works.

1346. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), Brown's Creek, S.C., Cane Creek, N.C. and S.C., Chunky River, Miss., Fourche Creek, Ark. and Mo., and Little Walnut Creek, Ind., each plan involving a structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity; to the Committee on Public Works.

1347. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), Browns Creek, Miss., Fitzgerald and Soldier Creeks, Okla., Harquahala Valley, Ariz., lower Elk River, Kans., Nezinscot River, Maine, Okfuskee tributaries, Oklahoma, Silver Creek, Miss., and upper Elk River, Kans., each plan involving a structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity; to the Committee on Public Works.

1348. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report of the Inde-

pent Study Board, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-136; to the Committee on Public Works.

1349. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases of aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (1) (28) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1350. A letter from the executive officer, St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, transmitting their final report pursuant to 79 Stat. 1129; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1351. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims settled and not settled arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Wichita, Kans., on January 16, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1352. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report concerning claims settled during fiscal year 1967 under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 241(e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1353. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting the printed proceedings of the 86th annual national encampment of the national organization, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, held in Chicago, Ill., August 6-10, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-605; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1354. A letter from the treasurer, American Historical Association, transmitting an examination of the accounts of the association for the year ending August 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1355. A letter from the board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1356. A letter from the honorary executive director, National Conference on Citizenship, transmitting the audit of the accounts of the National Council on Citizenship for the fiscal year July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1357. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement exhibiting the several sums drawn, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

1358. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on matters contained in the Helium Act for the fiscal year 1967, pursuant to Public Law 86-777; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1359. A letter from the General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of disposition of excess foreign property during fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1360. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the 12th annual report for the year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-870; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

House Report No. 1051. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Committee on Defense Production. The 17th annual report of the activities of the Committee on Defense Production (Rept. No. 1052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 90th Congress, first session (Rept. No. 1053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14594. A bill to provide for Federal and State cooperation in the inspection of poultry and fish products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 14595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase monthly benefits (with subsequent cost-of-living increases), to provide higher widow's benefits, to provide benefits for dependent parents, to permit the payment of benefits to married couples on their combined earnings records, to permit the exemption from coverage of services performed after attaining age 65, to eliminate the new restrictive definition of disability, to raise the wage base, and to otherwise extend and improve the OASDI system; to amend title XVIII of such act to provide coverage for certain drug expenses under the SMI programs; and to amend title IV and XIX of such act to eliminate certain restrictions and limitations added in 1967 to the AFDC and medical assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14596. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide for increase in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 14597. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14598. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States, and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto, and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 14599. A bill to prohibit the redemption in gold of any obligations of the United States for, and to prohibit the sale of any gold of the United States, to any nation which is indebted to the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 14600. A bill to encourage national development by providing incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial facilities in rural areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 14601. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of rice farm acreage allotments and rice producer allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 14602. A bill to eliminate certain limitations and restrictions (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1967) relating to aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act and medical assistance under title IX of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14603. A bill to amend title XV of the Social Security Act with respect to the assignment of wages for purposes of unemployment compensation for Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14604. A bill to repeal section 1511(f) of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of ex-servicemen for unemployment compensation their terminal leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14605. A bill to create in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Ecological Advisers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 14606. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 14607. A bill to establish the Travel Incentive Act of 1968; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 14608. A bill to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14609. A bill to eliminate certain limitations and restrictions (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1967) relating to aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act and medical assistance under title IX of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14610. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the mandatory separation from Government service of all officers and employees thereof at the age of 70 years; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 14611. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 607. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the issuance of currency of the United States depicting the Mount Rushmore National Memorial; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Con. Res. 608. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of France to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H. Con. Res. 609. Concurrent resolution to resolve the indebtedness of France to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H. Con. Res. 610. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States and the political entities

thereof should adopt "911" as the uniform, single, nationwide, emergency telephone number; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 611. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the 5-day period beginning August 12, 1968, as All American Amateur Baseball Association Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 1016. Resolution to provide further funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 34; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Res. 1017. Resolution to express the sense of the House concerning a means toward achieving a stable and durable peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 1018. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Res. 1019. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the relief of Lt. Comdr. Marcus Arnheiter and Capt. Richard G. Alexander; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. TENZER (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. REES, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, and Mr. RYAN):

H. Res. 1020. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the conventions on genocide, abolition of forced labor, political rights of women, and freedom of association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Res. 1021. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the conventions on genocide, abolition of forced labor, political rights of women, and freedom of association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

298. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a proposed amendment to the Federal Air Quality Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

299. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the proposal to cut back by 25 percent on reimbursement to the States by the Federal Government for welfare costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

300. By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to instruct and direct the Treasury Department of the United States to issue a series of bills in any denomination of the currency of the United States depicting the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, "The Shrine of Democracy," thereon; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14612. A bill for the relief of Laurel Ho Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 14613. A bill for the relief of Sara Laredo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14614. A bill for the relief of Angela Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 14615. A bill for the relief of Onofrio Saia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 14616. A bill for the relief of Sahara Saka, Wahidollah Saka, and Wajma Saka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 14617. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 14618. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adriano A. Agana and Consuelo R. Agana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14619. A bill for the relief of Jura J. Mikan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14620. A bill for the relief of Mariano Acasio Juan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 14621. A bill for the relief of Michael De Marcken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14622. A bill for the relief of Miklos Kohary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14623. A bill for the relief of Miss Carmen S. Carino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 14624. A bill for the relief of Kalender Arslan; 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:

217. By the Speaker: Petition of United Brick & Clay Workers of America, Chicago, Ill., relative to better housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

218. Also, petition of United Brick & Clay Workers of America, Chicago, Ill., relative to the expansion and stepup of school buildings and other facilities for the education and training of our youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

219. Also, petition of the Honorable Jeanette Rankin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

220. Also, petition of the Association of Cities, Towns and Villages in Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa, relative to return of administrative rights over Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

221. Also, petition of Jad Michael Wakileh, Amman, Jordan, relative to a claim for compensation due as an employee of AID; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

222. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the composition of the Congressional Record during the first session of the 90th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

223. Also, petition of City Council of Worcester, Mass., relative to the allocation of funds for the University of Massachusetts Medical School; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

224. Also, petition of Bay Area Air Pollution Control District, San Francisco, Calif., relative to a provision in the Air Quality Act of 1967; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

225. Also, petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to the proper recognition of George Washington's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

226. Also, petition of John P. Parkinson, Newark, Calif., relative to prohibiting privately owned automobiles from operating on certain roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Imports

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic industries in America is the steel industry. This industry has attracted over the years some of the finest men in our country and they have continuously challenged the industry to not be complacent but to move ahead, and by research and development have supplied highly sophisticated new steels for new uses which are so vital for our national growth and security.

This industry, however, has been faced with a threat from without—namely, imports—and Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., has pointed up the problem which faces this great American industry. I recommend Mr. Blough's thought-provoking speech to all Americans:

IMPORTS: THE WORD AND THE DEED

(An address by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp., in acceptance of the "Industrialist of the Year" Award at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Industrial Realtors, Washington, D.C., November 13, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, I am indebted to you for everything you have said. In light of some of my past experiences in this city, I hope you know how refreshing it is for me to hear some agreeable words. In times past I have received invitations to come to Washington—under a variety of circumstances. Being on the receiving end in this town is not new to me, but seldom has it been in connection with such a gratifying and unusual award as this one. Please accept my sincere thanks—and my wife thanks you also.

I remember noticing a number of years ago a cartoon in a New York newspaper depicting a middle-aged husband and wife in their bedroom. He had apparently just turned out the light on his side of the bed and turned over to go to sleep. Still sitting up on her side, she was saying, "George dear—I have something terribly important to tell you—but I think you'd better get a good night's sleep first."

I have something to tell you tonight which to me, at least, seems of considerable importance, and my concern is that you might just take the lady's advice and get a "good night's sleep," particularly when I tell you that I want to talk about international trade, giving special emphasis to the steel import problem.

I feel sure that the Society of Industrial Realtors is not very big in importing and exporting, and the reason is clear; real estate doesn't lend itself readily to being imported or exported. You cannot, for example, move the District of Columbia anytime or anywhere—it just doesn't budge. Or so it seems.

Nevertheless, I know that anyone who is interested in real estate is also interested in what creates its value, and that, of course, gets down to the economic utility to which it can be put. And I hope that means that you are as interested as any group in America in international trade and in new currents of thought concerning it.

I am sure it has not escaped your notice that the so-called "free traders," and the so-called "protectionists" seem to be engaged in a serious difference of opinion. I use the adjective "so-called" by way of registering a

note of caution, at the outset, that it will be unfortunate, in my opinion, if the debate tends to become too much an application of emotional labels, and too little a careful product by product analysis of precisely what is happening to our trade position in the international economy—what the problems are, what is causing them, what the consequences are to national security and the national economy, and what a basic concern for the American people suggests should be done about them.

Scarcely a day passes but there is a headline proclaiming how badly the United States will fare if the "protectionists" win. The label appears to apply to anyone and everyone who is currently supporting some one of the quota bills now before Congress, and the labeling is done almost as if the intent of supporters of these bills were to snuff out world trade completely.

Now several industries are supporting quota bills and among them is the steel industry. As we proceed I believe you can see for yourself that the steel quota bill certainly does not provide for closing out imports.

Let us accept the acknowledged advantages to all nations which can accrue from an enlightened pursuit of the theories of freedom in trade. But let us not follow such theories blindly—revering them as a gospel so sacrosanct as to permit of no qualification or deviation, whatever the emerging circumstances in the real world.

It is my hope that thinking people will agree that it would be fully as erroneous to fail to see the hazards in strict adherence to free trade theories for all products under all circumstances, as it would be unthinkingly to discard such theories and turn in full retreat toward a wall of "protectionism." Dedicated as we are to the theoretical advantage of freedom in trade, we are not, I hope, dedicated to it to the serious disadvantage of the American people and the security of the free world.

Can we, for example, be assured of the strong industrial base in steel we need for modern defense if one quarter or more of the steel we require were imported from countries lying uncomfortably close to the Soviet Union and China?

Or, to suppose a further example, if the general level of employment costs in the United States went suddenly so sky high that our manufactured products generally became non-competitive both in home and foreign markets, with obvious catastrophic results upon our trade balance, could we—even as committed free traders—abstain from protection in some form—at least until our wage costs and prices—or the value of our currency—were brought closer to equilibrium with our competitors in the world markets?

So my plea is that we try to avoid labels, and turn rather to a careful weighing of the facts, and that we react to the facts we uncover with as much foresight and as little emotion as possible.

In this vein, I should like to share with you the facts as I know them concerning the steel import problem.

If the communications efforts of the companies in the steel industry and its trade association, the American Iron and Steel Institute, have been at all successful, you should already be aware that steel imports are taking a large and increasing portion of the domestic steel market, and have already knocked the American steel industry out of most of the world markets in which it was once an important factor. Steel mill product imports have risen from 1.2 million tons in 1957 to 10.8 million in 1966, and they are still rising. Over the same period exports declined from 5.3 to 1.7 million tons. That makes a net adverse swing of over 13

million tons in the past decade. In terms of raw steel this 13 million tons represents about 15 per cent of this year's estimated national production.

Our own domestic market grew since 1957 by over 23 million tons, but foreign sources took over 40 per cent of the growth, and imports grew at an average annual rate of 27.7 per cent during the latter half of this period.

How far and how fast this increased penetration will continue, if nothing occurs to stop it is, of course, a matter of conjecture. We do know that both Europe and Japan have considerable capacity which is not in full use and they are still building more. They have shown no propensity to discontinue their practice of unloading whatever they can in our market. Trade papers and company literature from Japan have indicated plans approximately to double Japan's steel production capability by 1975, with some 30 to 40 million tons of raw steel available for export. Thus the longer run may bring increasing aggravation of the problem from external sources.

And the short run, that is to say, the coming year, contains the seeds of most uninviting possibilities. There are already indications that domestic customers are planning their hedge buying against the possibility of a strike in domestic steelmaking next August. Unless something can soon assure customers that there will be no strike of domestic steelmaking, the lower levels of domestic operations now prevailing will probably be transformed into higher levels at the same time that a sizable increase in imports is set in motion. Paradoxically, events of the coming year are likely to mask completely the problem of domestic steelmaking all the while it is becoming significantly worse. And import levels engendered by threats of strikes in the past have never declined to former levels after the threat passed.

You may ask, why and how did this situation come about? Any inquiry as to why domestic customers have been buying increasing quantities of foreign steel leads quickly, of course, to the fact that the prices of steel imports are significantly below the prices of domestic steelmakers—far enough below, in fact, that any discussion of the possibility that domestic prices might be generally reduced to the level of imports is in the realm of fantasy. The average difference between domestic and imported steel prices was more than twice the per ton income of the United States producers before taxes in 1966.

Consider your own business. If you were to make a practice of developing real estate and selling it at less than you had in it, you wouldn't be in business very long. There is no Merlin's magic which can be used to make such consequences vanish into thin air just because the business we're talking about is steelmaking.

The next logical question concerns whether this price disparity exists because the domestic industry is no longer a comparatively efficient industry. The fact of the matter is that available data as researched by Ewan Clague, the former Commissioner of Labor Statistics, indicate that average productivity in terms of output per man-hour is still higher in the United States than in any other steel producing nation of the world.

So there must be more to the story—and there is. As you will remember, in the wake of World War II, the United States shared both its technical competence and its capital broadly throughout the world, with special emphasis upon the rebuilding of the devastated economies in Europe and Japan. Relying mainly, to their credit, upon their own energy and resourcefulness and coupling that with the offered assistance, both areas made remarkable progress. Whether we like it or

not, their level of technological efficiency has gained on ours much faster than has the level of their employment costs—and that in a word is the kernel of the story.

Some recent analyses indicate that the Western Europeans now have a wage cost advantage in their steelmaking of around \$25 per ton and that the Japanese advantage is closer to \$40 per ton—and that is quite a difference when you're talking about a product which sells at an average of around \$175 per ton. Roughly steelworker employment costs in this country are \$40 a day compared with about \$10 in Japan for the same number of hours.

Meanwhile, disadvantages which foreign sources may have had in earlier years—such as higher costs for raw materials and capital equipment—have either largely disappeared or have become elements of advantage. Abundant new sources of ore delivered at low cost on new and much larger ocean carriers have changed the raw materials picture radically. And other nations are increasingly translating their growing technical competence into the manufacture and installation of their own-make production equipment at an installed cost which is highly advantageous to them because of the heavy influence of their lower wage costs. For example, the installed cost per ton of integrated steel capacity in the U.S. is estimated to be nearly 2½ times the Japanese cost. This kind of advantage contains the seeds of increasing trouble.

In these days of fast communication, new technological knowledge flows rapidly around the world. And in steelmaking, as distinct from coal mining or farming, for example, there are no natural conditions which impede the full transplantability of such technology. Moreover, many nations offer assorted inducements and encouragements to keep their own steel production capabilities moving forward. So the likelihood that we shall rapidly outpace the steelmaking efficiency or other major steel producing nations is not an early prospect, no matter how much money is devoted to research and new capital equipment. American steel companies are currently devoting well over \$2 billion per year to the effort, some of them increasing their long term debt to help finance it. But don't forget that to overcome a labor cost advantage of \$40 per ton would require our current man-hours per ton of 13 to be reduced to an unattainable 4.

Nor does it seem likely that employment costs abroad will increase at a sufficient pace to decrease our disadvantage in the foreseeable future. Percentage increases in wages abroad have, in some areas, admittedly been larger than they have here in recent years, but the percentages operate on such a small base that the gap in terms of dollars has not been narrowing. Japan is a case in point; their hourly employment costs have increased a full 100 per cent over the last decade in this country the percentage increase has been 44 percent—which sounds much smaller by comparison. Yet the dollar difference over the period, far from decreasing, has actually increased by 87 cents, and the spread in 1966 was \$3.55 per hour.

In what direction then should answers be sought, if not by asking Congress for some sort of "conservation"—to use the phrase of former Secretary of Commerce John Connor—of a portion of the domestic market for domestic competitors, so that our steel industry can generate the funds necessary to maintain its technological lead in serving an expanding economy.

The traditional answer of those committed to free trade is that the companies or industries affected adversely by low labor cost competition from abroad simply must suffer the consequences. They seem to conclude the answer is to let domestic production go by the board in favor of reliance on foreign sources.

There might be some reason for such an

answer, if the real world gave more evidence of total dedication to free trade theories than it now does. But in the case of steel, I know of no significant steel producing nation anywhere in the world which opens its own market freely to competitors from other nations or which does not materially infringe free trade concepts by the assistance which it gives its own steelmakers in order to help them sell abroad.

There might be value in such an answer if a continuing and adequate availability of the product from domestic sources were unimportant to the national economy and the national security. But in the case of steel, a domestic source second to none in quality and quantity surely is important. I know of no other nation of consequence in the world which does not consider its steel industry to be of great importance to its economy and its security.

There might even be some reason for such an answer, if the industry involved were simply less efficient than its foreign competitors or less proficient in research. But in the case of steel, that charge can neither properly be made nor justified. This is not an industry hurting because of inevitable change as in the case of buggy whips. It is not the absence of new products. Recently our company alone has produced a new or improved product at a rate of one each week. It is not the more advantageous use of men's time. To the contrary, it is the effect of wages abroad compared to ours, and the effect of government subsidization.

Under the circumstances, especially when existing laws give no hope of a sufficient remedy, we see no alternative but to turn in the direction a number of other industries have found it necessary to use—to quotas. Hence we have urged adoption of the bill introduced in the Senate last month by Senator Hartke and co-sponsored by Senator Dirksen and thirty-four other senators.

Certainly some means must soon be found to arrest the growing penetration of the U.S. market by foreign steel imports. Otherwise, the capital invested in steel in this country will increasingly have to look for more inviting opportunities in other areas of activity either here or abroad. And in terms of employee and community dislocation, to say nothing of impact upon trade balances, and the national security, this consequence must not be under-rated.

Now the steel quota bill does not—and I repeat does not—stop imports. It provides for the President to negotiate agreements with other steel exporting countries. These agreements would provide for imports of steel up to the average of the three most recent years: 1964, 1965 and 1966. That percentage works out to a little under 10 per cent. For comparison purposes this year's imports will probably amount to between 11 and 12 per cent, so the difference is not great. As the use of steel increases in this country, imports have an opportunity of also increasing under the proposal. The percentage remains the same, but the tonnage increases as consumption increases. If agreements cannot be reached on this basis then the average of a longer base period—the 1959-1966 period—automatically applies.

The proposal also provides for the Secretary of Commerce, who would administer the statute, to review the whole matter in five years and to report to Congress his recommendations for continuance, modifications or termination.

In a word, the bill would apply to that portion of the market which steelworkers and producers served in the most recent three-year period, and accomplish its purposes within a framework which need not be inconsistent with our GATT obligations. Furthermore, there would be no tariff which could automatically raise the cost of foreign steel to the level of domestic prices. Even at the outset, a market on the order of 10 million tons would still be open to imports. The

possibility of domestic steel producers recapturing such a market would clearly supplement the strong incentives to improve efficiency, quality and service already engendered by inter and intra industry competition.

The steel industry, as indicated, is by no means the only industry on whose behalf quota legislation has been recently introduced. I suspect that it is, in part, the mounting number of such requests which has alarmed the Administration and caused it to react so strongly if not sympathetically. By the same token, the growing number of those industries seeking some redress is symptomatic of a mounting problem.

The Administration's expressed position undoubtedly is taken out of a concern for what it believes to be in the best interests of the United States economy and of its people.

But we too are genuinely concerned with the future strength and growth of our economy; we too are concerned about such things as the balance of payments, because the net deficit in steel trade alone contributes nearly \$1 billion of the payments deficit. In connection with the balance of payments, it is interesting to note that nearly half of the imports in the past several years have come from Japan and that its industry, with a capacity of about 60 million tons of raw steel, is planning, as I have said, to increase that to about 110 million by 1975. If it does and if the rate of imports continues to increase from Japan and Western Europe—as they have recently—the import total could well reach an additional 20 million tons by 1975. In that case the balance of payments deficit for steel alone would approximate \$3 billion instead of \$1 billion.

Now again no one of us can be unaware of the benefits to all nations from a realistic application of the theories of free trade—regardless of how little "free trade" actually exists in the practical world.

But free trade and the theory of "comparative advantage" cannot be practiced in a vacuum. Nations do have a legitimate concern for national security and take protective action accordingly. This necessarily affects free trade. Practical nations must also take account of economic factors which are at work within their internal economy. When governments have initiated or tolerated developments within their economies which have engendered inflation resulting in home-produced articles no longer being competitive abroad or even at home, counter measures cannot be forever avoided. Again such domestic economic policies will importantly affect free trade. Thus, in the practical world of nations, the word may be "free trade," but the "deed" is far from it.

When so many industries in the United States are experiencing competitive difficulties, it is time, I think, to look deeply into the situation. Brushing off the problem by calling it "protectionism" will not cause it to go away. The search for a cure cannot be forgotten.

And the cure in my judgment can only be found in achieving a reversal of our past tendencies to try to take more out of the nation's economy than has been put in. The search for a cure may require a re-examination of whether labor laws enacted in the era of gross unemployment of the thirties and the forced draft full employment policies emerging from legislation enacted a full decade later are economically compatible with free trade philosophy. It may require a depth reconsideration of governmental fiscal and monetary policies, even including—if all else fails—a look at exchange rates.

But whatever it takes, we need to find a way to narrow significantly the dollar gap between employment costs here and abroad. Otherwise, our competitiveness as a nation in trade will seriously suffer and our balance of payments correspondingly deteriorate.

This does not mean we need turn a deaf ear to the trade problems of the developing nations. Undoubtedly, in appropriate cases,

some concessions need to be made there. Our concern is not there but with the well-developed, highly-capable nations who, may it be said, are also highly effective in protecting their own interests.

Perhaps you may say the situation will improve without the help of quota legislation. There is a story about a poor farmer whose barn blew down so he had to board his mule with a neighbor in the next county. Having gotten behind in the board bill, the neighbor offered to take the mule off his hands for \$50 and to forget the back board bill. To this the farmer reacted that he couldn't possibly sell such a good mule for such a low price—but if the neighbor would wait and just board the mule for another six months, he could have him.

I guess the moral of the story is that just waiting things out can be costly.

This matter of imports is not an easy one. Reasonable people may differ widely in their views. But the question should be considered on its merits—the merits of today—not those when employment costs among competing nations were more comparable and when the technological edge this country has had for so many years could be converted into higher-than-average benefits for everyone living here.

I believe as you do in international trade—in the wide exchange of capital and manpower. I believe as you do in the usefulness of multi-national businesses. But I also believe we live in a very practical world composed of nations each of necessity weighing its own interests with those of others. So I believe in fairness of opportunity for trade and non-discriminatory treatment for our own people.

Our nation cannot with impunity assume its dollar will forever remain competitive regardless of what we do to negate its worth in terms of manpower cost and national products.

Two weeks ago the House brought out of Committee a long staple cotton bill. If it becomes law, cotton growers in Texas will no doubt be able better to compete against Egyptian cotton.

Just a few months ago the President proclaimed quotas which cut imports of dairy products by more than one half. Imports had risen to over 2 per cent of U.S. production—from just under one per cent in earlier years. This practical limitation of free trade theory occurred, incidentally, on the very day the Kennedy Round took effect—last June 30. Here is an instance where, if you'll forgive me, the jobs of American cows were being exported. When steel imports reach not 2 per cent but 11 per cent, is it not time to stop exporting the jobs of American people?

To conclude:

Does America want and need a strong steel industry?

Does it want to maintain the maximum number of jobs at high wage standards?

Does it believe in fair play in the competition for its own markets?

Does our nation's security demand all the strength in steel we can possibly achieve?

If so, something has to be done. I believe the proposed legislation represents a realistic solution of this problem—fair to all—and that it is worthy of your sympathetic support.

Experienced Workers

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with all of the furor over discrimination, one area of discrimination that we must overcome

is the difficulties that are continually placed in the path of older workers seeking employment. The Lansing, Ill., Journal carried an interesting editorial on this subject in its December 30, 1967, issue, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

EXPERIENCED WORKERS

The older worker, a valuable asset in the nation's work force, is sometimes overlooked. Management would do well to utilize the reservoir of talent that these mature people represent, particularly in this labor-short period.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz recognized a fundamental truth when he said: "A strong and viable economy is the most important single factor improving employment prospects for middle-aged and older workers who lose their jobs. The more vigorous the economy—the higher the level of activity and the more rapid the rate of growth, the better the employment opportunities for workers of all ages."

Today excellent progress is being made by the voluntary route, as many firms have dropped bans on hiring older people. These firms have learned to place high value on older men and women.

Twenty-three states and Puerto Rico have already adopted laws prohibiting age discrimination. All but three of these laws have been passed since 1955, most of them since 1960; such legislation exists in the major industrial states and covers more than half the nation's industrial workers. The states are taking affirmative action to resolve this problem at their level.

More significant progress can be made through voluntary efforts as more employers recognize the values older workers offer—seasoned experience, judgment, stability and good attendance records.

They truly constitute a valuable asset in the nation's work force.

Law and Order in 1968

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor puts the present crisis of law and order in its proper perspective and points the way for dealing with it effectively. I commend these words to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

LAW AND ORDER IN 1968

Americans need to be alert to the possible violence of another "long hot summer." This near-insurrection need not occur. But it will be avoided only if people of good will and expertise, and the vast majority who desire law and order, accomplish two things:

(1) Create a persuasive climate of "something being done, and quickly," to alleviate the appalling conditions of life in poverty ghettos. (2) Reinforce respect for law and order, by giving attention to qualities now tarnishing from disuse, such as discipline and self-control.

The warning signals are up. Rev. Martin Luther King, for instance, has said he will lead a massive march on Washington next spring, a disruptive protest of the nation's "poor and disinherited." Most demonstrators will be law-abiding. But a militant minority will seek to arouse mob anarchy in the nation's capital. Again, some black power groups have riot programs that could be ordered into action. Campus groups may augment their draft sit-ins and Vietnam protests. All this could add up to an experience of mas-

sive disorder, a far cry from Gandhi's non-violent tactics.

In terms of 1968 politics, both Republicans and Democrats are aware that the issue of law and order plus "crime in the streets" can become as voter-persuasive as Vietnam.

"Law and order" means different things to different persons. To some ghetto dwellers it suggests police brutality. To property owners it means protection of person and property. A very small minority, perhaps 2 or 3 percent of today's protesters, are either Communist-inspired or so convinced that modern society is meaningless that they would wreck the nation and smash its "establishment." These are the activists who are found inciting to insurrection when mass protesters gather.

We are still months from next summer. It is encouraging that remedial moves have begun. In cities large and small the police are learning more effective means of handling riot and looting. Congress has renewed the antipoverty program for another year, though not increasing the appropriations.

President Johnson has hinted at a 1968 program to produce half a million jobs, through federal and private efforts, in the hard-core unemployment areas. Washington agencies are encouraged at the business community's response to ghetto joblessness. In his recent TV interview the President said emphatically "more housing has to be built."

The Vietnam war continues to nag, but opinion polls suggest a somewhat larger public understanding of the stakes involved.

What needs to be realized—by liberals, conservatives and all Americans—is that this crisis of law and order won't just blow away. Americans need not acquiesce in the "violence-prone" label which some countries would pin on it. But this will require a very extensive mobilization of resources, discipline and compassion, to cope with the crucial revolution of America's midcentury.

Hon. Lavern R. Dilweg

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of the Congress, a former Member of this body, and a personal friend of mine of long standing, Lavern Dilweg passed away while visiting in St. Petersburg, Fla.

Lavern Dilweg brought to this body the same competitive spirit and feeling he exhibited in his personal life prior to being elected to Congress, and in my opinion was a real asset to the Congress and the Nation. All of his friends mourn his passing and I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, his obituary which appeared in the Evening Star of January 3, 1968:

LAVERN R. DILWEG, LAWYER, EX-PACKER STAR, DIES

LaVern R. Dilweg, 64, a commissioner of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and a former congressman and professional football player, died in St. Petersburg, Fla., yesterday of complications following an operation.

Mr. Dilweg, a native of Milwaukee, Wis., received his bachelor of law degree from Marquette University in 1927. He had been an all-American end on the Marquette football squad in 1925.

He played professional ball with the Green Bay Packers from 1927 to 1934, and was all-pro in 1929, 1930 and 1931. He then was an official in the Big Ten for eight years.

Mr. Dilweg was elected to Congress from

Wisconsin's 8th District in 1943. He was assistant to the attorney general in 1951 and 1952.

Licensed to practice before the Supreme Courts of Wisconsin and the United States, the U.S. Court of Claims and District Court, Mr. Dilweg practiced law privately in Green Bay and the District from 1952 to 1961.

Appointed a commissioner of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by the late President Kennedy in 1961, Mr. Dilweg was appointed for his third term by President Johnson in October.

Recently nominated to Wisconsin's Hall of Fame, Mr. Dilweg was active in the Shriners and was a member of the Wisconsin and District Bar Associations.

Mr. Dilweg leaves his wife, Eleanor of 1650 Harvard St. NW; his daughter, Diane of 3900 Tunlaw Road NW; three sons, Lt. Comm. Jon C. of Sunnyvale, Calif., Robert A. of 5913 Wiltshire Drive, Bethesda, and Gary T. of Ft. Atchison, Wis., and five grandchildren.

Services and burial will be in Green Bay. The family requests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the San Francisco unit of the Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children, 19th and Moraga Avenues, San Francisco, Calif.

Vietnam: Time for a Diplomatic Offensive

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam, Nguyen Duy Trinh, has opened the door to diplomatic speculation by stating that North Vietnam "will" hold talks on relevant issues if the United States halts the bombing of the North and all other acts of war.

We know that the continuing bombing of North Vietnam has raised the price of aggression but we have also been told by Secretary McNamara that bombing has not reduced the infiltration of men and material.

The significance of this analysis by the Secretary of Defense is that a bombing pause would not endanger our troops in South Vietnam. It would make it easier for the North to infiltrate supplies but not necessarily in larger quantities than are already being brought across the DMZ or other borders of South Vietnam.

STOP THE BOMBING

For these reasons I have advocated a bombing pause on a number of occasions. In light of the recent statement by the North Vietnam Foreign Minister, I repeat my proposal for a halt in the bombing to be followed by a diplomatic offensive to achieve a cease-fire and productive negotiations.

The American commitment to protect the South has steadily accelerated and escalated to a point which cries out for a political settlement. We must not let this sign of change in the North's attitude go untested. It is well worth the minimal risk of a bombing pause.

POLITICAL SETTLEMENT

So long as the South is assured that it will have the right to determine its own future—whatever that future may be—our commitment has been met.

Let us test the sincerity of the north and stop the bombing. Then let the nations of the world bring the heavy weight of world opinion to bear on Ho Chi Minh and let Hanoi indicate its sincerity by participating in productive peace discussions.

We can always resume the bombing of the north, but let us first stop the bombing and go all out on diplomatic offensive. Hopefully these two steps will produce a cease-fire and a permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial which appeared in Newsday, the seventh most widely circulated afternoon newspaper in the United States. The Long Island paper has presented a straightforward and sound case for a bombing pause to be followed by efforts to achieve a cease-fire.

I place in the RECORD at this point the Newsday editorial of January 6, 1968, entitled "Why Not a Pause—And a Cease-Fire?"

WHY NOT A PAUSE—AND A CEASE-FIRE?

The foreign minister of North Vietnam, Nguyen Duy Trinh, has been quoted as having said that his nation "will hold talks on relevant questions" if the U.S. stops the bombing and all other "acts of war" against the North. This may merely be semantics, it may merely be an effort to embarrass this country, or—assuming the most optimistic view of all—it may be the first faint signal that peace talks will be acceptable to Hanoi some time in the future. Winston Churchill, after the defeat of the Germans in North Africa, observed that it was not the beginning of the end but probably the end of the beginning. Can the same be true of Hanoi's latest hint?

Given the choice between pessimism and optimism, it will do this nation no harm to be cautiously optimistic, and to hope that North Vietnam in fact is edging toward discussions leading to a truce. If we choose to be hopeful rather than negative, we should suspend the bombing of North Vietnam for an unspecified period—long enough to establish Hanoi's intentions while not so long as to permit Hanoi to undertake a really massive buildup of its badly mauled forces in the South.

To be successful, the pause should be followed by a cease-fire, honestly observed by both sides. Only when the fighting stops—on the ground as well as in the air—can we truly believe that peace is in sight.

If, during this unspecified period, it develops that Hanoi has no truly serious desire to end the war, then the U.S. will return to the fray satisfied that at the least we tried. Many of our Western friends and allies, along with many uncommitted "new" nations, have argued that we refuse to consider peace proposals and that we are determined to impose our will on Southeast Asia regardless of the cost in lives and money. That isn't the case, but a bombing pause will determine whether Hanoi means what it says or is seeking a propaganda advantage.

Many imponderables are involved in the position taken by North Vietnam. First is the lifelong record of Ho Chi Minh as a revolutionary, seeking what he describes as the liberation of Vietnam. Second is the attitude of Soviet Russia, which is supplying most of the armaments—torn, it would appear, between a desire to keep the U.S. tied down on an unproductive battlefield and a fear lest too long a war might lead to Armageddon. Third is the approach of the Communist Chinese, rent by internal strife but eternally suspicious of America.

These issues all must be weighed and explored by our diplomats. The military pros and cons must be assayed. And, in the end,

the President must decide, as can no one else, whether it is wiser to continue the bombing or whether the faintest possible hope of peace can be encouraged by a show of forbearance on our side. As the strongest nation in the conflict we have an obligation to exercise the utmost restraint. Our strength also permits us to take the risks of a pause.

If there is to be a cease-fire following the pause, it should be complete and unconditional, not unilateral. If a cease-fire does occur and exploratory talks occur, it is our obligation to state the basic term on which we will agree to a peace treaty. That basic term is the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own future, free of the outside intervention that brought on this war. If South Vietnam chooses to become a neutral, or indeed if the whole of Vietnam should be neutralized, that is acceptable. If the South Vietnamese wish to join with Ho Chi Minh in a Communist government, that again must be their own choice. But it must be the people's own decision, not one forced on them by an outside power.

In the meantime, let there be a suspension of bombing. At the best it is a gamble worth taking. Then, perhaps, we can establish whether Ho Chi Minh means business or whether he merely is using a cease-fire to prolong the war.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for a new diplomatic offensive and the first step on that road is a bombing pause, followed by efforts to negotiate a cease-fire. Effective and productive negotiations for a political settlement of the Vietnam war can be started in this way, and continued without charges and countercharges of political propaganda.

I urge my colleagues to review the proposal outlined in my remarks and the Newsday editorial and to join in support of a diplomatic offensive now.

I Am the Nation

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, every time a new year rolls around, all of us entertain a host of hopes and wishes for good things in the 12 months that lie ahead.

In the January 5, 1968, issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared a very interesting article entitled "I Am the Nation." This article first identifies our America and then expresses the Nation's wish, goal, and prayer for the new year of 1968.

The article concerned was published in the public interest by Norfolk and Western Railway, Roanoke, Va., and because of its unique nature and deep meaning, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 5, 1968]

I AM THE NATION

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the nation.

I am 200 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood

at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln.

I remember the Alamo, the Maine and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea and in the steaming jungle of Vietnam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor and the Merrimac.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific . . . my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii . . . 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 3 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 326,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman.

I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers and the Wright Brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster and Jonas Salk.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Thomas Paine.

Yes, I am the nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1968—one hundred and ninety-two years after I was born.

Imports Also Threaten Dollar

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, during the recess President Johnson took steps, through a Presidential directive, to reduce foreign travel and foreign investments in an effort to help close the gap in our balance of payments.

Some of us have been warning for years that unless the cash imports, which for many years have been greater than our cash exports, are reduced, the Nation would wind up in the serious financial condition it is faced with today.

In his recent column, David Lawrence graphically points this out. He says that closing the gap on seven basic categories would resolve this problem. One of the seven categories he mentioned is, of course, farm products, where we import

billions more for cash than we export for cash.

It is well the President discovers this imbalance at this late date if he is really interested in doing something to solve this serious problem.

The article is as follows:

IMPORTS ALSO THREATEN DOLLAR

Now that President Johnson has placed restrictions on travel outside the Western Hemisphere, the question has arisen as to why the administration has not put forth any plan to reduce the outflow of American dollars which pay for products imported from other lands.

The deficit in the "balance of payments" which is threatening the stability of America's monetary unit amounted to about \$3.5 billion in 1967. Yet the total amount of imports of certain products are expected to exceed the exports by \$3.9 billion.

In other words, if the United States could wipe out the imbalance between imports and exports in only seven categories of trade, there would be no deficit in the "balance of payments."

The United States traditionally has had a surplus in trade on an over-all basis, amounting in recent years to \$5 billion annually, but there are conspicuous deficits in important products.

Thus, in 1967 new automobiles imported from abroad are estimated at a total of more than \$1.5 billion, but only about \$600 million worth of cars were exported, leaving a deficit of more than \$950 million.

The same thing is true of iron and steel, which, it is calculated, the United States in 1967 imported in the amount of \$1.4 billion. Exports are put at \$417 million, leaving a deficit of \$983 million.

A big deficit was also noted in textiles and clothing. There were last year nearly \$1.5 billion of imports and only \$686 million of exports, or a deficit of \$768 million.

When the excess of imports over exports is added together in footwear, alcoholic beverages, meat products, toys and sports goods, another \$1.3 billion deficit emerges.

It is recognized, of course, that if the United States put restrictions on foreign trade in those products which show a deficit on the export side, there might be retaliation from other countries in various commodities which America sells overseas. So the real problem is how to reduce the deficits in certain categories while not injuring overseas trade in others.

One plan that has been given much attention by leaders in different industries would call for a quota arrangement whereby the average amount imported to this country over the last three years would be taken as a yardstick and no imports above that amount would be admitted. Foreign governments would be asked to hold their exports to the United States at the quota level.

This proposal would not immediately wipe out the balance of payments deficit, but might reduce it substantially because there is every expectation that, unless pressure is applied, imports will continue to rise.

Spokesmen for American industries are saying frankly that, while they may be able to cope with the existing quantity of imports, they do not want the situation to become worse year by year. Bills have been introduced in the Congress to set up a quota system but, unless the administration gives its wholehearted support to such a proposal, it is not likely to be enacted.

Incidentally, strikes to force higher wages in the steel and auto industries not only increase the costs of products inside the United States but make it possible for foreign countries to undercut those prices more than before. Yet no restraints are being placed on the labor unions.

The U.S. Department of Labor, for instance, revealed on Thursday night that, with the removal of the wage-price "guide-

lines," union wages increased an average of 5 percent in 1967. This is one of the reasons why imported products at lower prices are getting into American markets and increasing the outflow of American dollars to buy foreign goods.

As the balance of payments situation gets more and more hazardous, some restrictive measures will have to be imposed in order to curtail the outward movement of American dollars in import trade. Certainly, if the American people are to be prevented from traveling abroad as they wish, the question will be raised as to why imports from other countries are permitted to drain from the United States many hundreds of millions of dollars a year and thus enlarge the deficit in the "balance of payments."

Model Cities Program Realistic When Seen From Ground Level

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and informative article in the Denver Daily Journal has come to my attention. Denver, Colo., which I am privileged to represent, has recently been chosen as a model city. Early in December, Department of Housing and Urban Development officials and national and regional newsmen toured Denver, and Allen Young of the Daily Journal stated:

I think I learned last week what the Model Cities program really aims to do. It means to build a community that will make its people proud. A \$223,000 Federal Planning grant has been given to Denver to develop plans for Denver's two target areas to create a partnership between those living in the two Model Cities areas and the balance of the community.

I am proud that Denver has been chosen as a model city; I am proud that Denver is farsighted and creative in its approach to the problems plaguing all our major cities; and I am proud that Denver will become an even finer place to live in the years to come.

Allen Young's column follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Daily Journal, Dec. 13, 1967]

MODEL CITIES PROGRAM REALISTIC WHEN SEEN FROM GROUND LEVEL

I think I learned last week what the Model Cities program really aims to do. It means to build a community that will make its people proud.

In company with national and regional newsmen, HUD officials, and "resource" persons, I took a look at Denver, saw things freshly, had some doors opened for me, walked on some familiar and some less familiar streets, and returned from a day's tour with a magnified sense of what this city could be.

I believe the national \$300 million plan is one of the best ever designed to contain the human equation.

During the coming year under a \$223,000 federal planning grant, plans for two Denver target areas will be developed.

The most characteristic aspect of this planning is that it is to be done as a partnership between those living in the two Model Cities areas and the balance of the community.

A Resident Policy Task Force made up of Action Councils in the Denver Opportunity program under the Office of Economic Oppor-

tunity, and neighborhood improvement groups is one advisory agency.

The other, on the second level, is now being put together with help from the Core Cities Ministries.

These religious leaders of all denominations work to involve residents of the two local Model Cities areas in pinpointing their problems. When this is done, professional planning personnel will come into the picture.

The City and County of Denver stands as the Community Development Agency, activating religious organizations, labor, colleges, and universities, chambers of commerce, the Denver Urban Renewal Authority, and all ranges of civic groups.

And what will they do?

The will get as close to the people as they can, find out their needs, confer with the residents, and try to help them find viable solutions.

"Viable" is the popular word among urban specialists. In a time when superficial attempts to solve problems have gotten nowhere, "viable" solutions capable of growth are required.

The major Denver target area No. 1 runs loosely from Colfax north to W. 44th, with a small area on the west bank of the Platte River extending the boundary to 54th, east to York, and west to Zuni at Speer Blvd.

The problems of poverty are expressed in their extreme in this area. One-fourth of the housing is substandard. Crime is high and education low. Unemployment is about 8 per cent, or more than twice what it is in other Denver areas.

A large number of urban-minded Negroes and a lesser number of rural-minded Spanish-surnamed people suffer the problems of minorities.

What did I see here that gave me encouragement?

Hon. Burris C. Jackson

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of Congress, one of my many good friends in Texas, the Honorable Burris C. Jackson, of Hillsboro, Tex., passed away after several weeks of illness. Mr. Jackson was a regular visitor in the Washington area for the past several decades, having been a longtime friend of Jim Farley, Postmaster General under the later President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an item from his local paper, the Hillsboro Mirror, on the day of his death, as follows:

BURRIS JACKSON, COTTON INDUSTRY LEADER, DIES

HILLSBORO.—Burris C. Jackson, 62, a lifelong resident of Hillsboro and a nationally known leader in the cotton industry, died in a Hillsboro hospital at 3:45 p.m. Monday.

Mr. Jackson became ill in mid-November and had been in the hospital about two weeks.

He had served on countless committees, usually as chairman, in the cotton industry of the nation. He organized the Statewide Cotton Committee of Texas in 1936. This organization became a model for the National Cotton Congress which he helped organize two years later. He headed the National Cotton Congress for 20 years.

He loved politics and was an active member of the Democratic party, served as Hill

County Democratic chairman for several years, and seldom missed a Democratic convention on either state or national level.

Mr. Jackson served as Hillsboro postmaster for 19 years. When the Republican administration took over in 1953, he said they fired him for political reasons.

Friends said that under the Democratic administrations he had offers to go to Washington as a high ranking official in the Post Office Department, but he declined the offers.

Mr. Jackson was born in Hillsboro on Jan. 27, 1905. He attended public schools here and attended Hillsboro Junior College and Texas A&M.

He entered the firm of Jackson and Company in 1926, a firm founded by his father, General Will E. Jackson. The company was engaged in cotton merchandising, farm lands, and ginning. In 1930 he became managing partner of the firm, and upon death of his father in 1940, he took over the firm completely.

Mr. Jackson entered the Army as a captain in 1942 and was discharged in 1946 as a colonel. He served two years of this time in Washington, D.C., as a liaison officer for the War Department with Congress.

Mr. Jackson served as a member of the Official Board of the First Methodist Church here for more than 30 years. He served as both chairman and as a member of the finance committee of the church for 25 years.

He married Miss Frances Robertson of Hillsboro in 1934.

Mr. Jackson served as president of the Hillsboro Lions Club, was District Governor of Lions International for Texas, was president of International DeMolay Alumni, and was a member of the Texas Civil War Centennial Commission in 1961.

He also served as president of the Texas Postmasters Association and later as president of the National Postmasters Association.

He was commander of the Hillsboro American Legion Post, one of the oldest Legion posts in the nation, and for many years was master of ceremonies for its annual Nov. 11 breakfast. He presided at the breakfast last Nov. 11 even though he wasn't feeling well at the time.

Mr. Jackson was chairman of Hill County Day for the State Fair of Texas for many years. It is a big day, and several thousand Hill County residents go to the fair on that day each year.

Mr. Jackson sometimes told friends that he had "no hobby but cotton."

Other positions he held in the cotton industry included president of the Committee on Cotton Improvement of the Texas Cotton Association; chairman of the Texas Cotton Research Advisory Committee; chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the American Cotton Shippers Association; chairman of the Committee on Legislation and Public Relations of the Texas Cotton Ginners Association; member of the board of directors and Foreign Trade Committee of the National Cotton Council of America.

Mr. Jackson enjoyed entertaining friends at barbecues and dinners at his home. Only recently he and Mrs. Jackson built a new home on Corsicana Street and he delighted in showing friends through the new house.

"You've Got a Right"

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, WJZ-TV in Baltimore,

Md., will present the first of 10 half hour programs which will examine the origins and contemporary significance of the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights. This series, "You've Got a Right," is designed to give WJZ-TV's viewers a better understanding of the Constitution and of their fundamental liberties.

It is important that all Americans be aware of these basic freedoms, and I would like to congratulate WJZ-TV for its service to the community in presenting this worthwhile series.

Sir Patrick Dean, British Ambassador, Addresses Dinner Celebrating 250th Anniversary of Founding of New Orleans on January 3, 1968

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 250th anniversary of the founding of the great city of New Orleans, part of which I am proud to have represented for 27 years.

Many festivities and celebrations are planned during this eventful year—a year in which all New Orleanians can reflect upon the historic background of their colorful city.

It is in this vein that I want to include here a speech which was made by British Ambassador Sir Patrick Dean at a dinner celebrating the 250th anniversary of the founding of New Orleans on January 4, 1968.

The speech referred to follows:

ADDRESS BY HER MAJESTY'S AMBASSADOR, SIR PATRICK DEAN, G.C.M.G., AT A DINNER CELEBRATING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF NEW ORLEANS, JANUARY 3, 1968

Mr. Mayor, Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, I count it a most unusual honour that you should have invited me to help you in celebrating the 250th anniversary of your city, especially so early in this proud and eventful year. I do not believe that any historian has presumed to give an exact date to your foundation. Rome itself was not built in a day, and I imagine that the first settlers of New Orleans were too busy finding a living to go about laying foundation stones. In any event there is general agreement that they first came here in the year 1718, and that means that I must be a very early bird in the great migration that I hope you will have here in celebration of your anniversary. My visit to New Orleans at this time is a reflection of the goodwill prevailing between your city and Great Britain.

I have been looking into the early relations between this part of the world and England, and I am bound to say frankly that goodwill seldom characterised the relationship in the first century or so.

In fact it is remarkable how frequently the English and their related tribes, the Scots and Irish, turn up in the history books with the firm and specific objective of doing harm to the people of New Orleans. Sometimes they were not even in the service of the English crown; they had contrived to attach themselves to the French or the Spanish to pursue this fell intent. If matters had not changed as they have out of all recognition during the last century and a half, I confess that I

should be somewhat apprehensive of appearing before you tonight.

Let us look just briefly at the record. The story begins at the turn of the seventeenth century with Father Louis Hennepin, a renegade from La Salle's French expedition south from Canada, publishing in London exhortations to the English to colonise the Mississippi Valley. Daniel Coxe had the same idea. So of course did the Spaniards. It was partly to forestall this that Pierre Le Moyne was sent from French Canada at that time to settle the area. We can take some comfort in the fact that Le Moyne was born in Dieppe, which some people tend to regard as almost a part of England. The English were slow in starting, but within a year they were causing trouble. Only one ship of Coxe's expedition seems to have made the land fall here: the 12-gun corvette "Carolina Galley", commanded by Captain Bond. Appearing one September day up the river, he was fooled by Pierre Le Moyne's younger brother, Bienville, with five men in a canoe, into supposing that the French had considerable reserves around the bend. English Turn still marks the place where Bond ignominiously turned back. I have been amused to note that at this very early date a batch of French settlers was brought here in a ship called the "Pelican". It seems a nice coincidence with the title of your state. Perhaps I might interrupt my tale to say that pelicans today form a close link between London and Louisiana.

When we British diplomats are working at home in the Foreign Office, we often get some lunchtime relaxation watching the Louisiana pelicans being fed on the lake shore in St. James's Park. We know better than to feed them ourselves. Not long ago they were the source of warm concern in the House of Commons. It appears that, like the giant panda Chi-Chi from the London Zoo, who never really made anything of her visit to An-An in Moscow, our two Louisiana pelicans were not as friendly as they might have been. In fact there was even some doubt about their sex. Alas, that difficulty was resolved by the death of Wilfred, who turned out on a post mortem examination to have been appropriately named. His survivor for some time shared a rock with an Eastern White from the State of Bahawalpur in Pakistan, proving that East and West do sometimes meet. Nowadays we are much better provided, with half a dozen pelicans about the place and most of them from over here. I would not exclude one or two of them being Texan, but perhaps the less said about that the better.

But to return to the English in Louisiana. New Orleans was founded, as everybody knows, by Bienville in 1718, a year after the running of the colony had been turned over by the French Crown to the Company of the West, which was the creation of a Scotsman called John Law. I am sure he had the best intentions, but the fact is that within a dozen years, owing largely to the war with the Natchez Indians, the company went bust, causing much hardship to the settlers. Thirty years later, in 1662, we find the Spanish accepting a French offer to take over Louisiana, not from any intrinsic regard for the place, but to keep out the predatory English.

It is odd, isn't it, how history does repeat itself, with the predatory Anglo-Saxons being barred from the Continent of Europe by the French Government. It hardly seems however that in 1662 the settlers had much love for Spain either. If they did, it was rapidly dissipated when the Spaniards actually took control of the colony seven years later under the Governorship of General Alejandro O'Reilly, a native-born Irishman and I have reason to believe an evil name in these parts. Many of you will no doubt be familiar with the verses which begin:—

"What! Sold like cattle—
Treated with disdain!
No! Louisiana's sons can never bear
Such foul disgrace!"

So much for "Bloody O'Reilly". The most that can be said for him and his successor Galvez, is that they did at least keep the marauding English out of the Lower Mississippi Valley, permitting American occupation of the inland region at the time of the Revolution. That, I am glad to say is nearly the end of this part of the story. In 1801 Louisiana was transferred back by the Spaniards to France, on the grounds that in Napoleon's view France could better protect the colony against the English. That of course did not last long, because the Americans themselves did not want either the French or the English in occupation of New Orleans; and if England again went to war with France she might well decide to capture Louisiana.

It is nice to reflect that if he had to choose between the two, Thomas Jefferson knew which side his bread was buttered: "The day that France takes possession of New Orleans", he said, "fixes the sentence which is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark . . . from that moment, we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation." But Jefferson had what we must recognize, as we cast our eyes back over history, was a better idea. Rejecting Hobson's choice, he instructed Robert Livingston in Paris to negotiate the Louisiana Purchase. Louisiana was American, and from that time you have scarcely looked back. I propose to pass over in silence the events of 1815. Looking back at this distance, it seems a pity that the British and the people of Louisiana had to conclude this stormy chapter with a show of bloodshed. But perhaps it was necessary to enable them to become friends at all. And that is certainly what has happened.

You in Louisiana are an amalgam of many races. The early settlers came not only from France. There were Spaniards besides, and Germans and Swiss, and again the French Acadians from Canada, who still have their distinct way of life. We too in Britain are a great mixture, though we have had longer to assimilate successive waves of invasion.

Today we are making a great effort to assimilate an influx of coloured peoples, from the West Indies, Africa and the Indian sub-continent, just as you have absorbed into your society the African peoples who came here in the first 150 years of settlement. Like us, you rely much on trade; the great port of New Orleans is evidence of that. We have much in common. Of course there are also notable differences. If one considers this in the cultural context, I believe that these differences are to be capitalised upon, and not deplored. In this area it is always a matter of subjective judgment, but there are probably some things that you do better than us, and others that we do better than you. For instance, whenever I am sticking a stamp on a letter in this country, I wish it was a British stamp, which is nicer to lick and stays with the envelope much better. When I want a cab, I often wish I was in London, where it is so much easier to call one up and bring it to your door. I note that Mayor Lindsay of New York has suggested that the cabs in his city ought actually to be London taxis, because they take up so much less room. This is a revolutionary thought, Mr. Mayor: I wonder if I should not invite you to adopt it? In a wider field, I believe that we have much to offer you in radio and television. There is probably not much to choose in the field of newscasting, and certainly one can get all the good music one wants, whenever one wants, from the radios of both countries. But, largely because our system is less commercialized—and I include here our commercial television—we do have a wider range of original programmes, both documentary and purely creative. There is a

theory that our system is tainted because it is government controlled. I can assure you that this is not so. The government has no power whatever to forbid a programme, either from the British Broadcasting Corporation or the independent networks. The image of the BBC as a sort of Auntie has indeed quite disappeared, to the extent that influential groups have been formed to try to prevent it from being so controversial.

In case you should think that I am just blowing a British trumpet, I shall go on to say that after living more than 7 years in the United States I am convinced that you are well ahead of us in many things. To take only one, but very major instance: your system of higher education. Although we do not yield to you in quality, your system enables a vastly greater proportion of the young to enjoy a college education; and this is something absolutely essential to the proper organisation of an advanced industrial society. We are making great strides here, but what holds us back is naturally money. Relatively speaking you are not so constricted. But if I might for a moment resort to hyperbole and rather controversial hyperbole at that, the United States is in the position of a man who is suddenly given a million dollars and who is at a loss how to spend it. I am speaking generally now, not just of education; and not just of government either. It is much harder not to make mistakes with a million dollars than with ten.

I am obviously far from pretending that there is too much money in the United States; billions more could be used, and well used; and no doubt will be. But I do think it is a problem for any rich country, as for any rich man, to use its money wisely to enhance the quality of life. After that rather pompous pronouncement I should come back to the comparisons I was making. This is always an invidious activity, but the conclusion that I wanted to draw is that these differences are in themselves enhancing, or ought to be. That is why as many Americans as possible ought to visit Britain, and the other way around. Nor should we leave other countries out of it. A lot of Americans have toured the Soviet Union in recent years. They did not come back as communists, but they have seen the Russian people for what they are, which is for the most part ordinary human beings no more politically motivated than themselves. It would make an enormous change if we could only get at the Chinese in this way. And if we in Britain are at the present time just a tiny bit irritated with President de Gaulle, let us remember what we owe to France.

I do not suppose the people of Louisiana are likely to forget that, in spite of the wave of sentiment against French policy that has built up in the United States recently. We at any rate in Britain are not so shortsighted as to suppose a new Europe can be created without France; that the contrary view in the case of ourselves is held in the Elysee Palace in Paris must be seen as a temporary aberration. It does not reduce the need for closer connections between France and Britain wherever we can make them; indeed the need is increased; and anyway it is unthinkable that we should forgo the delights of French cooking for any short-term political reason. I have tried to give you some idea of how important I believe collaboration and exchange between all nations to be.

I am sure I am right in thinking that Louisiana and New Orleans have a particular contribution to make to this. The United States cannot avoid leadership and all its members must join in the endeavour. In one small way you have shown your eagerness to do so in asking the Representative of the United Kingdom to collaborate in your anniversary celebrations. That was a magnanimous act but it was characteristic. My wife and I are deeply grateful to you and very happy to be here.

**The 100th Anniversary of Sanford-Brown
College of Business**

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to share with you and my fellow Members of the House of Representatives the pride we in the Metropolitan St. Louis area feel in a college that is this year celebrating a century of educating young men and young women for business pursuits. It is the Sanford-Brown College of Business founded in 1868 by Mr. G. W. Brown, at a time when this country stood poised on the threshold of the greatest social and technological revolution the world has ever seen in any equal period of time. Changes of almost unbelievable magnitude were already in the making, and developed with a rapidity and frequency which would have amazed even the most sanguine prophets of the day. The whole structure of the economy was altered within the span of this century and in the important field of business education, Sanford-Brown College played a vital role of leadership and accomplishment.

With the signing of the formal Emancipation Proclamation by President Lincoln, Mr. G. W. Brown felt the first stirring of greatness in the emerging Republic and determined the part he wished to play in it. He envisioned the opportunity to offer another kind of freedom—financial freedom—to young men who lacked the training for the new and strange demands of a business world already caught up in a veritable whirlwind of change and transition.

St. Louis was showing signs of rapid growth in the fields of invention, manufacturing, and commercial enterprises of all kinds. Higher education at the university level was a privilege enjoyed by a select few from the wealthier families; and with the opening of the Brown Business College, many ambitious youths were glad to take advantage of this type of training for office jobs arising in the community.

Six years after the opening of the first Brown College, the first typewriter appeared with the rotary printing press; the year was 1874. In 1876, Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone and in 1877 Thomas Alva Edison invented the phonograph. Mergenthaler's first Linotype was made in 1887. The prolific Edison perfected the motion picture process in 1889 and in 1895 Marconi demonstrated the first wireless telegraph. Each of these inventions contributed in its own unique way to the ease and speed with which business data could be compiled and disseminated and Brown College of Business was to be in the van of those who adopted them to techniques of business teaching.

The year 1883 marked the revolutionary entrance of women in the business world. Brown Business College became coeducational and expanded. Realizing the great need for thoroughly trained

and qualified young men and young women in an expanding business and industrial market, Mr. Brown started opening and developing business schools in other cities in 1888.

In 1893 Mr. Brown was placed in charge of the business college exhibit at the Chicago World's Fair. Sixteen school participated. In 1904 at the next world's fair in St. Louis, there were just 16 schools represented, but this time, all the schools were Brown's Business Schools. Between 1904 and 1911, 13 more schools were added making a total of 29 schools.

The Brown business schools were the first schools west of the Allegheny Mountains to introduce shorthand and typewriting. With its position thus strengthened, Brown business schools were able to weather the drastic loss of enrollment as male students answered the call to colors and left for duty in the Spanish-American War.

Just ahead lay the dawn of the 20th century with its explosive increase in population, its miraculous mechanization, and the formation of great industrial empires. The era of big business had begun in earnest. New courses and new methods of instruction had to be devised to meet the fast moving changes in occupational trends and patterns. New teaching techniques were created but the Brown business schools were already further advanced than other schools in the training of teachers. In 1910 to meet the increasing demand by not only his schools but other business schools, public and private, Mr. Brown was instrumental in the establishment of Teacher's Business Training Courses, which he offered in five of the Brown Business Colleges "free" of charge to all desiring it. This included tuition, books, supplies, and incidental expenses. Of note here, should be the fact that in the advertising to get trainees for teachers, a part of the body copy read as follows:

We do not make any requirements of students in exchange for the privilege of free tuition, other than they will conduct themselves intelligently and ambitiously, put in all of their time to the best advantage, and then, whether employed by us or someone else, do work that is creditable to the general cause of business education.

In 1920 Mr. W. S. Sanford, who had been a teacher and principal of one of the Brown schools, bought the name, goodwill, and equipment of one of the St. Louis based Brown Business Colleges. Mr. Sanford moved the school to larger quarters and in 1929 changed the name from Brown's Business College to Sanford-Brown College of Business. At that time he was granted a charter by the secretary of the State of Missouri empowering the school to issue diplomas and confer degrees to its graduates. He operated the school until 1944 when he sold it to its present owners, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Gassaway and Arthur Gassaway.

The Gassaways set about to organize, improve, and promote the school under the new ownership as they recognized the business college as a special school—not just a place for general training. Modern techniques and franchised courses were adopted. An excellent faculty was added and Sanford-Brown College continued to grow.

We have come a long way from the days when a commercial school prepared its students to write a good hand and keep the books. Sanford-Brown College is fully equipped with its most modern machines and facilities and its teachers are competent, dedicated individuals eager to give their students the most comprehensive education possible.

One of the most vital and necessary bulwarks of our country's defense in these crucial times is economic productivity. Another is, of course, the education of our youth in all areas of learning. Sanford-Brown College is meeting both these needs by furnishing the industrial and business firms of the Metropolitan St. Louis area and the State of Missouri the finest type of employees drawn from the ranks of its graduates.

At this point in the school's long and remarkable history, its 100th anniversary, I wish to congratulate its administrators, its teaching staff, and all its students and alumni, fortunate enough to have had the advantage of its influence and training in good business techniques and administration.

Salute to the Draftee

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, not many young men are enthusiastic about being drafted, but most of them accept the call with a determination to give their very best in the service of their country. In any event, the moment of departure from home and family to go off to a new life is hardly a pleasant experience.

Some communities, but not enough, give what comfort they can to draftees when the times comes for them to report for duty. The Leader-Times, of Kittanning, Pa., tells how the people of Armstrong County treat the young fellows who answer the call.

The editorial also contrasts the thoughtful action of these patriotic citizens with the deplorable conduct of agitators who attempt to resist military personnel requirements.

The Leader-Times presents an idea which could, and should, be followed elsewhere. The message follows:

WORLD OF DIFFERENCE

What a world of difference takes place in Armstrong County regarding the military draft as compared to action in some cities throughout the nation.

While demonstrators in the cities block draft board headquarters, march, picket, push, shove, battle with police, lie limp on sidewalks and streets, face disturbance charges, and some even shedding blood in scuffles with police, a group of Armstrong County citizens quietly gather during early morning hours to "sendoff" draftees from the local area.

Meeting at the Armstrong County YMCA at 5 a.m. to fetter the departing inductees is a band of stalwarts including representatives of the Kittanning Ministerial Association, Salvation Army, Hamilton Hogg of Gideon's International, Richard George of the YMCA, George Piper and Marianne Colonna of the

Local Draft Board, Bill Wyant of the Kitting American Legion, Mitchell Lloyd of the Ford City American Legion, Mary Giardino of the Ford City Latin-American Club and Mary Protz of the original "Send-off Committee."

Mrs. Protz has been helping "send-off" inductees for the past 16 years. "I hate to see them go," she said, "but I try to make their leaving as pleasant as possible."

For the half-hour before the bus leaves at 5:30 a.m. for Pittsburgh, the inductees, together with those leaving for physicals, are treated to coffee and doughnuts. The draftees are given The New Testament from the Gideon's, a letter writing kit from the Salvation Army and a year's membership in the YMCA, good anywhere a YMCA is located.

The contrast between the traditional local send-off and the chaotic demonstrations marring so many cities is a happy commentary on life in this rural-industrial community.

It is at the same time a tribute to the faithful who regularly brave the early morning hours to give local inductees a little moral support from their hometown.

Law and Order

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the growth of riots and lawlessness generally in 1967 was a disgrace to the Nation. A mighty effort must be made to improve the situation in 1968.

The basic responsibility for the maintenance of law and order is upon the States, counties, cities, and communities. The Federal Government has no right to usurp the police powers of the State, but it needs to cooperate through the Federal Bureau of Investigation and otherwise in an effort to be helpful. It is true some decisions of the Supreme Court have made it more difficult for law-enforcement officials to do their jobs. This is regrettable. But regardless of the difficulties, ways must be found to preserve law and order and protect the lives and property of American citizens.

I have the feeling that State and local law-enforcement officials will make a special effort in 1968 to bring law and order back to the big and little towns of America and the countryside, as well.

I have noted in the press from various sections of the Nation evidences of renewed emphasis on law enforcement. The following excerpt from a story in the Indianapolis, Ind., Star, of January 10, is a case in point:

FELONY ARRESTS IN HIGH CRIME AREA TRIPLED

(By Thomas R. Keating)

Felony arrests in the city's highest crime area have tripled since the formation of a 25-man task force which is working between 8 p.m. and 4 a.m., the high crime hours, Police Chief Daniel T. Veza said last night.

The special reserve police force, formed Jan. 3, has been concentrating on burglaries, larcenies and vehicle thefts in an area bordered by 30th Street north to the city limits and from White River on the Westside of the city to Sherman Drive on the east. The area is known as the "Adam" sector.

"The selective enforcement is paying dividends already," said the police chief.

"During the six days these men have been working in the high crime area there have

been 23 felony arrests, triple the normal amount of arrests made by the district cars in that section of the city," Veza said.

Members of the 25-man force are drawing overtime pay to battle rising crime in Indianapolis.

The Struggle for a Free, Responsible Press

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in accepting the annual John Peter Zenger Freedom of the Press Award on January 13, 1968, Mr. John S. Knight aptly commented on the role of the press in guarding the people's right to know and the role of the Federal Government in telling the people the truth.

Mr. Knight, publisher of the Knight newspapers and former publisher of the Chicago Daily News, adapted his acceptance remarks to be used in his regular newspaper column.

Mr. Knight's column of January 13, 1968, follows:

THE STRUGGLE FOR A FREE, RESPONSIBLE PRESS

(John S. Knight, publisher of the Knight newspapers and former publisher of The Chicago Daily News, today receives the John Peter Zenger award "for meritorious service in the cause of the press and the people's right to know." The award, presented by the University of Arizona's School of Journalism, is named after the colonial printer whose trial established truth as a defense to libel, thus freeing the American press to report news that displeased the government. This column is taken from Knight's acceptance remarks.)

The struggle in behalf of a free and responsible press, as indicated by the name of the award itself, is a never-ending battle. It is, as Andrew Hamilton said in his defense of John Peter Zenger, a cause to secure "the liberty both of exposing and opposing arbitrary power by speaking and writing the truth."

Today's newspapermen—at least in this country—do not face the governmental dangers of John Peter Zenger. He was tried for sedition. But newspapermen since, and to this present day, are found guilty of contempt of court for refusal to divulge the name of a news source and, like Zenger, are subject to imprisonment upon conviction.

Further, the difficulties of their assignments are infinitely greater. A 24-hour budget of news is overwhelming, more perhaps than the human mind can comprehend.

The Washington correspondent, whose responsibility it is to examine the workings of the Great Society, must also produce a news report that makes this phantasmagoria capable of being understood.

According to the Associated Press, our government's public relations and information programs cost taxpayers about \$425,000,000 a year. This is more than is spent annually by the Congress and the judiciary.

And more than double the combined outlay for newsgathering by the two major U.S. news services, the three major television networks, and the 10 largest American newspapers.

So when the White House complains about adverse stories in our press—notably about Vietnam—let us remember that the press carries five times as much of the government's views as are presented by the administration's critics.

Moreover, as James Reston pointed out to

you four years ago, this nation is undergoing a set of social revolutions, each one as significant to the future as the Industrial Revolution itself.

All of these revolutions are meeting in the cities, where the technologically unemployed farmer, the Negro demanding his fair place in the affluent society and the youngsters are competing for jobs for which they are largely unprepared.

Possibly because of the growing importance of news, we in this business find ourselves being subjected to detailed scrutiny.

We have been weighed and found wanting by everyone from the Man in Charge, who finds us high in calories and low in conscience, as Arthur Krock put it a few years ago, to the man in the street, who wonders why there is such a credibility gap between the press and the President.

And he wonders, when he is told hard and unpleasant facts about America's involvement with Vietnam, why he has not heard these facts before.

The blame, I suggest, lies both with the press and with the President.

The press as well as the public is too inclined to forget, so long as all is going well, that, as Rep. John Moss said a few years ago, "Management of the news has always existed in government at all levels, just as it exists in every private business. Everybody wants to put out information in a way to show his actions in the best possible light."

But we of the now-aroused press must object when, in his efforts to put himself in the best possible light, the President forgets his responsibility to the people. They are the ones who hired him.

It is one thing to hide vital facts which Hanoi, Peking or the Viet Cong don't know, and another thing entirely to misinform the people when it serves no security purpose.

And it is totally inexcusable to lie to the people about matters which are of their utmost concern, and about which the enemy already knows.

Yet the hard fact is that in trying to put itself in the best possible light, this administration has resorted to distortions of fact and half-truths of history.

Let me give a few examples.

Sec. Rusk and other administration spokesmen justify our involvement in Southeast Asia on the ground that we have entered into sacred commitments.

One of the "commitments" most frequently mentioned is the Eisenhower offer of aid to Premier Ngo Dinh Diem in 1954. Yet the American people are not told that it was conditioned on the expectation that "this aid will be met by performance on the part of the government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

More than 13 years later, these reforms are still largely in the talking stage.

The President is fond of alluding to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, which included South Vietnam as a protocol state, as a "solemn commitment."

Yet the treaty required the parties thereto to "refrain . . . from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." The United States is in violation of that requirement.

Furthermore, in the event of subversion, we were obliged only to "consult immediately" with the other signatories on what to do.

In case of aggression, members of SEATO were to "act to meet the danger in accordance with constitutional processes."

France, Great Britain and Pakistan refused to become involved and the remaining signatories have given only token support to the United States war effort.

Yet our government would have us believe that we are in Vietnam because "we always live up to our commitments."

Were we ever told, until Dean Rusk's speech of last October, that containment of China is our real objective?

And when the defense secretary's press officer publicly proclaims that the govern-

ment has the right to lie, how much confidence can we have in government?

We should be thankful that the best U.S. reporters in South Vietnam have never succumbed to the blandishments of either the Saigon government or our own State Department.

Specifically, I mention R. W. Apple of the New York Times, Malcome W. Browne and David Halberstam who shared the 1964 Pulitzer award for international reporting, Neil Sheehan, then of the UPI, Peter Arnett of the Associated Press, Don Oberdorfer of the Knight Newspapers, Raymond Coffey of The Chicago Daily News and Mark Ethridge, Jr., of the Detroit Free Press as exemplars of truthful reporting from South Vietnam.

The unpopularity of our top correspondents with both governments in Saigon—the Thieu-Ky regime and the United States—is a tribute to their skills and dedication.

Upon entering this fateful year, the role of newspapers is more important than ever.

As the politician uses his purchased air for his understandably one-sided argument, the importance of print grows. We need the permanence of print for reference.

This is merely age-old "instant replay," recently discovered by television. But the second time around it drifts off into the air just like the first, while print remains.

Our obligation is to provide the voters with fair, honest, all-sided, clear presentation of campaign news. They need the sharp illumination of your own editorials and the pungent, uninhibited viewpoints of your readers.

If it is possible to put labels on syndicated columnists, the reader would benefit if warned of their political or other persuasions. These journalists are now choosing up sides and the number of "house columnists" is—sad to relate—increasing in number.

How well will we do our job in 1968? Certainly, we have improved over the years. There is no longer a political press in the sense of slanted news, although we still catch hell from all sides.

Heritage for the Worthy

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past few months have caused many people to wonder if our system of Government is not on trial. If so, it may be due to the fact that too many citizens take the right of self-government for granted. The Bonner Springs, Kans., Chieftain recently editorialized on the value of this heritage of self-government. This editorial carries a message for all of us as we begin this new session of Congress. In sharing this message with my colleagues, I include the editorial "Heritage of the Worthy," in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bonner Springs (Kans.) Chieftain, Dec. 28, 1967]

HERITAGE FOR THE WORTHY

Above all else, 1967 appeared to be a year when the verities were questioned—in politics, in economics, in religion and in virtually every other element of the structure of present-day society. What does it all mean? No one really seems to know. Some claim the tearing down of old standards reflects what might be called a healthy renaissance of advanced thought. Others view with foreboding a trend they feel is leading to a moral breakdown and anarchy.

CXIV—5—Part 1

The experts are the most confused lot of all. Sometimes their judgments of coming events are ludicrous. Typical of their inability to assess the future was the recent statement of one of this country's leading financial authorities that devaluation of the British pound was unlikely because the English program of austerity was so fundamentally reassuring as to make a crisis improbable.

By the time this particular forecast was in print, the British pound had been devalued, and no one knows what the future holds for the monetary systems of the world.

Out of all the confusion of 1967, one fact has become clearly obvious—self-government itself is on trial. This is so because the very truths which are the mainstay of self-government are being altered or swept away one after another—truths that were once called "self-evident." These truths have to do with financial responsibility, the integrity of the family, the inviolate rights of persons and property under the law and concepts of individual self-reliance and initiative that are inseparable from freedom under representative government. A gradual decline in respect for these prerequisites of liberty was never more apparent in the observation of many people than during the crucial months of 1967.

Outwardly, the United States is invincible. But, the founding fathers warned nearly 200 years ago that the greatest danger to the American experiment in free government could well come from within. A debauched currency, a weakening pride in individual independence and the gradual ascendancy of state authority are undeniably changing the outlook for constitutional government as we have known it in the United States. Few now living have the capacity to view the present era as it will be recorded in the history books at some distant time in the future.

Our present civilization and more specifically our own country, measured by material progress and the potential for future progress, opens a vista that staggers the imagination. The precepts under which civilization has advanced to this point, and which have brought a greater measure of well-being to more people than has ever been known in the world before, must have a validity that the hippies, the malcontents and the anti-American demonstrators have failed to perceive.

No political party, no single group of citizens is solely to blame for the dismal drift that has put self-government on trial, and as the elections of 1968 approach, we should expect no miracles from our elected representatives.

They but reflect the temper and attitudes of the electorate. The signs became abundant during 1967 that a turning point has been reached in the affairs of the world and of our country. As we enter 1968, everyone of us should resolve to be worthy of the heritage of self-government—a heritage for which 500,000 men in Vietnam are laying their lives on the line every day.

Travel Curbs: A Backward Step?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting editorial commentaries I have seen on the travel curbs which the President will attempt to move through Congress appeared in the Polish

American on January 6, 1968. The editorial, which very thoughtfully and objectively analyzes the fallacies of the President's proposal, follows:

TRAVEL CURBS: A BACKWARD STEP?

President Lyndon Johnson's New Year's Day announcement that he will ask Congress to restrict travel by Americans going outside the western hemisphere—as part of a crash program to reduce our balance of payments deficit—warrants some comment since travel to foreign lands should concern Polish-Americans just as much as their non-Polish fellow citizens.

While it must be conceded that the growth of the travel (or tourist) industry in recent years has contributed to the "dollar drain" (more than a million Americans reportedly visited Europe last year alone) it must be seriously questioned whether government restrictions or harassments of the American traveler is the answer to the problem either in part or in whole.

Since this is a democracy and not a dictatorial police state which restricts the movements of its citizens, the only likely way that President Johnson could reduce international travel would be through taxation of the tourist either upon his departure from, or return to, the United States.

Such a proposal—a tax of \$100 upon tourists going to Europe—was suggested by Johnson several years ago, but the resulting public outcry caused it to die a quiet and unlamented death. But now that proposal may once again surface to life as the government searches for a way out of its present dilemma of cutting down on the flow of dollars to foreign lands.

We oppose such a tax since it would represent a hardship upon the student, retired couples, and others of modest income who can travel only on a very limited budget. It would not, on the other hand, represent much of a burden to the Rockefellers, Fords (and Johnsons) who are affluent enough to pay any tax which the government might impose.

Since the growth of international travel—especially to countries such as Poland which need all of the exposure to Western influence they can get—tends to increase understanding among people and thus helps build world peace, any restrictions upon that trend would be a negative and backward step that is probably doomed to failure in any case.

If the government wishes to cut the dollar drain, instead of preventing Americans from going to Europe it should encourage Europeans to visit America.

Or is Washington allergic to the tourist dollars of Europeans?

F-111, the Guys Who Fly It Like It

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage in gambling circles "Put your money where your mouth is." To me we can apply this to the continual rounds of criticism of our F-111 program, and using the words of Col. Ivan H. Dethman, USAF "the guys who bad-mouth this airplane are the guys who never got in the cockpit." This is the basis for an article by Claude Witze of Air Force-Space Digest on our F-111 program which appeared in a recent issue of theirs and which I want to commend to all Members of this body:

F-111A—THE MEN WHO FLY IT LIKE IT (By Claude Witzke)

Born and bred in an atmosphere of unprecedented controversy, the Air Force's General Dynamics F-111A now has combat veterans in the cockpit and they are enthusiastic about the potential of their new airplane.

These Air Force pilots consider the F-111A weapon system the greatest single technological jump designed for their mission since the wedding of the jet engine and modern avionics. The F-111A, they predict, will let them hit tactical targets harder, with greater accuracy, and at longer ranges than any other airplane in the USAF inventory or likely to join it in the foreseeable future.

It must be made clear at the outset of this report that the subject is the USAF F-111A, and that airplane alone. The first production models, configured for operational use, are now being delivered to Nellis Air Force Base, near Las Vegas, Nev. The Tactical Air Command is using them to equip the 4480th Tactical Fighter Wing. The pioneering unit is Detachment 1, 4481st Tactical Fighter Squadron, commanded by Col. Ivan H. Dethman.

Equally important, from the standpoint of operational capability, is the test work under way at the Air Proving Ground Center at Eglin AFB in Florida. Here, USAF has come to realize that the F-111A is a vehicle incorporating advances in the state of the art that have outpaced the technology incorporated in the available weaponry it can carry.

Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney, APGC Commander, speculates that improved bombs, equipped with terminal-guidance systems, may turn out to be the most important addition to airpower capability since World War II. As this issue goes to press, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has made the first public disclosure of the fact that Walleye, a bomb that carries a TV camera to seek out its target, is being used in Vietnam. Earlier this year, veterans back from Southeast Asia were complaining loudly that they had seen no improvement in the technique of delivering iron bombs. Walleye, developed by the Navy, is now also being used by USAF. It is made by the Martin Marietta Corp.

Walleye, of course, has limitations imposed by night, bad weather, and other hindrances to visibility because of its TV "eye." So APGC is working hard on other more advanced projects, all of them highly classified. The urgency of these projects clearly has been compounded by the F-111A. Back at Nellis AFB, where the users are aiming for operational capability by early 1968, you can talk to pilots who say, first, that the new airplane is more accurate than the bombs it drops. Even before production airplanes started to arrive, they found the F-111A delivery of plain old-fashioned iron bombs to be twice as accurate as that of its predecessors, the F-105 and F-4.

Even this is not good enough, says General Kinney, nor as good as we can do. Further accuracy must be achieved and made operational as fast as possible. The point, of course, is that the avionics subsystems in the F-111A—both navigation and attack systems—can work together to position the plane in the air with unprecedented accuracy. The pilot knows exactly where he is when the bomb is released. He still does not know exactly where the bomb will hit. Basically, that is why we have lost up to sixteen aircraft, flying 160 sorties to demolish one bridge in Vietnam. The cost/effectiveness of the improved F-111A system, with an aircraft that can position itself automatically in any kind of weather or visibility, if it can drop a bomb that can be steered to the target, is obvious.

The pilots at Nellis display no doubt that the F-111A will achieve this capability. At Nellis, as well as Eglin, Edwards AFB, the

Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson AFB in Dayton, and Air Force Systems Command Headquarters, Andrews AFB, Md., there is one common observation. It is put most succinctly by Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., Commander of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Center at Nellis:

"Nobody is qualified to pass judgment on the F-111A until he has flown it. I wish the critics who have not flown it would come out here and talk to our pilots."

One of his pilots, interviewed on the flight line, agreed with the boss in the kind of language you hear around a hangar:

"The guys who bad-mouth this airplane," he said, "are the guys who never got in the cockpit."

Nellis is where USAF makes Ph. D.s out of fighter pilots. The current F-111A program, called Harvest Reaper, is manned by veterans of the Korean and Vietnam Wars, men who have faced flak and Soviet MIGs in F-105s, F-4s, F-86s, F-104s, and F-84s. Harvest Reaper is the Accelerated Testing and Training Program for the F-111A, launched last July when the first of five aircraft, built for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), was shifted to the Nevada base from Edwards AFB in California.

By September, the new wing had set an unprecedented record. During that month, the five planes flew a total of 304.1 hours, an average utilization rate of 60.8 hours per aircraft. In October, the month in which the first production model was delivered and added to the Harvest Reaper stable, the rate hardly wavered. It was 59.7 hours per aircraft. The stated requirement for the F-111A is thirty hours per aircraft. The best previous records set at Nellis on other aircraft have been in the area of thirty-eight hours a month per aircraft. This has been with systems far less complex than those of the F-111A.

Colonel Dethman emphasizes that the five airplanes are all different, that they are not production models, and that they offer a type of disparity, both as to maintenance and the flight envelope, that his wing will not face when it has production aircraft. Airplane No. 31, flown into Nellis on October 16 by Colonel Dethman, was the first F-111A to be delivered fully configured for operational use.

The thirty-first F-111A and following aircraft now being delivered to Nellis incorporate two improved Pratt & Whitney TF30-P3 engines, modified engine air inlets, an attack radar, and other changes not included on all of the test aircraft.

These are changes that both air and ground crews await with a new kind of impatience. Of the features already aboard, in the preproduction models flown by Harvest Reaper pilots, the men are most enthusiastic about the avionics. The radar and navigation systems, all agree, are the best they have ever seen.

It is not difficult to find pilots at Nellis who entered the F-111A program with a high degree of skepticism. And it is not entirely gone. A typical major, an F-105 veteran of Vietnam who has shot down a MIG, says that so far he has been learning what he can do with a new and different kind of weapon system.

"It is not possible," he says, "to compare the F-111A with other planes I have flown—the F-105, RF-101, F-86, or F-84. This thing is entirely new and different, and I know there is no single answer to all our problems. The F-111A is easy to fly, but there have been some deficiencies in the RDT&E planes we have been using. But I expect they will be licked, for the most part, when we all have production models."

This man is struggling to get used to the side-by-side seating arrangement. The avionics systems are monitored, for the most part, by the man on the right. The pilot simply

can't see out that side of the cockpit from his seat on the left. The veteran, of course, has been able to look right or left and over his shoulder on each side and past the tail. He does have a detector in the tail that can tell him when he is being followed, but it does not identify what it is that is coming up behind. This can be disquieting to a combat veteran who is used to single or tandem seating. The F-111A provides four eyes to look straight ahead, which has its advantages, and the electronic systems provide new low-level capability for day or night missions.

A recent illustration was provided by Colonel Dethman when he flew F-111A No. 31 from the General Dynamics plant at Fort Worth, Tex., to Nellis. It was an automatic flight, less than 1,000 feet above the ground for 1,047 miles. Colonel Dethman used the controls only on takeoff and landing.

The terrain-following radar (TFR) makes the F-111A capable of day or night low-altitude penetration at subsonic or supersonic speeds. It does not have to be automatic, but can be set for manual operation, which might be necessary to evade enemy defenses, particularly where they are as heavy and diverse as they are in North Vietnam. A safety feature is that the system continuously checks its own operation. If there is a malfunction, the aircraft goes to a higher altitude. The radar is the AN/APQ-110 made by Texas Instruments and is used in partnership with the flight control system made by General Electric.

One pilot, interviewed at Nellis, had drawn up his own list of what he considered good, fair, and poor about the F-111A. His opinion is based on close to 100 hours in the preproduction (RDT&E) models.

Under *good*, this veteran lists range, endurance, bomb load, stability, flight control, navigation, radar, bombing systems, and landing characteristics.

The maneuverability and takeoff distance he rated as *fair*. Under *poor*, he was critical of the thrust and subsonic acceleration provided by the early model engine, the air-to-air radar capability, and the manual operation of the scope camera.

This brings up the whole subject of the Pratt & Whitney engines, their role in the development problems, and the various versions of the engine. The first five aircraft at Nellis, RDT&E models, are powered by the TF30-P1. The production airplanes have the TF30-P3, with modified air inlets.

Maj. Gen. John L. Zoelcker, Deputy Chief of Staff for Systems at AFSC and former director of the F-111 program, is first to admit that the most serious deficiency at the outset was the matching of the airplane and the engine. There were compressor stalls, especially at high speeds and altitudes. He is confident this has been corrected and that the TF30's combination of turbofan and afterburner will guarantee low fuel consumption for long-range subsonic flight. The feature was demonstrated when an early F-111A was flown nonstop to the Paris Air Show last June.

The unusual thing about the F-111A afterburner is that the pilot is not restricted to using it for a "kick-in-the-pants" approach to higher speed levels. For the first time, he can use more than "power-on" and "power-off" settings for the afterburner. He can take advantage of a smooth range of thrust augmentation, going through five zones of afterburner application.

The experience at Eglin AFB and Edwards AFB also shows that the graduated afterburner contributes to fuel economy, when that is important to a mission.

General Kinney, at Eglin, has his own list of major advantages he sees in the F-111A. On one of his first flights, with a contractor pilot, he was instructed to set the TFR dial for fifty feet and let the plane go to that altitude and skim the ground. At the mo-

ment he got the instruction he was at 20,000 feet. General Kinney says it was difficult to resist grabbing the stick as the aircraft started to go down fast, seeking the fifty-foot level. He managed to leave it alone, and the F-111A leveled out at fifty feet and continued the mission, automatically. The General says he was convinced that the plane is safer and puts the pilot in a better position to do his job, visually or blind, than any other aircraft he has seen.

The F-111A can operate from short runways. It needs 1,500 to 3,000 feet to land. With a heavy load it can take off in less than 5,000, usually about 3,500 feet. The landing speed is in the range of 125 to 130 miles an hour, with no drag chute employed. Outside of what it contributes to safety, this feature increases the flexibility of the F-111A by permitting it to operate out of available airports in more undeveloped countries. It is attributable, of course, to the variable-sweep wing, which lets the pilot redesign the airplane in flight for a range of speeds from slow to supersonic.

The aspect ratio of the F-111A wing, a characteristic that is important in achieving long range, is on the order of 6.9 with the wing at cruise position. Aspect ratio of a 727 airliner is 7.1, and that of the military F-4 fighter is 2.82.

Those who have never flown the airplane have been free with criticism of the F-111A. For this report, the men who have flown it were asked to assess some typical fault-finding. Here is a résumé of their answers, compiled from sources at five USAF commands:

The first thirty F-111As have performed so poorly they will never be fit for active service. The first thirty never were intended for active service. They are for RDT&E. No two are entirely alike. Hundreds of changes were made before No. 31, the first production aircraft, was built, and more changes will come. The deficiency lists on the early aircraft are no longer than and no different from the same lists for other aircraft now in the fighting inventory. This is routine in the development of new weapon systems. If it were not true, it would be an indication that the aircraft would be obsolescent before it was operational.

The thirty-first F-111A still falls short of several requirements. Correct, if you substitute specifications for requirements. With the changes that were incorporated in the design, weaponry, and subsystems, some original performance specifications had to be revised. The substitution of iron bombs, hanging on pylons under the wings, for internally carried nuclear weaponry, is an example. This has increased the versatility of the F-111A and thus its effectiveness. The airplane also falls short in low-level dash range, but still is acceptable to the using commands and will carry out its mission. It is not unusual for the user to ask, initially, for more than he can get. But it is a good way to make progress, and the F-111A still has a super-sonic dash capability superior to that of any other aircraft in the world today.

USAF specified a 40,000-foot ceiling. No. 31 will not be able to operate above 30,000 feet with a bomb load. USAF specified much more than 40,000 feet, but not with a bomb load. There was no requirement fixed for a ceiling with externally mounted iron bombs. The F-111A can carry up to forty-eight of them hanging on four pylons under each wing. Work is under way at Eglin AFB to provide bombs with guidance and better aerodynamic properties.

Because of buffeting, the size of the speed brakes was reduced until they are largely ineffective. The speed brakes are effective. The buffeting is undesirable but not uncontrollable. This is not a major problem. From a practical viewpoint, the variable-sweep wing is the best speed brake on the airplane.

Takeoff weight of the F-111A has increased from 69,000 pounds to nearly 90,000 pounds. This is true when the aircraft is fully loaded with iron bombs. The 69,000-pound figure was for a load of one nuclear bomb and two GAR-8 rockets. The aircraft can take off weighing up to 98,000 pounds. USAF now wants tires qualified to support a weight of 100,000 pounds.

The ferry range is 800 miles less than USAF required. Wrong. The F-111A can remain on patrol hours longer than any other fighter. The flight to the Paris Air Show was 2,900 miles. On arrival, there were two hours of fuel remaining.

There are engine troubles still unfixed. The TF30-P3 will resolve afterburner problems encountered in the RDT&E aircraft, as well as thrust deficiencies. There is confidence that most basic development problems in the engine have been solved.

Anyone who seeks out the men most familiar with the F-111A will come up with scores of observations and related experiences that they use to express their high hopes for the new system. Here are some examples:

A General Dynamics pilot, at Eglin, had a malfunction in his bomb-release mechanism, after releasing one bomb. If he dumped the remainder in the Gulf of Mexico, he might lose all clues about the malfunction. He elected to land with nineteen 750-pound bombs under his wings. The plane stopped in less than 5,000 feet of runway. The bombs were loaded with cement.

The TFR equipment astounds the veterans. For the first time, pilots have had the experience, flying automatically at 200 feet, of passing beneath the level of a TACAN station.

Every pilot in the program knows that the F-111A was not intended to perform up to specifications, or meet requirements, until aircraft No. 31 was delivered in October. They feel that criticism before this date was premature and that the aircraft follows the pattern set for all earlier weapon systems. In many cases, the first test results were identical with those experienced on other aircraft. Specifications were much higher than requirements; that also is normal.

The airplane, in its test program, has set an extraordinary record for safety. Far fewer aircraft have been lost than USAF experienced in previous similar programs.

The high utilization rate of the first five aircraft at Nellis is attributed almost entirely to the maintenance and reliability features of the F-111A. General Dynamics officials point out that their contract is the first one to include "specific quantitative maintainability requirements." This means that reliability and ease of maintenance had to be designed into the aircraft. Ninety-five percent of the components that need service are at eye level when the mechanics remove the fuselage plates.

Reliance on ground-support equipment (GSE) is reduced by self-testers built into the aircraft's subsystems. In contracting for these subsystems, General Dynamics has passed the basic USAF requirement along to the subcontractors. The reliability and ease of maintenance was not easily achieved. No supplier met the demand on the first design effort. As a rule, it took three exercises, back at the drawing board, to satisfy the prime contractor that the results would suit the customer.

Another factor, according to General Dynamics, was that, in this case, full funding was provided for the ground-support equipment early in the program. This is not always so and in the past has resulted in the delivery of new weapon systems that could not be properly maintained until all GSE was available.

So far as the self-test equipment is concerned, some of it can be operated directly from the cockpit, giving the aircraft com-

mander and pilot an instant check. The remainder is available through test stations, manually operated after fuselage panels have been removed. The built-in test circuits make it possible for a technician to locate a malfunction quickly. Then, a line replaceable unit (LRU) can be pulled and replaced. The LRUs are sent to the avionics shop for repair. All of this makes the location of trouble swift and easy and cuts ground time on the airplane.

Because the F-111A program is so young and most of the aircraft are RDT&E models, there are no sound figures available at Nellis on the maintenance man-hours per flight-hour. The design requirement is for not more than thirty-five hours of ground work for each hour in the air, and the high utilization record set at Nellis indicates it will be easily met. In one test run, the figure was down to 12.6 hours, but this was not considered definitive. The September utilization record of 60.8 hours per aircraft, set at Nellis, is at least twice as good as the requirement, which was set in the contract at thirty flight-hours per month per aircraft.

There has been no attempt in this report to examine other versions of the F-111, programmed for the US Navy, Australia, Great Britain, or the Strategic Air Command. USAF is not concerned at this point with the inferno that surrounded the selection of General Dynamics as the contractor, the virtues of the design as opposed to that offered by the Boeing Co., or the role, if any, played by politicians when the F-111 was known, in the embryo, as the TFX. Neither have we investigated the choice of materials in the aircraft, the extent of commonality, the location of engine inlets, or the degree of competence displayed in estimating costs.

All of these subjects, and others, have been involved in the brouhaha that has been raging about this aircraft for years. The men most intimate with its performance as USAF's F-111A read the newspaper and congressional comments with astonishment. A national weekly calls the airplane a "lemon." In the Senate, a Claghorn-type speech declared it "a poor strategic bomber and an even poorer tactical fighter," a statement the pilots say is at least half wrong.

So far as USAF is concerned, the pudding now is ready for eating. So far as the crew at the table is concerned, the question is out of the kitchen and away from the cook, except for seasoning. The F-111A is a weapon system in being.

Jet Noise: A National Issue in Need of Federal Legislation

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress in January 1965, I have devoted a great deal of my time and attention to the problem of aircraft noise. In more than 20 House statements, I have attempted to alert my colleagues in the House to the menace of jet noise and the need for Federal regulations and appropriate legislation.

At first, the general attitude of the executive branch and the legislative branch seemed to be "nothing can be done." Then following my request in the fall of 1965, the President appointed a White House task force and referred to this subject in his transportation message to Congress in February 1966. The Presi-

dent called for "an action program to combat this problem."

The recognition of jet noise as a national problem marked an important first step in the fight to bring relief to the thousands of Americans living in the shadow of our Nation's airports. Research in developing a quiet jet engine, new operational procedures, land-use planning programs, and other Government activities have been accelerated. However, much more needs to be done.

Last year, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce began hearings on proposed noise abatement legislation including an administration bill—H.R. 3400—to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum noise standards to be used in certifying aircraft.

I have sponsored comprehensive legislation—H.R. 1398—to provide regulatory authority over airports as well as aircraft and to authorize Federal funds to assist in implementing modifications at airports and on aircraft to reduce noise.

At the start of this second session of the 90th Congress, I call on the President to assign a high priority to aircraft noise abatement legislation and I urge my colleagues to support pending legislation to control this menace.

In the New York Times magazine of January 14, 1968, Mr. Robert Sherrill discusses this problem in a comprehensive article entitled "The Jet Noise Is Getting Awful."

I place the article in the RECORD at this point for the information and consideration of my colleagues, because now, the menace of jet noise is in the forefront of national attention. If the airport in your State, or in your congressional district is not yet servicing jets, they will do so in the near future. Take cognizance of the problem now.

The article referred to follows:

THE JET NOISE IS AWFUL
(By Robert Sherrill)

WASHINGTON.—To millions of Americans who live near major airports and are being driven frantic by the noise from jet engines, President Johnson must seem the luckiest guy in the world. No planes, propeller or jet, are permitted to fly over his home, and when the boisterous world of air transportation intrudes on his private or political life, he can silence the intruder with a command—as he did recently during Carl Sandburg services at the Lincoln Memorial. The commercial airliners landing and taking off from National Airport were interfering with outdoor eulogies and Johnson, not wanting his own speech interrupted, told a Secret Service man to call the airport tower and have the planes temporarily rerouted. They were.

The ordinary jet-noise victim, however, cannot command relief. He can only complain or sue, and neither does him much good. At last count, there were \$200-million in lawsuits pending in courts around the country initiated mainly by citizens who felt that aviation noises had destroyed the value of their homes—and sometimes so thoroughly as to constitute actual confiscation of property. In the past, few of these suits have been successful; aviation noise has reigned as one of the era's most privileged nuisances.

This victimization of the public has been very democratic, touching alike all economic classes, from the wealthy homeowners of Playa del Rey, near Los Angeles' International Airport, and the élite of Georgetown,

in the path of jets from Washington's National Airport, to the residents of walk-up flats in South Queens.

Congressmen from districts that include major urban airports have files containing many thousands of letters, accumulated over the years, begging for Federal help in muting the engines that make normal life an impossibility. The letters have piled up in a huge snowdrift of despair.

Scoop out a few from the La Guardia and Kennedy Airport areas: A Flushing physician complains that "it is sometimes impossible to have a conversation with patients and even less possible to listen to a heart or take the blood pressure of patients." A Flushing music-lover claims he "cannot listen to a complete symphony without 10 to 15 interruptions." A Whitestone father says he cannot talk with his family at the dinner table "without being interrupted every three or four minutes while the parade of jets goes by overhead." A pupil of No. 3 School in Cedarhurst complains: "We cannot hear the teacher's questions and she cannot hear the class' answers. Every two minutes a plane passes over our school." A Rosedale housewife calls the situation "unbearable . . . there are no hours when this horrible shrieking noise is not overhead . . . my baby cries constantly from the noise." A Floral Park mother, finding conversation impossible, spends two hours counting 76 planes passing overhead.

Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal and Herbert Tenzer, whose constituents are battered around-the-clock by La Guardia and Kennedy traffic noises, warn that the prevailing mood is not merely one of unhappiness but of desperation, and some of the letters support this. From an East Rockaway housewife: "My nerves have me at the point of a nervous breakdown from the constant noise of the planes passing over my house. I don't know how much more I can stand." A letter signed by Bernard Landers, president of the Woodmere Park Association, and 100 neighbors: "Right now the noise is so bad in some areas that not only the comfort, but also the health and well-being of families are being affected. Many people cannot sleep later than 5:30 in the morning when a continuous volume of noise begins."

Consider the life of Martin Kaplan, 35, a former Air Force and airline pilot whose home in Inwood, L. I., is about half a mile from the northwest runway at Kennedy Airport. Kaplan, who had earlier appealed to Congressman Tenzer, gave me a follow-up report by telephone. He sounded keyed up, as if he were relaying observations from a front-line battle. I almost expected to hear the thumping of mortars in the background.

"They're using the runway tonight! Wish you were here! Ho, man, I wish you could feel the walls. When they take off, it's like they were shooting at us. It's like they were firing guns at us. I really mean it. Everything vibrates. It's vibrating right now. There are cracks in the walls. The beams are giving way in the basement. The floor slants. I'm constantly repairing and plastering the place. If you were here, you could smell the fuel. They've been using the northeast runway for two weeks, and that means we're catching it."

Kaplan admits he isn't sure the house is cracking up as a result of the jet-induced vibrations, "but this house is 15 years old and that seems a bit odd to be settling from natural causes. It's ridiculous already." Worse, Kaplan believes that he and his family, like the house, are beginning to give under the strain. "I honestly think it's getting to us." When the wind is wrong, the stench from the jet fuel washes over the house and makes his 11-year-old asthmatic son sick. His 8-year-old daughter wakes up with troubled accounts of how the wall by her bed shook all night. Kaplan feels cornered. He may sue. "Either the New York Port Author-

ity moves the airport," he said, "or it moves me."

What is happening in New York is also, of course, happening wherever traffic concentrates. For example, the neighbors of O'Hare Airport in Chicago—it is the busiest field in the world; a jet lands or takes off on the average of every 40 seconds—must put up with what their Congressman, Roman C. Pucinski, recently described as "the unremitting, unremitting, intolerable boom and whine of tidal waves of sound." Similar Miltonic descriptions of misery are even being heard from such places as Minneapolis that used to be considered way stations.

For more than 15 years, Federal officials have been aware that these things would happen as a result of the urban build-up around airports. If they had not known it before, they received a warning in the Doolittle report, "The Airport and Its Neighbors," which was issued in the last year of the Truman Administration, before the jet age had really begun. But only now is the Federal Government making any measurable effort to coordinate its own regulatory bodies (the Department of Transportation, the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board) with state and local authorities, and with the aircraft-manufacturing and operating industries, to bring relief before the public rebels.

Even now the Government's commitment is questioned by some critics, who point to the fact that the only important legislation pushed by the Administration (and passed by this Congress) pertaining to air transportation was an appropriation of \$150-million to begin development of the nation's first commercial supersonic transport (SST), which will generously increase the noise.

If the SST is permitted to fly overland instead of being restricted to ocean travel—and Maj. Gen. Jewell C. Maxwell (U.S.A.F.), head of the SST program, says that overland supersonic travel is "inevitable"—the plane will drag along a 50-mile-wide sonic boom, coast to coast, which could reach the ears of 20 million Americans.

It is this possibility that chills even some of the men normally most loyal to President Johnson's programs. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, concerned about the effects of the sonic boom on wildlife and on geological formations and ancient Indian structures that can be destroyed by the boom's shockwaves, recently acted independently of the Administration to seek the advice of half a dozen scientists on the question of possible damage from the SST. Among White House intimates, however, he is a lonely dissenter. The birth of the SST and its potential monster boom was the Administration's contribution to the noise problem for 1967.

But this year, White House lobbyists have assured some Congressmen, they are going to give top priority to legislation attacking jet noise. They say that if they can just pass a bill giving Department of Transportation Secretary Alan Boyd authority to set noise standards for the industry, he will start setting standards all over the place and that will help a lot.

It sounds good, but it might as well be acknowledged by everyone involved that the victims of airborne chaos cannot look for any relief within a decade. The delay in dealing with the problem has guaranteed that, short of moving the major airports or moving most of the people away from them—neither of which seems likely—the situation will become much worse, if not intolerable, before it gets better.

Air travel is expected to triple in volume by 1975, which means that the noise it creates will also triple. At the same time there will be few pro-public counterforces. The momentum of special interests will continue for much of this period. Aircraft industry spokesmen, most of whom concede that noise is their No. 1 problem, admit that the immediate future is barren of solutions; so

do officials of the Department of Transportation. Here are the major traditions and influences working against a quicker solution:

Confusion of regulation by whom of what. Some Congressmen want to give the job of regulating aircraft noise to the Surgeon General and to the Department of Housing and Urban Development on the grounds that they are primarily concerned with people and homes, whereas the Department of Transportation—which the Administration wants to have regulatory authority—is primarily interested in the aviation industry. Inasmuch as Secretary Boyd is on record, as of 1962, in opposition to the idea of Government control of aircraft noise—"the Government ought not to involve itself in matters which are primarily the business of business"—these Congressmen have a good argument, but at this stage the jurisdictional dispute is just a bit sad because technical difficulties as well as the economics of the industry are expected to block the introduction of a quieter engine for at least seven or eight years.

The National Aeronautics and Space Agency (which is doing, or supervising, most of the impressive noise research these days) has contracted with Pratt & Whitney, manufacturers of the engine of the upcoming 747 jumbo jet, to turn out a blueprint for a "quiet engine" within the next few months. After that, the industry will spend the next five or six years building the prototype engine at an estimated cost of \$200-million.

But even then (and now we are speaking of 1973 or beyond), there is no assurance that the prototype will in fact be suitable for commercial use. It is not intended to be more than a demonstrator. If a commercial engine is adapted from it, the airlines may not want to use it for a few years anyway because they may still be paying for their current fleet and may not be in a financial position to switch to another engine just because it is quieter.

If all goes well, this prototype engine will be 20 decibels quieter than anything flying today. A decibel is an arbitrary unit of sound measurement (10 decibels for breathing, 70 for heavy traffic, etc.) and the best way to suggest what the 20-decibel reduction will mean is to point out that most big jets taking off today are recorded at 120 decibels and up—about the same loudness as a machine gun at close range. A 20-decibel drop would be very noticeable and doubtless very welcome, but it would still leave the jets of the future making more noise than is considered the maximum tolerable level. Community complaint, which can be expected to begin at 90 decibels, usually boils over at about 105 decibels.

And when the aircraft industrialists talk of a 20-decibel drop, they talk of their ideal. Dropping back to reality, the major manufacturers recently sent Gen. William F. McKee, F.A.A. administrator, a private memorandum saying that after much soul-searching they had concluded that a six-to-eight-decibel drop is all that they can promise, sometime in the nineteen-seventies. So that's that: a commercial "quiet engine" which, in fact, is still a noisy engine is 7 or 8 to 10 years away, and it will be absorbed into the commercial fleet thereafter very gradually.

With these technical obstacles ahead, it is not clear why Secretary Boyd is pressing for immediate jurisdiction. It will be many months before even the most general standards are ready. Some observers fear that Boyd's legislation can only result in shifting the risk of damage suits from industry onto the Federal Government. If that were the effect of the legislation, it might cause the aircraft industry, which now is conscientiously spending millions of dollars seeking a quiet answer, to ease back in its research. As a Senator told Evert B. Clark of The New York Times recently: "If the Department of Transportation would come up here and say, 'We've got to have this new power because Lockheed

or American Airlines or so-and-so isn't doing its part,' then we might do something. But there is no point in passing a bill and conning people into thinking we've solved their problems when we know we really haven't."

Some officials think noise protestors are a little odd. Secretary Boyd suspects the mental and nervous balance of people who hate airplane noises. Five years ago, when he was chairman of the C.A.B., Boyd testified at a Congressional hearing on the noise problem that the Government should get the advice of psychologists on how to deal with the protests, which, he said, could probably be traced back to the "anxiety psychosis that seems to dwell over a great many people nowadays." He called for "more tolerance of noise." In a recent interview with a reporter from Science magazine, Boyd said that most of the opposition to the SST's inevitable supersonic boom comes from the "periphery," a statement which the reporter interpreted as Boyd's "euphemism for 'nuts.'" Boyd did not ask the magazine for a correction.

More recently he has given further indication that he thinks the anti-noise forces are composed largely of fanatics who would like to go back to the horse and buggy. In a November appearance before a House committee, Boyd's opening plea was for the committee to disregard those who would "eliminate aircraft in the United States" simply because planes are noisy—a radical suggestion that, in fact, nobody had made.

Boyd is not alone in this fear. General Maxwell told me that the opponents of the supersonic boom give him the impression that they are "little old ladies in tennis shoes who don't think we should travel 1,800 miles an hour when God clearly intended we shouldn't fly faster than 600 miles an hour."

A variation of this attitude finds the bureaucrats convinced that the public can be brought back to normalcy through repeated exposure to aircraft noise. "I think it is fair to say that as one lives with noise one tends to develop a greater tolerance of it," said Boyd, in a statement that has been repeated, in one form or another, by every important official of the Department of Transportation.

It is, somehow, a myth that has survived scientific studies showing the contrary. Dr. Karl D. Kryter of Stanford University, in an often-cited study, showed that the more exposure to noisy flights a community is subjected to, the feebler its tolerance becomes. With one aircraft blast per day, the community will put up with a rating of 115 decibels. But with 128 flights a day, the tolerance level drops to 94 decibels. (And where does that put the neighbors of Kennedy Airport, who contend with about 700 jet flights a day during the peak tourist season?)

A recent experiment at Edwards Air Force Base in California demonstrated that one-third of the people who have worked to the constant accompaniment of airplane noise for several years still find the sonic boom "intolerable." The most famous tests—tests intended to prepare the way for public acceptance of the SST's boom—were conducted in Oklahoma City in 1964, when the area was bombarded with up to eight sonic booms a day over a six-month period. The F.A.A. had been shrewd in choosing Oklahoma City for this test, inasmuch as a third of the city's residents depend for their living on some phase of aviation. Nevertheless, even if Oklahoma City is a hospitable place for aviation, after six months of booming 27 per cent of the people said they could not stand to think of living with the noise indefinitely.

Experience helped very little; only one in five who started out being annoyed with the boom had adjusted in some degree to it by the end of the tests. Most of the population said the noise was more detestable at the end of the test than at the beginning.

A second variation of the crackpot theme holds that the trouble is all in the public's imagination. This theme is especially com-

mon among F.A.A. officials when the conversation shifts to property damage from sonic booms and noise vibrations. The test homes in Oklahoma City that were exposed to the sonic boom developed hundreds of cracks. General Maxwell has an explanation: "I think it is an interesting fact that irritation brings with it an idea that somebody is doing damage." He said most of the blame belonged to green lumber and imagination, although he admitted there might be some exceptions. (One resident successfully charged that the booms split his home in two and won a \$10,000 damage suit.)

Like Boyd, General Maxwell sees the answer as a fundamental choice between accepting noise or doing away with airplanes altogether, with nothing in between. "If you don't like supersonic airplanes," he said, "you can go back to the good old days and get a horse. You're either going to have to accept the boom, or . . . well, I don't see any probability—I don't want to say anything isn't possible, but right now I don't see anything coming down that is going to rid the airplane of it. Anyway, I've never tried to convince people that the boom is going to be acceptable, and I don't now."

Officials at all levels are oriented to pay-rolls and profits rather than to public comfort. Local zoning officials continue to permit realtors to build right up to the landing strips, rather than insisting on an empty buffer zone or a commercial-only zone around the airport. More high-density, high-rise apartments are already on the drawing board for the Kennedy Airport area. At Dulles Airport, the semi-ghost facilities serving Washington, Federal officials tried to get county officials to keep the houses away but they were turned down.

People sometimes seem to have a mysterious moth/flame attraction to noise centers. In the early days of railroads, towns were strung out along the tracks as if everyone were trying to get his share of the soot and rattle. But Federal housing officials are convinced that for the most part people buy houses near airports either out of ignorance—"not realizing that within five years the noise will be driving them crazy," as one H.U.D. official put it—or as victims of real-estate hucksters who show them the houses during the hours of least traffic and when the wind is blowing favorably.

When Federal officials attempt to exert some corrective pressures, they are often stymied. A perfect example of this was the directive issued by the Federal Housing Administration to withhold F.H.A. financing of new homes within a certain proximity of the New Orleans International Airport. Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana, testifying at a Congressional hearing recently, boasted of getting that directive reversed, although he went on at once to complain that the homeowners who had built near the airport with his help were now finding life "intolerable" because of the noise.

In a recent letter to Washington officials, Alfred N. Warwick, chairman of the aviation committee of the Queens Borough Chamber of Commerce, recalled proudly how in the nineteen-thirties the chamber had "selected the actual sites for what are today's Kennedy International and La Guardia airports. Our business vision has been more than justified." He ticked off the resulting thousands of jobs and millions in payroll dollars and hailed the two ports as "without question, Queens' biggest single industry . . . good for borough, city and state." Only as a kind of second thought did he mention that passage of some noise-abatement legislation might be a good idea for the people who want to live, rather than only work, in Queens.

The embodiment of this philosophy at the national level is Secretary Boyd, who holds that economics and noise "are completely interrelated." He has always taken the position that the best way to "cause people to look at the discomfort of the airport in a

somewhat different light" is to remind them of how many jobs air transportation creates and how unpleasant it is to be out of work. Still very much a favorite saying around the F.A.A. is an old slogan of the agency's former administrator, Najeeb Halaby: "What is one man's annoyance is another man's livelihood."

The C.A.B., which certifies airlines for operation, makes its judgments on the premise that the amount of noise and soot and other nuisances created by airplanes is none of its business. If an airline gives good service, that's all the C.A.B. cares about. To it, air transportation is a matter of efficiently launched ledgers and the public is made up only of paying passengers—not of people who sleep, watch TV, sit in their backyards and converse or participate in a variety of other activities that require some quiet.

Congressman Rosenthal once protested that if the Government could build a national aquarium "so that fish could have a quiet place to spawn, I think that for the perpetuation of the race as I know it, at least in my district, my constituents are entitled to the same thing as the fish."

C.A.B. officials would probably sympathize, but when they certify an airline on the basis of "public convenience and necessity," they are thinking strictly in terms of getting people from one place to another safely, on time and for the industry's profit.

The same bookkeeping philosophy brought the SST program into being, but even more so. SST promoters seldom talk of the convenience of faster trips; they talk about the SST's providing the aircraft industry with 50,000 jobs and sales of between \$20-billion and \$48-billion; they talk of the threat of losing the jetliner market to the French-British supersonic plane, the Concorde, which is expected to be in production by 1971, and they speak of the dangerous outflow of gold if the Concorde and other European-built supersonic jetliners are left without competition.

The SST is strictly a money proposition. The comfort of the public at large has nothing to do with it. The spirit of the SST era was captured in a recent Minnesota Law Review article: "If the national interest in acquiring a cross-continental SST fleet cannot be sacrificed to the interests of a more quiet society, cost balancing not unlike that underlying the general airport noise problems seems in order." Translated, this means: go ahead and break the crockery and let the people sue.

The future, however, is not altogether hopeless for the advocate of moderate quiet. In fact, there is one positive influence that is developing along such healthy lines that it may eventually balance these negative influences. It deserves a title, so let us call it:

The New Environmental Putsch. Two months ago in Anaheim, Calif., M. Cecil Mackey, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Policy Development, warned a group of aerospace engineers that if something isn't done to make jet noise acceptable, "people will just say, 'Sorry, we don't want airplanes around anymore, we don't want to travel that way.'" That is a far-fetched threat, but Mackey's speech was considered something of a landmark simply because he was the first important official who seemed to be aware of the bitter rebelliousness developing in airport communities.

Just as revolutionary for a bureaucrat was his admission that the airlines and the airport operators and the aircraft manufacturers can no longer be treated as a privileged industry, as they were in the beginning, but must from now on be considered as just another part of the environment and subject to the total environmental goals of the community.

"As a nation we have changed our standards," he said. "We are no longer satisfied

to have additional airports, new aircraft, more freeways, modern buildings or new industries. We must have them on *acceptable terms*—even if this means greater costs. And if they are not available on acceptable terms, they may be rejected altogether."

It is doubtful that Mackey spoke for his department as a whole. The idea that air transportation can only be measured by its community impact and can only be considered in its social context, and that the solution to its problems will be political as much as economic and technical—this doesn't sound much like the kind of traditional thought one finds in the F.A.A. and the C.A.B., whose umbilical cords stretch back unfrayed into the good old days when Government regulatory bodies were tied altogether to the market place.

However, the cord-cutting precedents have been established, one of the most famous being the Second Circuit Court of Appeals' ruling that the Federal Power Commission should not have licensed Consolidated Edison of New York to build the Storm King Mountain plant on the Hudson River without considering the total environmental impact of the plant—not just engineering and profiteering questions but also such things as esthetics and the tranquility of the community.

The courts are beginning to demand that regulatory agencies view the public as more than consumers, and one of these days, probably soon, the same kind of demand is going to be made of the F.A.A. and the C.A.B. There are several organized efforts to hurry that day along. One of the most militant groups is trying to cancel jet operations out of Washington's National Airport. Headed by Frank C. Waldrop, formerly executive editor of the now defunct Washington Times-Herald, the movement includes many Washington notables, such as Justice and Mrs. William O. Douglas, Mr. and Mrs. Dean Acheson and the wives of several Senators. Not only are they outraged by jet noises, they are also (like airport neighbors everywhere) angry about the pollution from jet traffic.

F.A.A. officials protest that the jets are not great polluters. One of the big jets like the Boeing 727 uses 450 pounds of fuel (kerosene) a minute, they say, and only four-tenths of 1 per cent of this comes out in smoke, soot and other debris. It takes a jet about two minutes to clear the area. This means that the plane will deposit only about two pounds of fuel cast-offs on the city. F.A.A. officials insist that this is a negligible amount; but those who live under it contend that it adds up to several thousand pounds of filth each year.

Waldrop, a highly efficient organizer of the militants, feels that the noise and soot have tightened his army's ranks to the point where they are ready to break through the C.A.B.'s defenses.

"Eddie Rickenbacker told the National Press Club recently that 'the public will just have to get used to aircraft noise,'" said Waldrop, smiling grimly. "Well, we will not accept it. The mice are rebelling. We're the mice and we intend to be heard. Heretofore, the C.A.B. has dismissed individual protestors as crackpots. Maybe we are crackpots. But crackpots as a class deserve to be heard."

"The C.A.B. has so far said they don't have to hear our story, but they only said it by a three to two vote. They're shaking in their boots. If they tell us, 'You have a case but we don't give a damn,' then we'll go down the street to the courts and sue everybody all over the place for damages—including the C.A.B. They have ignored the public as long as they are going to."

Waldrop's assault on the C.A.B.—and on the courts, if it comes to that—will follow a new route that others also are considering: the qualitative route. Heretofore, aviation has had to adhere mostly to quantitative measures: speed, safety, efficiency. But the elusive

index of community impact has not been measured, nor even much considered. As Dr. Patrick J. Doyle, not only one of Waldrop's supporters but also chairman of the Community Medicine and International Health Department at the Georgetown School of Medicine, put it recently: "No matter what euphemisms are offered, this is a real physiological and psychological hazard not measurable by noise machines or computers."

It is a fuzzy area, poorly explored, but the C.A.B. is going to be dragged into it one of these days. "The technological age," says Waldrop, "has run smack dab into the esthetic and psychological age."

If airline and airport and Government officials can limit the growing rebellion to legal action, they will be lucky. When Waldrop complains that his opponents "don't understand anything less than a punch in the nose," he is not speaking literally, but it is still a good measure of the kind of emotions that the noise problem has aroused.

Assistant Secretary Mackey believes that "the methods of protest that are becoming rather widespread in areas like civil rights are equally likely to be used in environmental disputes." Already it is being tried. Some groups have blocked access to airports with their autos; some mothers have tried to wheel their baby carriages onto the landing strips; there has been considerable picketing; here and there an irate citizen has actually taken a potshot at a passing plane. Tempers are short.

Increasingly, airport neighbors would agree with Congressman Pucinski that "a lot of the vested interests, a lot of the special interests who have been trying to skirt around this problem are going to face up to the fact that progress does not mean virtually destroying the lives of some 30-million Americans."

But as a matter of fact, laying all the blame on special interests is the very way to delay progress. The reciprocating machinery of capitalism is propelled by the aggression of special interests balanced by the restraint of government. Aviation's special interests have become overbearing only because Pucinski and his political colleagues at all levels of government haven't done their restraining job. If the politicians are ignorant of how to proceed, it is only because they have not listened to their hirelings.

At least eight agencies and an interagency task force have experts working on the problems, and these are some of their better suggestions for making the airplane a more civilized disturbance.

(1) Manufacturers should be induced (subsidized or bought off) to reverse their present emphasis on engine development. Now they design their engines first and try to silence them after; they should design quieter engines first and then modify them upward in power.

(2) If the quieter engines cannot lift as many passengers per load, fares should be increased to make up the difference. If this chases some travelers back to the rails, thus encouraging the development of faster surface transportation, all the better. If it calls for more Government subsidization of aviation, this will scarcely embarrass the industry, which is perhaps already the most subsidized industry we have.

(3) Future airports should be laid out as nearly as possible to imitate the generosity of the one being prepared for Fort Worth and Dallas. It spreads over 18,000 acres (nearly twice the acreage of the second largest field, Washington's Dulles), and this may even be enough to hold back rapacious real-estate developers.

(4) Wherever possible, neighboring homeowners should be bought out along the paths of maximum noise. Los Angeles, often cited as a model on this point, floated a \$20-million bond issue, of which some will be used to buy private property bordering the take-

off route. (But as 80 per cent of the complaints come from landing noises, this is a limited relief. Around New York City's airports, where hundreds of miles of premium real estate are involved, the cost of buying would be impressive, indeed.)

(5) Airports established in distant suburbs, like Dulles or Baltimore's Friendship (30 miles from Washington), should be made more attractive by servicing them with really highspeed and cheap transportation.

(6) Within earshot of every major airport in the country are dozens of schools and several hospitals; there are 40 schools within noise distance of the Los Angeles airport alone. By 1975, at least 460 cities will be getting jet service. Schools and hospitals built in these cities in the future should be insulated against noise; the materials have been available for years.

In proposing all these things, the experts are quite correct. The only trouble is, with Government planners the good ideas are almost always canceled out by timidity and by niggardliness. Dorn McGrath, director of metropolitan area analysis for H.U.D., after estimating that \$240-million would be needed to insulate the homes most plagued by noise around Kennedy, O'Hare and Los Angeles International airports, said that one should not expect Congress to pick up such a bill.

In saying so, he exposes the operative psyche of Washington's legislators, who are expected eventually to appropriate up to \$3-billion to develop the supersonic of the SST but are not interested in spending 1/12th that amount to insulate homes against jet bedlam.

McGrath's pessimistic appraisal is probably justified, just as is Mackey's warning that "the Federal Government cannot be looked upon as the principal source of capital" to pay for aircraft reform. The reason is simple: Congress just doesn't care enough. Perhaps 50 to 60 Congressmen are really worked up over the problem, but no more than that. The results are exactly what one would expect.

More than two years ago, the brand-new Housing and Urban Development Department was statutorily ordered to "undertake a study to determine feasible methods of reducing the economic loss and hardship" suffered by people who live near airports. The study was to include "feasible methods of insulating such homes from the noise of aircraft" and it was supposed to be completed within one year. It still isn't complete. In fact, it has hardly been started. Congress refused to supply the money for the job.

The default was symptomatic of why the noise problem will continue for a while. There is nothing metaphysical about it. It is just a matter of buying land, of developing quieter engines, of paying the airlines to use them, of soundproofing homes and schools, and hospitals, of not filling in more Jamaica Bays to please real-estate operators, of not subsidizing the development of noisier SST's.

It all comes down to a matter of budgetary priorities and esthetics—the very things, unfortunately, that politicians understand least and that an exasperated public will probably have to teach them.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for the Congress to pass noise-abatement legislation. With the age of the supersonic transport upon us, the noise problem will increase. We have not yet found the answer to subsonic noise from which the people living near the Nation's airports are entitled to relief.

Until we legislate the authority for the Secretary of Transportation to set noise standards and use those standards in certifying aircraft, we cannot achieve noticeable progress in bringing this relief to our citizens.

Now jet noise is being recognized as a national problem. The Federal courts have stated that jet noise is a Federal responsibility. Now is the time to meet that responsibility.

Postal Services Does Great Job in Handling Christmas Mail

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, with virtually everyone in the country as a customer at one time or another, and more than 200 million separate items to handle daily, it is no wonder the Post Office gets complaints.

What we hear about, of course, are the complaints. But the truth of the matter is that in the overwhelming majority of cases, mail is delivered quickly and accurately.

Never was this fact demonstrated more dramatically than last Christmas.

During the Christmas period, the U.S. Post Office Department delivered more mail, and delivered it more economically, than ever before in its history.

The excellent Christmas mail service that Americans in virtually every section of the Nation received was a truly remarkable achievement.

The postal service and our dedicated postal employees merit the thanks and commendation of the public for doing such an outstanding job of delivering the Christmas mail.

It is always a difficult task to handle such a large volume of mail in so short a period, but this past Christmas the postal service's work was made even more challenging by the disastrous fire at Morgan Annex in New York.

Coming at the height of the Christmas rush, the fire knocked out more than 1 million square feet of postal space in the world's busiest post office.

That the postal service was able to overcome this loss is a credit not only to the extra effort put forth by postal employees all along the line, but also an impressive testimonial to the effectiveness of the ZIP code system.

Postmaster General O'Brien said that without the ZIP code it would have been impossible to handle some 10 billion pieces of mail with the use of few man-hours than was required to process less volume just a few years ago.

Growing public acceptance and use of ZIP code make a major contribution to the efficient handling of Christmas mail.

ZIP code was particularly effective in averting the major tieup that easily could have resulted from the fire in Morgan Annex.

Because employees can sort mail by ZIP code without learning complicated sorting schemes, other post offices were able to process much of the mail that normally would have been handled in New York.

Postmaster General O'Brien said post

offices across the land sorted New York City mail by the five digits of the ZIP code, indeed making every large post office an annex of the New York City Post Office during this emergency.

Now that ZIP code has proved itself under the most exacting conditions, I hope this will encourage all Americans to make it an everyday habit to use ZIP code on all their mail.

I offer my congratulations to Postmaster General O'Brien, his staff, and especially to the fine group of postal workers who contribute so much to our Nation's welfare by giving us good, dependable postal service—not just at Christmas, but throughout the year.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of January 3, 1968, was one of a number of newspapers which commented on Christmas mail service, and I include the Monitor editorial as part of my remarks, as follows:

THAT POST OFFICE BLIZZARD

"Despite a major fire in New York and heavy snows in the West, the Post Office Department said today it delivered more Christmas mail at less cost per piece than ever before"—United Press International news item.

We are happy to hear it, and we are happy to say a thank-you to the men and women who, for most of the month of December, endured a fall of white stuff, far exceeding the record snowfalls which hit Arizona and New Mexico.

It is traditional to complain about the Post Office Department and its service, and the former has learned to live with this public attitude. Yet it is only just to point out that much of this criticism is both ill-informed and unfair. It is not always recognized that few government departments have had to cope in so major a way with changes in American national life as has the Post Office. The movement of millions of individuals from city to suburb has greatly enlarged the amount of territory that, in many cases, the same number of mail carriers must cover. Furthermore, notwithstanding the telephone, Americans are becoming a writing people all the time.

All right, we admit that here and there service could be better. But given the size of the job, we think the service is still pretty good.

Alabama's Man of the Year in Agriculture

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a widely known and highly respected citizen of north Alabama has been selected as Alabama's man of the year in service to agriculture by the Progressive Farmer magazine.

The richly deserved recognition has gone to H. Maynard Layman, assistant to the publisher, farm editor, and circulation manager of the Decatur Daily, for his unflinching devotion to the advancement of the farm economy and the people who live in rural areas in his county, his region, and his Nation.

Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson have sought his services on a national level through appointment to advisory agricultural committees.

It has been my great personal pleasure to know and work with Maynard Layman for many years. He is a true gentleman who puts service to his fellowman ahead of any personal considerations.

I want to commend the Progressive Farmer for this excellent selection and I join the magazine in praise of Maynard Layman's service to agriculture.

So that my colleagues may know more of his outstanding service, I include a news story from the Decatur Daily of January 4, 1968, and an editorial by Barrett C. Shelton, Jr., as it appeared in the Decatur Daily of January 7, 1968, as a part of my remarks:

[From the Decatur (Ala.) Daily, Jan. 4, 1968]
PROGRESSIVE FARMER NAMES LAYMAN "MAN OF THE YEAR"

Horace Maynard Layman, assistant to the publisher, farm editor and circulation manager of the Decatur Daily since 1930, has been named Alabama's "Man of the Year" in service to agriculture by The Progressive Farmer.

The award will be presented to Layman at the annual meeting of the Alabama Press Association in February, Vernon Miller, editor of the farm publication said.

Miller said the January issue of the monthly magazine, which will be mailed to subscribers this week, will carry a story on Layman.

"With a wide knowledge of cotton in general, and North Alabama in particular, Layman has provided much assistance to both state and congressional legislators as a consultant on cotton legislation," the story said in part.

The Progressive Farmer began selecting "The Man of the Year" in 1937. Among past winners of the award are Sen. Lister Hill, 1948; Sen. John Sparkman, 1962; and E. P. Garrett, Decatur, 1957.

Layman was born June 12, 1907 in Huntsville. His parents were the Rev. and Mrs. Horace M. Layman.

He moved with his family to Maysville, in Madison County, in 1914 to his grandfather's farm and graduated from Madison County High School at Gurley in 1924.

As a farm boy, Layman was a member of the "Fig Club" and the "Canning Club," sponsored by the Auburn Extension Service, before 4-H clubs were established.

On the farm, cotton, corn, sorghum, peas and soybeans were grown as row crops. Beef cattle, pigs and chickens were the livestock program. There were no tractors in the Maysville Community and all the work on the farm was done with people, mules and horses. In those days a good saddle horse and a good buggy horse were prize possessions.

Layman went to Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn., in 1924, working his way through college. He graduated in 1928 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree. He was a class officer, student secretary of the YMCA and lettered in baseball.

During his college summers Layman worked for the Decatur Kiwanis Club-YMCA as director of the Boys Camp at Vinemont.

In 1929, he held four jobs simultaneously—director of physical and health education for the public school system of Decatur; Boys secretary for the YMCA; and in charge of the recreation program at the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Shops and Connecticut Mills Co.

In 1930, Layman married his college sweetheart, Eleanor Bird of Tryon, N.C., and toward the end of that same year he came to work for the Decatur Daily as circulation manager and farm editor. In the course of the years he has accumulated a farm on Mud Tavern Creek where he grows grass and Black Angus cattle.

A great part of his time, between 1930 and 1967, Layman has been busy as an agriculture leader, an officer in his church, a mem-

ber in the Decatur Rotary Club, and in working with people and their problems.

In the years in which he has been circulation manager, he has directed more than 1,000 boys and it has always been his aim that any boy who started with him through school would either get a job for which he was well suited or would go on to college.

In the course of the years, Layman has been chairman of the agriculture committee of the Decatur Chamber of Commerce. He originated the concept that one of the foundations of the city had to be, "A farm market every day in the year for every farm product grown in the Decatur area." Decatur today is one of the finest farm marketing centers in Alabama.

Since 1954 he has been going to Washington on the problems of the Alabama and Southeastern cotton farmer. With the help of the Alabama Congressional delegation a bill known as the "1966 Freeze" stopped the movement of Southeastern cotton into the western states. Again, with the leadership of the Alabama Congressional delegation, a bill known as the "Release and Reapportionment" was passed which stabilized cotton acres in the Southeast. And again, with the help of the Alabama Congressional delegation, Layman played his part in the passage of the 1965 agricultural bill. The main feature of this bill made it possible for American cotton to compete in the world markets.

Layman is a past president of the Alabama Education Television Commission; a former member of the Agricultural Center Board; and is presently a member of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's National Feed Grain Advisory Committee. He is a past president of the Alabama Episcopal Churches.

For eight years he was a consultant with the Alabama Cotton Legislative Study Committee. He was a member of the original North Alabama Cotton Hardship Committee. He has been a soil conservation supervisor since its establishment in Alabama.

He has one daughter, Mrs. Allison Bailey, Mooresville, and two grandchildren, Pride and Douglas Bailey.

[From the Decatur (Ala.) Daily, Jan. 7, 1968]
THERE ARE MANY HONORS MAYNARD LAYMAN DESERVES

When it was learned here that H. Maynard Layman, who wears a number of hats for The Decatur Daily, was to be named by the Progressive Farmer as the "Man of the Year" in Alabama agriculture, we couldn't have agreed more with the selection. As a matter of fact, the news struck with us such gladness that it was necessary to stop for a moment, feel a tear of gladness grow, and then our thoughts turned us toward the heavens with the thought that he finally is gaining some of the recognition he so richly deserves.

Although this honor deals only with the field of agriculture, there are many areas in this life in which Maynard could be named "Man of the Year" and the honor would also be richly deserved.

To make a conservative statement, we would say that his efforts have reached into many thousands of lives, both directly and indirectly. His specialty has been helping people, and from the time he reached adulthood he has been dealing with people, beginning with YMCA camps, and right on up the line to thousands of carrier boys, who have now become men, at this newspaper. Hardly an hour goes by in the course of a day that someone doesn't call on him for help of some sort, and in every case he has been ready to do everything he possibly could to see that the request was met. Often in order to fulfill the request, it required a great deal of his time and money and each was gladly given without the thought of remuneration.

Many of his former carrier boys still reside in Decatur and have gone on to be successful businessmen, but among these are several

who ask for his judgment when they are faced with making a business decision. Here is a tribute to his desire to help by taking the time to think a problem through, listen to both sides, and offer a suggestion with logic and reason.

The list of those whom he has helped doesn't stop here in Decatur or the Tennessee Valley, but it extends even to Washington where members of the Department of Agriculture often ask for his thinking on problems involving the nation's agriculture. Two Presidents of the United States, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, thought enough of his ability to appoint him to the National Small Grains Advisory Committee.

And there are other areas. Many a night he has sat up with a troubled alcoholic hoping that in some way he could be of help. And today there are many "on the wagon" who will vow Maynard was the one who helped them gain the strength to face life sober.

It is often said that the most successful men don't care who gets the credit for a job well done. Few statements could apply more to Maynard than this one, for it is true that time and again accomplishment has been gained through the extremely hard efforts he has put forth while the credit went to others.

No man is closer to his God and church than is Maynard, and he has never failed to keep close ties with St. John's Episcopal Church from which he credits much of his strength. Not many years ago a terrible tragedy entered his life, and his first move was to go to his church where he summoned the courage to know that life must continue and he had to live it. With this help from the Almighty, he was able to look ahead and say in effect "The Lord makes the decisions, and he had his reasons." Quickly he offered comfort to others who felt the tragedy but not as deep.

It isn't often a newspaper gets to write about the people who make up its heart and soul until they are dead, and for this reason it makes us extremely grateful that this occasion has arisen, both from the standpoint that it was an honor well deserved and also offered the opportunity for us to speak out about a man who we feel is one of the most outstanding to be found anywhere.

We'll beg the readers' pardon for turning to a personal statement, but we never seem to take the time to say thanks to someone for what he has meant to us, and we'll use this opportunity to say to Maynard, "Thanks for everything, and thanks for coming into our life."

Progressive Farmer has made a wise decision.

Stalemate on the Poverty Front

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in a sense, those who blame the disorders of last summer on the poverty program are right, not because any conspiracies were plotted by OEO employees housed in community action centers, but because the war on poverty made a promise—one which was taken seriously by America's poor, but not fulfilled.

And until this Nation and this Congress are willing to make the effort and the expenditure necessary to eradicate poverty in America, the present war on poverty will reap only frustration. William Shannon, writing in today's New

York Times, discusses the "Stalemate on the Poverty Front." I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

STALEMATE ON THE POVERTY FRONT

(By William V. Shannon)

Adam Clayton Powell was walking the streets of Watts, the Negro section of Los Angeles, last week announcing that the serious riots there in 1965 marked the beginning of "the second civil war and the black revolution."

The Johnson Administration, particularly the officials in the Office of Economic Opportunity, where the "war on poverty" is conducted, scarcely needed the return of Adam Powell to remind them that the stubborn problems of the Negro slums are still unsolved.

The fundamental reason is that the poverty war is not a war at all; it is still a pilot project. Congress has not appropriated money on the large scale that is necessary. Moreover, to many Americans this war is even more obscure than that other war in Vietnam—and to some as controversial.

One reason for this popular incomprehension, as pointed out by John C. Donovan in his recent book, "The Politics of Poverty" (Pegasus), is that in 1964 when President Johnson launched the war on poverty, most Americans also received an income tax reduction. This was a war that was going to be financed painlessly out of defense savings and the growth of the Gross National Product.

This war was not only cheap but inconspicuous and uncontroversial. Congress passed the initial poverty legislation, which made a far-reaching national commitment to the poor just as blithely as it also passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution making a far-reaching military commitment in Asia. In his sympathetic but searching appraisal of the beginnings of the poverty program, Mr. Donovan, a former assistant to Secretary of Labor Wirtz, argues persuasively that far-reaching programs originated without considerable public controversy and Congressional involvement are headed for trouble later on. When the inevitable difficulties do occur, these programs lack the sustaining forces of popular understanding and support.

This certainly appears to be true of the poverty program. The public is bewildered by the number and variety of programs such as the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start and Follow Through, not to mention the intricacies of "community action."

CONFUSION ABOUT PROGRAM

This confusion about the program is connected with the fundamental ignorance as to why urban Negroes need so much special help in a nearly full-employment economy. (Although three-quarters of the 30 million poor are white, the Federal war on poverty is directed mostly at helping urban Negroes since many of the non-Negro poor fall into special categories—the residents of Appalachia, the migrant farm workers, the Indians, the aged. Each group needs a program tailored to its specific needs.) The white person living away from a Negro slum has to read books such as Kenneth Clark's "Dark Ghetto" to understand how the miseries of slum life are all interrelated and feed upon one another.

Job statistics, however, give a glimpse of slum conditions. Over-all unemployment for the nation has averaged 3.8 per cent for the past two years, but for Negroes it has averaged above 7 per cent and for Negroes who are 16 to 21 years old it has been close to 25 per cent. Many of the Negro unemployed are men who have been jobless, not for a month or two but for years. Many of those who are counted as working are only sporadically em-

ployed in dead-end jobs as messengers, dishwashers, etc.

These shutouts are among the people the poverty program is principally trying to reach. The existence of jobs is not enough since they are unqualified. Even training programs are not enough because, in the minds of these men, training is associated with the schools they dropped out of. Many suffer from a serious lack of self-confidence in confronting the normal workaday world. They do not know how to fill out forms; they cannot believe that a four-month training course will really get them anywhere; they are afraid to travel to a job in a strange neighborhood. They have never disciplined themselves and find it hard to develop good work habits.

Community action programs, where they are effective as the ABCD program in Boston is, cooperate with the Department of Labor in easing these men into the work force. ABCD, for example, hires Negro men from the slums to cruise the pool halls and street corners recruiting jobless men to enter the training programs. Each recruit is assigned to a counselor who advises him on personal problems and encourages him to stick with the course. Once he is placed in a job and then drops out of it, he receives a follow-up visit to persuade him to make another try.

WHAT A GOOD PARENT DOES

In studying this program, one is inevitably reminded of how middle-class parents rear their children with summer camps, special lessons, tutoring and constant advice and encouragement. The community action workers, in effect, do for these youths and men from severely damaged, deprived backgrounds what a good middle-class parent does for his growing children. The objective is really the same. It is to steer those who are learning away from bad companions, encourage them to look beyond easy gratifications to lasting accomplishment, and help them to belief in self.

Like rearing a family, it is slow, often tedious work, and it will take a generation or more. If this war is ever to be won, it will cost far more than Vietnam and it will be going on long after names like Dak To and Haiphong have been forgotten.

High-Power Transmission Lines

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, several communities in my district are seriously affected by pending proposals to erect high-tension powerlines above ground to meet the increased domestic and industrial electrical needs of the area. In fact, several of the high towers, ranging from 120 to 160 feet high, have already been built.

The State supreme court has now been asked to rule on the problem as the result of an appeal filed by those communities which have local zoning ordinances requiring that such powerlines be placed underground.

I may state, Mr. Speaker, that I have received a number of very strong, vigorous complaints and objections to the proposed routes for this construction from many substantial officials and citizens.

These objections are based on very compelling grounds—first, that the relatively large strip of land proposed to be

taken and utilized for powerlines through our beautiful countryside would not only be extremely unsightly, but would ruin pastures and woodlands, as well as land, that in normal circumstances would be utilized in the future for the construction of homes, schools, public buildings, roads, and other appurtenances vital to the normal expansion, economic interests, and esthetic aspects of our precious resources of land, farming areas and territory that we will be required in the time to come to meet the needs of the people for adequate living space and many other essential private and public purposes.

Among other things, it is asserted that these lines would ruin pastures, woodlands, streams, and our lovely, scenic, peaceful countryside, and ruthlessly convert them into a succession of discordant, unsightly, and dangerous environments.

The lines, it is claimed, would affect electrical equipment of all kinds, including radio and television, increase the normal hazards of electrical storms, and in addition, create serious new dangers and risks for the people of the affected communities, including schoolchildren, women, and other residents of farming and suburban districts.

The case that is made by the opponents against the proposed routes is, to my mind, very strong, and it is confirmed and supported by an overwhelming number of people in the communities involved, as well as by an overwhelming number of people in other communities in our State and area, who see in this proposed transmission route a forbidding precedent that may well be followed in the case of their own communities.

I would like to make it very clear that I fully appreciate and sympathize with the problems of the power company incident to the development of new, high-tension transmission lines, the growing need for more power caused by increased population, industry and business that are now facing us and will continue to face us with increasing urgency in the future.

I am anxious, in every way that I can, consistently with the public interest, and the interests of the people I serve, and the people of our State and Nation generally, to cooperate in every way that I can with our great power industry in its efforts to provide adequate power, better service, and meet these rapidly growing demands.

However, I must state that, notwithstanding the magnitude of the problems involved for the company—and I know that they are many and difficult ones—the public interest must always be paramount, and when we have a situation like the present one, which would impose such shocking, disabling burdens and impediments, inconveniences and annoyances and serious economic loss in terms of reduced property values and esthetic frictions upon both communities and people and expose them to very real dangers as well, in all good conscience and judgment some other satisfactory, alternate solution definitely must be found.

I would not for a moment try to substitute laymen's judgment in the determination of general routes and directions for that of the engineers, experts and ad-

ministrative heads of the power company. They are well qualified for their job and we can be sure that they will perform it, as they have the right and duty to do, with full concern for the many-sided interests of the power company.

But those of us in the public service have a part to play here too, and that is to represent and speak for the public interest—to speak and to protest for the very many people of the rank and file who cannot be here to speak for themselves—for the home and farm owners, the industries, the workers, and all the people.

I do not wish to propose specific alternate routes at this time, but there are some such routes available and I hope that they will be considered and acted upon by the power company and by the public bodies and officials of our great State, particularly the regulatory agency concerned, the department of public utilities, so that most earnest attention will be given to the prospect of appropriate, corrective measures to minimize the dangers, risks, economic losses, inconveniences and the objectionable, disagreeable characteristics of the pending high-tension route proposals.

I hope that the representatives of the power company, who are so expert and well versed in these matters and who well understand the changes, the alternate routes and revisions in this program that can be considered and utilized, will move to adjust this overall route, in whole or in part, in ways to make it less obnoxious, less disagreeable, less of an economic and esthetic impediment and less objectionable to so many people, even if it will cost some more money, even if it entails some additional effort and work on their part, even if it means that the company, too, is put to some inconvenience. It is my opinion that these company representatives can give their penetrating, expert attention to setting up alternate routes that will do the job that has to be done without the dire, detrimental impact upon so many fine communities and their people that this one would unquestionably produce.

I recognize, of course, that cost is an element in these matters, especially in these days of inflation and high prices and that any cost involved in this project will be most likely reflected in rates. But I also believe that no matter what curative and corrective changes are made in this route the cost would not be truly prohibitive, and I think the experts might well agree that ordinary changes could be absorbed in the rate structure.

If underground lines were adopted in this project, it would be costly and expensive, to be sure. But here again, in time, it might be covered into the rate structure without producing any prohibitive increase in the rates.

In time, we will have to come to underground transmission lines in this district, State and Nation, in the not too distant future anyway, as this great, bounding, dynamic economy grows and expands, in order to cope adequately with the multitude of complex community problems of this complicated, fast-moving nuclear-jet age.

It seems very clear to me that the time is coming, and I think it not too far away when in the interests of everyone concerned, the public, the company, the homeowners, farmers, business, industry, and all the people we will have to consider putting these dangerous unsightly electric powerlines underground.

Whether that procedure can be followed in the present instance or not, I do not definitely know. But I think it could be given study and consideration, and I think that all proposals to change the present route of this power transmission project, which is so bitterly objected to by so many people, could be given most careful and most serious consideration with a view to finding a formula and a solution that will truly serve the business interests, the interests of the power company, and the interests of everyone concerned, and relieve the people and all the parties involved from the very unhappy circumstances and consequences that are entailed in this route.

As one who believes in, supports, and fights for our great free enterprise system in the Congress, and who is interested in keeping it vigorous, healthy, and strong, so as even better to serve the American people, I respectfully urge everyone concerned in pressing the proposed route, to pause before this project goes forward as it is now proposed.

I urge that the project be studied carefully to try to find a more adequate rationale—a better overall plan, a more acceptable route that will not cause such deep bitterness and resentment on the part of those who will be the victims of any plan which causes so much upset in so many places and sparks the fears and deep hostility of so many people.

I hope these pending questions will be given most comprehensive and sober attention, and urge by all means the adoption of a plan and a program that will meet the serious, deep-rooted objections that have been made to portions of this particular route. Let us have some basic, organic changes, where necessary and indicated, that will permit to be accomplished the job that has to be done to provide electric power at reasonable cost to widespread communities, and at the same time command the respect, confidence, and gratitude of the people for serving them faithfully and well without desecrating their cherished countrysides and bringing new dangers for them, their communities, and their dear ones.

Let us not have an economic, social, and certainly not, a political blackout in this vital enterprise. Let us keep it in line with the best traditions of our great productive system and the best interests of the people. That is the finest job we can do in this important matter at this time for everyone concerned.

I again urge that this high-tension route not be approved in its present form, and that it not be approved until such time as it has been revised and corrected to meet the many objections that have been raised against it. I hope this end can be achieved by agreement between the parties. This is our chance to show that we can adjust a great economic problem facing us with true concern for the public interest and in the

spirit of fairness and justice for everyone involved.

The Congress and the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, are already carefully studying the need for underground transmission of electric power. The problem was brought sharply into focus by President Johnson at the White House Conference on Natural Beauty on May 25, 1965. At that time the Panel on Underground Installation of Utilities made this statement:

Electric power exists in this country to a remarkable degree and contributes greatly to our national strength. The transmission lines interconnecting sources of production and areas of utilization are channels of energy movement and sinews of might. These are part of our Nation's capacity to achieve higher standards of living for more and more people. They merit our most thoughtful understanding and action.

The need for underground transmission, however, is not new. It dates back more than half a century. This need has been continually accentuated by the increasing demand for higher transmission voltages and the necessity to provide more and larger transmission structures. In metropolitan areas, transmission lines have already been forced underground because of the expensive rights-of-way. It would be impossible both from the standpoint of natural beauty and public safety for all these power lines to traverse our major cities.

Today, an estimated 300,000 miles of overhead transmission lines cut across the open spaces and through the small towns of America. These lines eat up nearly 7 million acres and have a detrimental effect on many millions more. In some communities, a mile of line detracts from 300 acres of property.

This is bad enough, but what about the future? According to estimates by the Federal Power Commission the present transmission facilities will more than triple by 1980. This means that we will have nearly 1 million miles of overhead lines in the United States. It also means that some 20 million acres of our Nation's land will be lost to rights-of-way for power corridors. Just how much is 20 million acres? Let me give you a graphic comparison. Twenty million acres would be a chunk of land about twice the size of our whole national park system.

Here's another way to state the problem: suburban sprawl and other urban uses are gobbling up about 2 million acres of rural countryside every year.

Underground distribution is already the common practice in many progressive residential areas. In 1966 there were 320,000 single unit dwellings connected to underground systems in this country. New connections are being added at the rate of about 100,000 a year. Estimates show that by 1970 we will have more than 1.2 million units being served by the underground method.

Another example of what can be done to improve underground utility systems can be found at many of our modern universities. A university campus is a microcosm of a city. On campuses you often find utility tunnels forming a network between the buildings. All the

pipes and wires needed to serve the occupants of several buildings go through these multipurpose tunnels. This makes it easier to repair or replace any particular pipe or wire. If we had such tunnels under city streets, traffic would not be held up so often whenever utility repairs are required.

Alaskans call these big tubes "utilidors." Since utilidors have proved to be successful in the Arctic, perhaps cost-benefit studies might show that they would be good investments in milder climates also. Such tunnels might reduce our electric, telephone, gas, water and other utility bills, as well as improve the landscape.

The power industry itself is not able to tackle the underground transmission problem alone. The costs are too great. To me, it seems clear that the responsible Federal agencies have not assumed the necessary leadership. Furthermore, it seems to me that ultimately the Congress will have to take necessary action in this field.

This conflict can and must be resolved. But we cannot resolve it with pleasant words about natural beauty. It will take something more than study groups, conferences, and legislation that does little more than plead for increased research, planning, and cooperation.

All these elements may be necessary, but to actually solve the problem will require much more. What will be most needed is concerted action by all groups—local, State, and Federal—joining together to help speed a solution to this pressing problem.

The time to act is now, before it is too late.

Dr. George Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, NASA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the fall, 1967, issue of "Challenge," a House publication of the General Electric Co., contained an excellent article on Dr. George Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight of NASA, which I believe to be one of the finest coverages of a man who is shouldering one of the largest responsibilities in our country today. The entire world is focused on our manned efforts in space, and while the entire world may not know Dr. George Mueller, in the words of former President Harry Truman, if we fail, "the buck will stop" at Dr. George Mueller's desk.

The article follows:

THE MAN BEHIND MANNED SPACE FLIGHT

Dr. George E. Mueller is NASA's Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight. But to let it go at that is like allowing that Mickey Mantle plays baseball for the New York Yankees. Either way, you say something, but not nearly enough.

From his fourth floor office in NASA's headquarters in Washington, D.C., George Mueller directs a 300,000-man outfit with people lo-

cated at the Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas; the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama; the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Florida; in Washington, D.C., and about 20,000 industrial plants around the country. A staff meeting with everyone in attendance would be SRO in a facility three times the size of Philadelphia's John F. Kennedy Stadium or the Los Angeles Coliseum.

Employment figures, although they indicate an organization's size, give no hint of the complexity of its task. Referring to one program—Apollo—Dr. Mueller grins as he recalls a remark made by Bob Hotz, editor of *Aviation Week*. "Bob once said that the technical challenge presented by the Apollo program alone was equal in complexity to building the supersonic transport, the pyramids, and the atomic bomb—taken together.

"I don't think there's any doubt that the manned space effort is the most complex effort this nation has ever undertaken. We started with no road maps, no proven methods for getting where we wanted to be in space. And I do believe that Apollo and Gemini represent the toughest technical challenge the world has ever seen. On the other hand, I guess the program manager on the pyramid job figured he had some pretty tough technical problems to handle, too!"

Probably. But the stringent long-life reliability requirement seems to have been offset by a rather liberal cost/schedule package. Obviously, things have tightened up a bit.

Some things, however, never change. One is the need for effective communications throughout an entire program organization. Dr. Mueller's is no exception. "Because of our size and the complexity of our task," he says, "we have an almost unique communications situation. Generally, it works pretty well, but there's always room for improvement. If I had to point to a single area in which there's no room for a breakdown, it would be communications. It's absolutely necessary that we have clear, accurate, hard communications—within NASA and between NASA and its contractors.

"You can't operate this organization or these programs on emotions. You've got to know what the problems are, and then get on and solve them. People have got to talk to each other, and this dialogue has to be present during all phases of a program. We and the contractors must work together to develop a program and a schedule for its successful competition. Then we've got to meet that schedule, or at least signal each other if we see a delay coming.

"The necessity for detailed planning—and for adherence to the plan—is clear. But I see with equal clarity the need to keep others on a program informed. There's simply no alternative."

George Mueller's is not a one-sided view. It's one he's acquired through years of experience and changing perspective. Trained as an engineer, he's done research, been a teacher, a businessman, and now a NASA executive.

After winning his electrical engineering degree from the Missouri School of Mines, Dr. Mueller moved on to Purdue University where he earned a master's in E.E. His next stop was Bell Telephone Labs. While with Bell Labs he performed TV, microwave and measuring experiments. It was during this period that he did some pioneering work in measurement of radio energy emitted by the sun, microwave propagation and low-field electrons.

While at Bell, Dr. Mueller attended Princeton University and undertook additional graduate studies. Later, he joined the faculty of Ohio State University where he eventually became a full professor of electrical engineering, did more research and won his Ph. D. degree. His research activity carried him into the fields of broadcast and

dielectric antennas, cathode emission, low field magnetrons and traveling wave tubes.

He then had one more stop to make along the way to becoming America's top man in the manned space effort.

At the Space Technology Laboratories, Inc., (STL), Dr. Mueller continued his pioneering ways. He merely exchanged his lab jacket for a suit coat. His list of assignments is impressive:

Director of Electronic Labs.

Director, Able program.

Vice President, Space Systems Management.

Vice President, Research and Development.

As research and development vice president, Dr. Mueller gave the marching orders for all of STL's technical operations. And since STL was itself so deeply involved in so much of the nation's space activity, Dr. Mueller was at one time or another responsible for design, development and testing of systems and components for Atlas, Titan, Thor, and Minuteman ballistic missiles. Space probes were yet another area in which his influence was felt.

Pioneer I, America's first successful space probe, illustrates the impact of Dr. Mueller's influence. He is credited with having made a major contribution to Pioneer's development. Subsequently, he had over-all program responsibility for both Explorer VI and Pioneer V.

A recognized expert on space communications and space technology—he was one of the originators of the concept and design of the Telebit digital telemetry system—Dr. Mueller carried a long list of achievements with him when he moved into his NASA office. Holder of seven electrical engineering patents, author of more than 20 technical papers, and co-author (with E. R. Spangler) of the book "Communication Satellites," George Mueller has, for all purposes, seen and participated in science and space from every angle.

It's therefore almost irresistible to wonder: why would you want to give up a soft job in an outstanding university and then go into this wild business? But you don't ask it that way. You inquire: "Was there a turning point in your career? Some incident that led you toward your present job?"

George Mueller laughs. He knows what you mean. "I can't recall any special turning point," he replies.

"It's all been fascinating. I must say there is a tremendous contrast between today's job and teaching and doing research at Ohio State. I doubt that I'm any different than a lot of people with relatively similar backgrounds and training. At some point in a person's career he must decide between management and becoming a technical expert. But it seems to me that the problems you encounter as you go along with your profession very often help you with that decision. For instance, the pressure at universities sometimes forces people into assuming certain management tasks. So they're launched on a new facet of their career whether they like it or not. As for me, I like management. Once I got into it, I was determined to learn it as well as my technical specialty and to do the best job I could. And like every other manager, I'm still learning."

The modesty is genuine. Spend an hour with George Mueller and you know it. Some of it he surely brought to the job, and just as surely the job helps a man keep himself in perspective. One of the things he stresses is that manned space is not a one- or ten- or even hundred-man show. Every person and every contractor has got a big job. He says:

"It's often difficult, I know; but all of us have got to put the program before ourselves and our companies. Having been in industry, I know how tough this can be on occasion

for a contractor. But contractors have got to give us their ideas, and they've got to tell us their troubles when they have them.

"In Apollo alone, it's so important that people at all levels understand the goals of the program. And communications must be such that the Apollo executives and the presidents and chairmen of the various contractor organizations can always get together to work out the big problems when they arise.

"I think there's a good and conscientious spirit within the contractor community. We've made good progress in overcoming cost problems—and these we had in quantity until last summer. We've got an active and continuing cost program and we're getting the cooperation we need from industry.

"Regarding communications, we have been operating on the basis that we'll do today what we have planned for today. It's a sort of step-by-step procedure following the plans and goals laid out and agreed on by everyone involved. This is the same procedure that worked so well on Gemini. It was going well on Apollo, too, before the accident. Now, we've made some adjustments and we've strengthened our team considerably."

George Mueller lives in a world where people must act on the problems, not react to them. It's therefore natural that he should offer this comment when asked the primary characteristic of a good manager:

"The true test of a good manager is evident in his ability to select and then persuade people who are better than he is to work for him. This, I think, is the essential ingredient prevalent in the best managers. I think that all of us must constantly strive to find ways to improve our ability to do this.

"This is a basic problem that all of us—in NASA and in industry—face. We must never cease to replenish the reservoir of skills so vital to proper support of the program.

"This is something we could all do better. We've got to seek out and develop new ways to maintain high morale and enthusiasm at all levels.

"Furthermore, I think that to be truly successful with Apollo and future manned programs, contractors are going to be so confident in what they do that they really stand behind the products they build—this is the real challenge of Apollo.

"It's always easier to begin a program than it is to successfully complete one—within budget and on schedule. And I must say that by and large the contractors have done a good job here—and General Electric has done an excellent job."

For George Mueller, the Apollo program is just a beginning. He sees the so-called post-Apollo period as one that will bring the real rewards of space activity down to earth. Some of the goals for this period:

The extension of man's experience in space through a step-by-step process in flights of one month, two months, and eventually a year or more in orbit.

The continued scientific exploration of the moon, after the initial landing, at the rate of two to four flights a year.

Research and development of new payloads that will exploit the capability of the Saturn-Apollo systems in earth orbit and lunar orbit.

Improvements of the Apollo spacecraft so it can be used with the up rated Saturn I launch vehicle as a six-man ferry between earth and earth orbit, with capability for landing on land.

This venture, called the Apollo Applications Program, has two principal objectives. Dr. Mueller comments: "Our first objective is concerned with the advancement of manned space flight capability. The second is related to things that can be done with this capability.

"Obviously, in the first category are efforts to develop the capability for economical space flight and to determine the usefulness of man in space. In the second category,

we see the opportunity to conduct astronomy observations, extended lunar exploration and experiments to study benefits on earth.

"Of course we don't yet know all the commercial applications that may result from the man-in-space program. A lot of people want to know if space vehicles will one day replace the airplane. I don't think it's likely, at least not for intraplanetary travel. It would seem to be a relatively inefficient use for a spacecraft and booster, and the cost of transportation always determines its applicability. On the other hand, I'd like to point out that during the past nine years of the space program we've gotten our cost-per-pound of payload down by about 1,000 times.

"Over the next ten years this may be reduced additional hundreds of times. Another factor: our fuel costs are minute compared to those of the airlines, where fuel represents a main cost of transportation. This part of the future is difficult to predict."

In the immediate future of manned space flight, Dr. Mueller emphasizes the efficiency and economy of the Apollo Applications Program. He points to current and continuing efforts toward improvements that reduce vehicle unit costs, thereby speeding the day of economical applications.

"One of the cost-saving aspects of Apollo Applications is the re-use of the Command Module. We hope to refurbish Command Modules flown in the Apollo program for Apollo Applications, and thus avoid several million dollars in costs for new hardware.

"Another step is the addition of land-landing capability which facilitates re-use of the Command Module. This would have even greater impact on costs if it should lead to the ability to dispense with the requirement for naval recovery forces.

"The land-landing capability will provide still another major benefit, an increase in crew capacity from three to six. This is so because land-landing requires retrorockets that soften the impact to three or four feet per second. In water landings, the impact is between 10 and 20 feet per second. The lowering of the impact shock reduces the requirements placed on the couches and their suspension; therefore we can have a crew of six.

"A fourth item is the double use of the second stage of the up rated Saturn I—the S-IVB. After it has done its job in the launch phase of the mission, the stage will be converted to the Orbital Workshop.

"Fifth is the repeated use of the Orbital Workshop as an embryonic space station.

"Number six is the plan to conduct flights of increasing duration. The program worked out with the advice of the space medicine community envisions a series of steps that roughly double the length of each previous flight. We hope this process will lead to missions lasting a year or more in orbit.

"Finally, one of the most important economy features of Apollo Applications is its basic concept—that of using the flight hardware and physical plant developed for Apollo, and employing the skills of the Apollo people and industrial organizations as they become available."

But before any of these programs with their increased benefits for science, and indeed the entire nation, there's still the matter of the first manned Apollo launch and subsequent Apollo flights. Or as Dr. Mueller has put it, doing today what we have planned for today. "It's quite clear," he says, "that the future of this nation depends on its ability to produce more and better things for all people. Man-in-space, and the subsequent application of what we learn, is just one of those things—but an important one. To date, the creative participation of individuals from government and industry—working as a team—has resulted in bringing about changes and benefits to the national way of life that

even the greatest visionaries wouldn't have dreamed of.

"Most of what we have already accomplished has been the result of intelligent and dedicated individuals joining together to form a team. We can't afford to lose that spirit. We must have enthusiasm, we must insure that people retain their respect for the program and its goals. As managers and as individuals that is perhaps our greatest challenge—and in this we must not fail."

Report to the People of the Seventh Ohio District

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my report to the people of the Seventh Ohio District on my voting and attendance records for the first session of the 90th Congress.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place a compilation of the votes I cast from the opening day of the first session, 90th Congress, January 10, 1967, until the sine die adjournment on December 15, 1967.

There were 447 calls of the House to which I responded 410 times, a score of 92 percent. Of these, 202 were routine quorum calls to which I responded 190 times, a 94 percent attendance record. These quorum calls are omitted from this report in the interest of conserving space.

There were 245 recorded rollcall votes in the House. I was present to vote for 220, a score of 90 percent. By comparison, a compilation by Congressional Quarterly shows that, on the 245 House rollcall votes, Republicans averaged 83-percent participation and Democrats averaged 81 percent.

Ten of the 25 missed rollcall votes took place on Friday or Monday of the weekend my wife and newborn son returned home from the hospital in Ohio. All 10 issues were considered noncontroversial in nature and all passed by wide margins. The remaining 15 missed votes were at various times during the year when I was absent from Washington in order to meet previously made commitments to my constituents.

On several of these occasions, I inserted statements in the RECORD indicating how I would have voted if present. (See notes at end of table.)

The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for the purpose of identification only. No attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. The descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bill, which do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. However, upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill and the reasons for my vote.

My voting record follows:

REPORT ON RECORDED VOTES CAST BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., 1ST SESS., 90TH CONG.

Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote	Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote
2	Jan. 10	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 246, Ford 186.) (See note 1, last page.)	Ford.	63	Apr. 11	H.R. 2512, revising the copyright law: On passage. (Passed 379 to 29.)	Yes.
3	Jan. 10	H. Res. 1, authorizing the seating of Adam Clayton Powell: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Rejected 126 to 305.)	No.	65	Apr. 12	H.R. 5404, amending National Science Foundation Act of 1950: On passage. (Passed 391 to 22.)	Yes.
4	Jan. 10	On resolution as amended. (Agreed to 363 to 65.)	Yes.	68	Apr. 13	H. Res. 418, establishing a standing committee known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: On resolution. (Passed 400 to 0.)	Yes.
5	Jan. 10	H. Res. 7, adopting rules of House to cut off debate and prevent presentation of amendment to abolish 21-day rule adopted as part of rules of previous Congress: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Rejected 196 to 225.)	No.	70	Apr. 20	H. Res. 443, expressing sympathy of the House on death of Konrad Adenauer: On resolution. (Passed 357 to 0.)	Yes.
6	Jan. 10	On amendment to eliminate the 21-day rule. (Agreed to 233 to 185.)	Yes.	71	Apr. 20	H.R. 207, authorizing Interior Department financial participation in a large water desalting and nuclear power plant: On passage. (Passed 315 to 38.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 8	H. Res. 226, providing for consideration of H.R. 4573, the national debt limit increase: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 223 to 183.)	No.	73	Apr. 27	H.R. 9029, making appropriations for Interior Department for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit with instructions to limit spending to 95 percent of 1968 budget estimate. Rejected (158 to 231.)	Yes.
12	Feb. 8	H.R. 4573, national debt limit increase: On motion to recommit with instructions. (Rejected 155 to 261.)	Yes.	74	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 377 to 11.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 8	On passage (to increase the debt ceiling). (Passed 215 to 199.)	No.	75	Apr. 27	H. Res. 442 providing for consideration of H.R. 2508, congressional redistricting: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Passed 284 to 99.)	Yes.
15	Feb. 20	H.R. 2, amending United States Code to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and clarify status of National Guard technicians: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 325 to 13.)	Yes.	76	Apr. 27	H.R. 2508, providing for congressional redistricting: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete provision permitting Hawaii and New Mexico to continue electing their Representatives at large. (Rejected 161 to 203.)	Yes.
17	Feb. 21	H. Res. 83, authorizing Agriculture Committee Investigations: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Passed 230 to 85.)	Yes.	77	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 289 to 63.)	Yes.
18	Feb. 21	On resolution as amended to exclude overseas travel. (Agreed to 306 to 18.)	Yes.	79	May 1	H.J. Res. 543, extending the period for 47 additional days during which a strike or change in work rules was illegal under the Railway Labor Act applicable to the current dispute: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 302 to 56.)	Yes.
22	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278, seating of Representative-elect Adam Clayton Powell: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Rejected 202 to 222.)	No.	81	May 3	H.R. 9481, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1967: On passage. (Passed 391 to 6.)	Yes.
23	Mar. 1	On ordering previous question on amendment to exclude Adam Clayton Powell from membership in 90th Cong. as a substitute to the resolution. (Passed 263 to 161.)	Yes.	84	May 9	H.R. 9240, authorizing appropriations during fiscal 1968 for military procurement: On passage. (Passed 401 to 3.)	Yes.
24	Mar. 1	On amendment. (Passed 248 to 176.)	Yes.	86	May 11	H. Res. 161, providing additional \$1,200 per year telephone allowance for Members of Congress to use in their home districts: On resolution. (Passed 189 to 157.)	No.
25	Mar. 1	On resolution as amended to exclude Adam Clayton Powell from being seated as a Member of the House of Representatives. (Passed 307 to 116.)	Yes.	87	May 11	H. Res. 464, authorizing the hiring of 78 additional Capitol policemen: On resolution. (Passed 334 to 16.)	Yes.
26	Mar. 1	On ordering previous question on preamble. (Passed 311 to 9.)	Yes.	92	May 17	H.R. 9960, making appropriations for Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968: On amendment to cut out \$10,000,000 rent supplement contract authority. (Passed 233 to 171.)	Yes.
28	Mar. 2	H.R. 4515, authorizing supplemental military procurement for fiscal 1967: On motion to recommit with instructions that none of the funds could be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam. (Rejected 18 to 372.)	Not voting.	93	May 17	On motion to recommit with instructions to decrease from \$225,000,000 to \$12,000,000 funds to be used for model cities programs. (Rejected 193 to 213.)	Yes.
30	Mar. 8	S. 665, authorizing supplemental military procurement for fiscal year 1967: On conference report. (Passed 364 to 13.)	Yes.	94	May 17	On final passage. (Passed 347 to 56.)	Yes.
32	Mar. 9	H.J. Res. 267, for emergency food assistance to India: On passage. (Passed 312 to 63.)	Yes.	95	May 17	H.R. 6431, extending the programs of Federal matching grants for the construction and staffing of community mental health centers: On passage. (Passed 355 to 0.)	Yes.
33	Mar. 9	H. Res. 376, authorizing the Speaker to appoint a special counsel to represent the House in litigation filed by Adam Clayton Powell: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Passed 254 to 85.)	Yes.	102	May 24	H.R. 7819, authorizing appropriation of funds for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education programs for fiscal 1969: On amendment changing the formula for distribution of title I funds to school districts with needy children, so that 15 poorer States would receive more money. (Passed 222 to 194.)	Yes.
36	Mar. 15	H.R. 6098, providing for an extension of the interest equalization tax: On passage. (Passed 261 to 138.)	Yes.	103	May 24	On amendment providing that Federal funds for supplementary centers and services go directly to the qualifying State departments of education. (Passed 230 to 185.)	Yes.
38	Mar. 16	H.R. 7123, providing supplemental Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1967: On passage. (Passed 385 to 11.)	Yes.	104	May 24	On motion to recommit with instructions that committee hold further hearings. (Rejected 180 to 236.)	Yes.
39	Mar. 16	H.R. 6950, restoring the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property: On passage. (Passed 386 to 2.)	Yes.	105	May 24	On passage. (Passed 294 to 122.)	Yes.
40	Mar. 20	H.R. 2068, increasing veterans' pensions: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 360 to 0.)	Yes.	108	May 25	S. 1432, extending the draft law for 4 years: On passage. (Passed 362 to 9.)	Yes.
41	Mar. 20	H.R. 2513, proposing a Commission on National Observances and Holidays: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 315 to 35.)	Yes.			H.R. 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary:	
43	Mar. 21	H.R. 5277, increasing the present authorization for Pacific Trust Territory civil government for fiscal 1967, 1968, 1969: On passage. (Passed 371 to 15.)	Yes.	110	May 31	On amendment to limit amount of Federal subsidy in the sale of Small Business Administration participation certificates. (Passed 186 to 144.)	Yes.
45	Mar. 22	H.R. 7501, authorizing appropriations for the Departments of the Post Office and Treasury and related agencies for fiscal 1968: On amendment providing for 15 proposed new positions in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury. (Passed 211 to 175.)	Yes.	111	May 31	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit spending to 95 percent of 1968 budget estimate excluding FBI funds. (Passed 171 to 156.)	Yes.
46	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit spending to 95 percent of 1968 budget estimates. (Rejected 168 to 217.)	Yes.	116	June 5	H.R. 10226, providing additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for more servicemen: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316 to 0.)	Yes.
47	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 372 to 7.)	Yes.			H.R. 10509, making appropriations for Agriculture Department for fiscal 1968:	
49	Mar. 22	H.J. Res. 428, supporting other American Republics in a historic new phase of the Alliance for Progress: On motion to recommit with instructions to reword the resolution to the effect of giving sympathetic consideration to ways and means of implementing agreements reached at Punta del Este, Uruguay. (Defeated 147 to 210.)	Yes.	119	June 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit spending to 95 percent of 1968 budget estimate, but this exclusion not to apply to special milk and school lunch programs. (Rejected 175 to 222.)	Yes.
50	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 234 to 117.)	No.	120	June 6	On final passage. (Passed 357 to 38.)	Yes.
52	Apr. 5	H. Res. 364, providing funds for the expenses of the Science and Astronautics Committee: On motion to recommit with instructions to provide additional funds to hire Republican minority staff employees. (Rejected 176 to 216.)	Yes.	122	June 7	H. Res. 504, providing for consideration of H.R. 10328, to increase national debt ceiling: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Passed 291 to 99.)	Yes.
53	Apr. 5	H. Res. 221, providing funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities: On ordering previous question on resolution and amendments. (Passed 305 to 92.)	Yes.	123	June 7	H.R. 10328, increasing the national debt ceiling: On passage. (Rejected 197 to 211.)	No.
54	Apr. 5	On motion to recommit with instructions that open hearings be held to justify additional funds for committee. (Rejected 92 to 304.)	No.	126	June 8	H.R. 9029, making appropriations for Interior Department for fiscal year 1968: On conference report. (Agreed to 321 to 49.)	No.
55	Apr. 5	On resolution providing funds for continuance of committee investigation un-American activities. (Agreed to 350 to 43.)	Yes.			H.R. 1318, authorizing funds for food stamp program for fiscal 1968:	
57	Apr. 6	H. Res. 413, providing for consideration of H.R. 2512, copyright law revision: On resolution. (Agreed to 347 to 42.)	Yes.	128	June 8	On amendment requiring states to pay 20 percent of program costs. (Rejected 173 to 191.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 6	H.R. 2512, revising the copyright law: On motion to strike enacting clause. (Rejected 126 to 252.)	No.	129	June 8	On passage. (Passed 230 to 128.)	No.
62	Apr. 11	H.J. Res. 493, adding 20 days to the 60-day "cooling off period" during which a strike or change in work rules was illegal under the Railway Labor Act applicable to the current dispute: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 396 to 8.)	Yes.	131	June 12	H.R. 7476, authorizing adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates: On passage. (Passed 234 to 109.)	No.
				135	June 13	H.R. 10738, authorizing appropriations for Defense Department for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 407 to 1.)	Yes.
				139	June 19	H.R. 6111, providing for establishment of a Federal Judicial Center: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 230 to 97.)	No.
				140	June 19	H.R. 10730, extending provisions of the Older American Act: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 333 to 0.)	Yes.
				141	June 19	H.R. 480, extending the period during which Federal funds could be appropriated to continue the purchase of wetlands for migratory waterfowl conservation: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 329 to 8.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

REPORT ON RECORDED VOTES CAST BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., 1ST SESS., 90TH CONG.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote	Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote
142	June 19	H.R. 482, increasing the price of the Federal migratory bird hunting stamps from \$3 to \$5: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 238 to 97.)	Yes.	224	Aug. 21	H.R. 12257, extending and expanding authorization for vocational rehabilitation: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 340 to 0.)	Yes.
144	June 20	S. 1432, extending the draft law for 4 years: On conference report. (Agreed to 377 to 29.)	Yes.	226	Aug. 21	H.R. 11565, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize the transfer of peanut acreage allotments: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 208 to 146, a two-thirds majority being required.)	No.
145	June 20	H.R. 10480, prohibiting desecration of the U.S. flag: On passage. (Passed 387 to 16.)	Yes.	229	Aug. 22	H.R. 12474, making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 312 to 92.)	No.
147	June 21	H.R. 10867, increasing the national debt limit: On motion to recommit with instructions to make permanent the present temporary national debt limit ceiling of \$336,000,000,000, with any increases beyond this figure temporary in nature. (Rejected 191 to 223.)	Yes.	235	Aug. 25	H.R. 12048, authorizing foreign aid appropriations for fiscal 1968: On amendment to prevent Export-Import Bank financing of arms sales to foreign nations. (Passed 236 to 157.)	Not voting.
148	June 21	On passage. (Passed 217 to 196.)	No.	236	Aug. 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to cut the technical assistance authorization from \$243,000,000 to \$210,000,000. (Passed 234 to 163.)	Not voting.
153	June 26	H.R. 8582, increasing the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals: On passage. (Passed 335 to 6.)	See note 4.	237	Aug. 25	On passage. (Passed 202 to 194.)	Not voting.
154	June 26	H.R. 10783, relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia: On passage. (Passed 355 to 14.)	See note 5.	239	Aug. 28	H.R. 8965, increasing the amount of Federal funds needed for building a pollution control measure to benefit Washington, D.C.: On passage. (Passed 118 to 109.)	No.
155	June 26	H.R. 10943, authorizing funds to continue modified Teacher Corps and training programs:	Yes.	240	Sept. 11	H.R. 11816, providing disability and death benefits for State and local police or their survivors when officers are injured or killed in apprehending or attempting to apprehend violators of Federal laws: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 310 to 0.)	Yes.
156	June 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete Teacher Corps. (Rejected 146 to 257.)	Yes.	241	Sept. 11	H.R. 8654, permitting in certain cases appeals by the United States from pretrial orders for return of seized property or to suppress evidence: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 311 to 1.)	Yes.
157	June 27	On passage. (Passed 312 to 88.)	Yes.	242	Sept. 11	H.R. 8775, increasing the authorization for Interior Department work in the Missouri River Basin from \$60,000,000 to \$68,000,000: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 225 to 83.)	No.
160	June 28	H.R. 10340, authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit with instructions to decrease funds by \$136,400,000 and set up an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. (Passed 239 to 157.)	Yes.	244	Sept. 12	H.R. 10738, authorizing appropriations for Defense Department for fiscal 1968: On conference report. (Agreed to 365 to 4.)	Yes.
161	June 28	On passage. (Passed 342 to 53.)	Yes.	245	Sept. 12	On motion to recede and concur with Senate amendment prohibiting funds under the bill from being expended to build Navy ships outside of the United States. (Rejected 144 to 233.)	No.
163	July 11	H.R. 10805, extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 284 to 89.)	Yes.	253	Sept. 14	S. 602, authorizing funds for Appalachian and regional development commissions: On amendment to reduce authorization. (Passed 199 to 161.)	Yes.
165	July 12	S. 20, providing for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs: On passage. (Passed 369 to 19.)	Yes.	254	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions that authority for spending funds go to the Federal agencies involved, to delete \$5,000,000 housing program authorization and add \$2,500,000 for Great Lakes fishery conservation grants. (Defeated 178 to 184.)	Yes.
167	July 13	H.R. 10595, prohibiting the sale of State lottery tickets by most banks and savings and loan institutions: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 135 to 257.)	Yes.	257	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 189 to 168.)	No.
168	July 13	On passage. (Passed 271 to 111.)	Yes.	255	Sept. 18	H.R. 4451, providing protection for U.S. fishing vessel owners: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 147 to 175.)	Not voting.
170	July 17	S.J. Res. 81, providing for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees: On motion to concur in Senate amendments to House amendment binding determination of Special Board to take effect in absence of agreement between parties to dispute. (Passed 244 to 148.)	Yes.	258	Sept. 18	S. 1657, extending authority for indemnity payments to dairy farmers: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 320 to 7.)	Not voting.
173	July 18	H.R. 11456, making appropriations for the Transportation Department for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit with instructions to limit spending to 95 percent of 1968 budget estimate. (Passed 213 to 189.)	Yes.	259	Sept. 18	H. Res. 838, authorizing House Judiciary Committee to conduct various investigations involving overseas travel by its members and employees: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 262 to 52.)	Not voting.
174	July 18	On passage. (Passed 393 to 5.)	Yes.	262	Sept. 19	S. 953, authorizing funds for food stamp programs for fiscal 1968 and 1969: On motion to recede and concur with Senate conference report amendments. (Passed 196 to 154.)	No.
176	July 19	H.R. 421, prohibiting travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance: On passage. (Passed 347 to 70.)	Yes.	264	Sept. 20	H.R. 9547, amending the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operation of the Inter-American Development Bank: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on retaining proposal for a continuing audit of the bank's operations. (Passed 274 to 126.)	Yes.
178	July 20	H. Res. 749, providing for the consideration of H.R. 11000, for Federal rat control: On resolution. (Rejected 176 to 207.)	No.	265	Sept. 20	H.R. 6418, the partnership for health amendments: On amendment to increase authorization by \$40,000,000 for grants for special health programs. (Passed 227 to 173.)	No.
180	July 25	H.R. 11641, making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, for Army engineers and Interior Department public works projects and for various independent agencies: On amendment to delete planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric plant in Maine. (Passed 233 to 169.)	Yes.	266	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 395 to 7.)	Yes.
181	July 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce each appropriation item contained in the bill by 5 percent for a cut of \$231,000,000. (Defeated 166 to 239.)	Yes.	267	Sept. 20	H.R. 6430, Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967: On passage. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
182	July 25	On passage. (Passed 376 to 26.)	Yes.	270	Sept. 21	H.R. 6736, proposing the creation of a Public Broadcasting Corp.: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete provisions for a Public Broadcasting Corp. adding that funds be distributed among educational TV stations. (Rejected 167 to 194.)	Yes.
186	July 26	H.R. 9547, amending the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operation of the Inter-American Development Bank: On motion to recommit with instructions to decrease share payable by the United States from \$900,000,000 to \$750,000,000. (Defeated 185 to 217.)	Yes.	271	Sept. 21	On passage. (Passed 265 to 91.)	No.
187	July 26	On passage. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Yes.	273	Sept. 25	H.R. 13042, authorizing an elected school board for the District of Columbia: On Passage. (Passed 324 to 3.)	Yes.
189	July 27	H.R. 8630, extending the authority for exemptions from the anti-trust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States: On passage. (Passed 308 to 66.)	No.	274	Sept. 25	H.R. 13025, allowing the new District of Columbia Council to make rules and regulations under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act: On passage. (Rejected 153 to 182.)	No.
190	July 31	H.R. 6098, providing for an extension of the interest equalization tax: On conference report. (Agreed to 223 to 83.)	Yes.	277	Sept. 26	H.R. 12120, Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1967: On amendment substituting block grants to the States in place of Federal agencies granting funds to local agencies. (Passed 234 to 139.)	Yes.
192	Aug. 1	H.R. 11722, authorizing construction at military installations: On passage. (Passed 394 to 2.)	Yes.	278	Sept. 26	On amendment to prohibit the receipt of funds under this act by agencies administered, funded or contracted by the OEO. (Passed 241 to 132.)	Yes.
200	Aug. 8	H.R. 5037, authorizing Federal grants to State and local governments to assist in the reduction of crime and improvement of law enforcement: On amendment providing that most of funds would generally go in block grants to State agencies for distribution and highest priority given to riot control and prevention. (Passed 256 to 147.)	Yes.	282	Sept. 27	H.J. Res. 849, continuing appropriations for many Federal agencies for the month of October: On motion to recommit. (Passed 202 to 182.)	Yes.
201	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 378 to 23.)	Yes.	285	Sept. 28	H.R. 478, making studies of the impact on American workers of low-wage imports from foreign countries: On passage. (Passed 340 to 29.)	Not voting.
204	Aug. 9	H. Res. 512, expressing disapproval of the House of Representatives at proposed plan to reorganize the District of Columbia government: On resolution. (Rejected 160 to 244.)	Yes.	287	Sept. 29	H.R. 10673, proposing to strengthen and clarify stockyard owners' rights and responsibilities with respect to the management of their stockyards: On passage. (Passed 234 to 6.)	Not voting.
206	Aug. 10	H.R. 7659, providing for a mid-decade census in 1975 and every 10 years thereafter: On passage. (Passed 255 to 127.)	No.	289	Oct. 2	H.R. 4903, increasing the ceiling on annual appropriations for Ryukyu Islands' social and economic aid: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 284 to 80.)	No.
208	Aug. 14	H.R. 43, authorizing the Central Valley project in California: On passage. (Passed 225 to 83.)	No.				
209	Aug. 14	H.R. 6278, providing for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data for physical science standard reference program of Bureau of Standards: On amendment to limit the fiscal 1968 authorization and requiring annual authorizations for this project. (Passed 320 to 2.)	Yes.				
214	Aug. 15	H. Res. 856, providing for consideration of H.R. 2516, Civil Rights Amendments of 1967: On resolution. (Agreed to 330 to 77.)	Yes.				
220	Aug. 16	H.R. 2516, Civil Rights Amendments of 1967: On passage. (Passed 326 to 93.)	Yes.				
222	Aug. 17	H.R. 12080, social security amendments: On passage. (Passed 415 to 3.)	Yes.				
223	Aug. 17	S. 16, increasing veterans' pensions: On conference report. (Agreed to 404 to 0.)	Yes.				

See notes at end of table.

REPORT ON RECORDED VOTES CAST BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., 1ST SESS., 90TH CONG.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote	Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote
290	Oct. 2	S. 223, authorizing the sale to private industry of certain Government-owned communications in Alaska: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 357 to 1.)	Yes.				
291	Oct. 2	H.R. 9796, authorizing loan of warships to foreign governments: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 321 to 42.)	Yes.				
293	Oct. 3	H. Res. 938, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 853 making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968: On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Passed 213 to 205.)	No.				
294	Oct. 3	H.R. 11722, authorizing construction at military installations: On conference report. (Agreed to 377 to 33.)	Yes.				
296	Oct. 4	H.R. 10196, making appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions that House conferees disagree to Senate amendments which exceed the budget requests. (Passed 226 to 173.)	Yes.				
297	Oct. 4	H.R. 1411, permitting the Postmaster General to issue a mail stop order against false representations without the additional previous requirement of proof of intent to deceive: On passage. (Passed 353 to 32.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 10509, making appropriations for the Agriculture Department for fiscal 1968:					
300	Oct. 10	On motion to disagree to Senate amendment No. 43 increasing appropriations above budget recommendations to the conference report. (Passed 337 to 8.)	Yes.				
301	Oct. 10	On motion to disagree to Senate amendment No. 56 (same reason as above). (Passed 362 to 24.)	Yes.				
302	Oct. 10	On motion to disagree to Senate amendment No. 63 (same reason as above). (Passed 391 to 3.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 7977, adjusting postal rates, increasing Federal and postal employees pay and regulating the mailing of pandering advertisements:					
306	Oct. 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to report back with additional amendments. (Defeated 199 to 211.)	Yes.				
307	Oct. 11	On passage. (Passed 318 to 89.)	Yes.				
309	Oct. 16	H.R. 13048, extending and amending the Library Services and Construction Act: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Yes.				
310	Oct. 16	S.J. Res. 112, extending until Dec. 31, 1968, the time for filing the report of Commission on Urban Problems: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 310 to 10.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 11456, making appropriations for the Transportation Department for fiscal 1968:					
313	Oct. 17	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to hold the line on items increased by Senate over House. (Defeated 124 to 268.)	No.				
314	Oct. 17	On conference report. (Agreed to 367 to 22.)	Yes.				
315	Oct. 17	On motion to recede and concur on Senate amendment 13 providing funds for an airport at Kelley Flats, Mont. (Defeated 161 to 222.)	No.				
316	Oct. 17	H.R. 159, providing for establishment of a Federal Maritime Administration: On passage. (Passed 324 to 44.)	Yes.				
		H.J. Res. 888, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968 until Nov. 23, 1967:					
319	Oct. 18	On amendment providing that Federal spending shall not exceed the amount spent during fiscal 1967. (Passed 239 to 164.)	Yes.				
320	Oct. 18	On motion to recommit the resolution to committee. (Rejected 158 to 244.)	No.				
321	Oct. 18	On passage. (Passed 253 to 144.)	Yes.				
323	Oct. 19	H.R. 13178, providing for safety on the U.S. Capitol Building and Grounds: On passage. (Passed 336 to 20.)	Yes.				
325	Oct. 19	S. 676, making it unlawful to intercept, disclose or use the contents of a wire communication except in normal course of employment or by President under special conditions: On passage. (Passed 275 to 47.)	Yes.				
327	Oct. 20	H. Res. 241, transferring jurisdiction over military and national cemeteries to the Veterans' Affairs Committee: On passage. (Passed 227 to 0.)	Yes.				
328	Oct. 20	H. Res. 947, providing for consideration of H.R. 10442, facilitating the exchanges of land for use for public schools: On resolution. (Agreed to 221 to 1.)	Yes.				
329	Oct. 20	H.R. 10442, facilitating the exchanges of land for use for public schools: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete language regarding special fund provided to Agriculture Secretary for purchase of lands. (Rejected 30 to 191.)	No.				
333	Oct. 23	H.R. 11627, authorizing construction of tunnels and bridges in Maryland: On passage. (Passed 342 to 9.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 9960, making appropriations for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968:					
335	Oct. 24	On motion to recommit the conference report with instructions that House disagrees to certain Senate amendments. (Rejected 184 to 208.)	Yes.				
336	Oct. 24	On motion to recede and concur on Senate increases for model cities. (Rejected 156 to 241.)	No.				
337	Oct. 24	On motion to recede and concur on Senate amendment, rent supplement program. (Rejected 152 to 250.)	No.				
338	Oct. 24	H.R. 13606, making appropriations for military construction for the Defense Department for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 362 to 26.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 11641, making appropriations for Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968:					
340	Oct. 25	On motion to recommit the conference report. (Rejected 117 to 278.)	Yes.				
341	Oct. 25	On motion to recede and concur with amendment of Senate to provide additional funds for the Dickey-Lincoln project. (Rejected by 162 to 231.)	No.				
342	Oct. 25	On motion to recede and concur with Senate amendment designed to eliminate funds for the Dickey-Lincoln project. (Passed 283 to 111.)	No.				
		H.R. 9960, making appropriations for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968:					
343	Oct. 26	On motion to recommit the conference report with instructions to insist on House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67, rent supplement program. (Rejected 184 to 198.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 9960, etc.—Continued					
344	Oct. 26	On conference report. (Agreed to 295 to 88.)	Yes.				
345	Oct. 26	H.R. 13510, adjusting pay of the uniformed services both active and retired: On passage. (Passed 385 to 2.)	Yes.				
		H.R. 2508, providing for congressional redistricting:					
346	Oct. 26	On motion to recommit the conference report with instructions. (Rejected 82 to 283.)	No.				
347	Oct. 26	On conference report. (Agreed to 241 to 105.)	Yes.				
349	Oct. 30	H.R. 10915, regarding reduction of extra-long-staple cotton quota: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 101 to 244.)	No.				
350	Oct. 30	On passage. (Passed 274 to 64.)	Yes.				
354	Oct. 31	H.R. 12144, Meat Inspection Act: On passage. (Passed 403 to 1.)	Yes.				
359	Nov. 2	S. 780, extending the Clean Air Act: On passage. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Not voting.				
361	Nov. 3	H. Res. 966, providing for consideration of S. 2388, to provide for an improvement and to authorize funds for the Economic Opportunity Act: On resolution. (Passed 262 to 39.)	Not voting.				
362	Nov. 6	H.R. 11565, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize the transfer of peanut acreage allotments: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 255 to 57.)	Not voting.				
363	Nov. 6	S.J. Res. 33, establishing a National Commission on Product Safety: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 206 to 102.)	Not voting.				
364	Nov. 6	H.R. 3639, protecting the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Not voting.				
365	Nov. 6	H.R. 13165, extending until Mar. 1, 1969, Secret Service protection for widow and minor children of a former President: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 302 to 11.)	Not voting.				
366	Nov. 6	S.J. Res. 114, extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 308 to 6.)	Not voting.				
367	Nov. 6	H.R. 3982, relating to transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 319 to 0.)	Not voting.				
368	Nov. 6	H.R. 13669, permitting the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Not voting.				
369	Nov. 6	S. 1552, amending the Highway Safety Act: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 252 to 65.)	Not voting.				
370	Nov. 6	S. 423, authorizing use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 291 to 25.)	Not voting.				
		S. 1872, Foreign Assistance Act:					
374	Nov. 8	On motion to recommit the conference report with instructions regarding countries with ships carrying supplies to North Vietnam. (Rejected 196 to 200.)	Yes.				
375	Nov. 8	On conference report. (Agreed to 205 to 187.)	No.				
378	Nov. 9	H.R. 11641, making appropriations for Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968: On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing planning funds for Dickey-Lincoln School power project. (Rejected 118 to 263.)	No.				
380	Nov. 9	H.R. 8569, making appropriations for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1968: On conference report. (Agreed to 354 to 6.)	Yes.				
		S. 2388, providing an improved Economic Opportunity Act and authorizing funds for continued operation of its programs:					
86	Nov. 15	On amendment prohibiting use of funds to defend persons involved in unlawful civil disturbances or riots. (Passed 332 to 79.)	Yes.				
387	Nov. 15	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide a \$1,600,000,000 authorization instead of an \$2,060,000,000 authorization. (Passed 221 to 190.)	Yes.				
388	Nov. 15	On passage. (Passed 283 to 129.)	Yes.				
390	Nov. 16	H. Res. 978, providing for consideration of H.R. 13893, foreign assistance and related agencies appropriations for fiscal 1968: On ordering previous question. (Passed 200 to 190.)	No.				
		H.R. 13893, making appropriations for foreign assistance (foreign aid) and related agencies for fiscal 1968:					
394	Nov. 17	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 135 to 177.)	See note 6.				
395	Nov. 17	On passage. (Passed 167 to 143.)	See note 7.				
396	Nov. 17	H. Res. 509, providing for consideration of H.R. 8, regarding obstruction of Armed Forces: On resolution. (Agreed to 211 to 37.)	Not voting.				
399	Nov. 20	H.R. 13933, authorizing modifications or revisions in the Interstate System: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 361 to 1.)	Yes.				
400	Nov. 20	H.R. 12010, creating a bistate watershed protection and flood prevention district: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 356 to 2.)	Yes.				
401	Nov. 20	H.R. 9063, providing for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 24.)	Yes.				
402	Nov. 20	H.R. 11527, providing for land transfer to University of Maine: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 24.)	Yes.				
404	Nov. 21	H.R. 6430, Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967: On conference report. (Agreed to 354 to 0.)	Yes.				
405	Nov. 21	H.R. 6418, the partnership for health amendments: On conference report. (Agreed to 347 to 3.)	Yes.				
		S. 1031, authorizing appropriation for Peace Corps Act for fiscal 1968:					
406	Nov. 21	On motion to recommit with instructions regarding a reduction of \$10,700,000 from the authorization and regarding deferrals from military service because of service in the Peace Corps. (Rejected 141 to 203.)	Yes.				
407	Nov. 21	On passage. (Passed 312 to 32.)	Yes.				
410	Nov. 27	H.R. 12603, the National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1967: On passage. (Passed 316 to 34.)	Not voting.				
411	Nov. 27	S. 1003, increasing the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics: On passage. (Passed 325 to 0.)	Not voting.				
413	Nov. 28	H.J. Res. 936, making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968 to provide that joint resolution of Oct. 5, 1967 (Public Law 90-102), be further amended by striking out Nov. 9, 1967, and inserting in lieu thereof Dec. 9, 1967: On passage. (Passed 368 to 13.)	No.				

See notes at end of table.

REPORT ON RECORDED VOTES CAST BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., 1ST SESS., 90TH CONG.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote	Roll-call No.	Date, 1967	Measure, question, and result	My vote
414	Nov. 28	H.R. 2275, providing for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala with Senate amendment for congressional redistricting: On ordering previous question. (Passed 201 to 179.)	No.			H.J. Res. 888, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968:	
415	Nov. 28	H.R. 12601, strengthening the Attorney General's office and the Subversive Activities Control Board to better facilitate a system of public disclosure of the identity of Communist organizations and members of Communist-action organizations: On passage. (Passed 269 to 104.)	Yes.	430	Dec. 11	On ordering previous question on amendment No. 2 of conference report. (Passed 213 to 183.)	No.
417	Nov. 29	H.R. 12144, Federal Meat Inspection Act: On preferential motion to instruct conferees to accept the Senate amendments to bill. (Rejected 166 to 207.)	No.	431	Dec. 11	On motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 2 with amendment. (Passed 366 to 26.)	Yes.
418	Nov. 29	H.R. 13706, amending Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Credit Act of 1933: On motion to recommit with instructions designed to remove the 6-percent interest rate limitations for a period of 2 years. (Rejected 102 to 269.)	No.	433	Dec. 11	H.R. 7977, adjusting postal rates, increasing Federal and postal employees' pay and regulating the mailing of pandering and obscene advertisements: On motion to recede and concur on Senate amendment to conference report. (Passed 327 to 63.)	Yes.
421	Dec. 4	H.R. 11276, authorizing appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for 2 additional years: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 352 to 0.)	Yes.	435	Dec. 12	H.R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 307 to 77.)	Yes.
422	Dec. 4	H.R. 13054, relating to age discrimination in employment: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 344 to 13.)	Yes.	436	Dec. 12	H.R. 4765, relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956: On conference report. (Agreed to 274 to 104.)	Yes.
423	Dec. 4	H. Res. 996, resolution to send Subversive Activities Control Act amendments to conference: On resolution. (Agreed to 287 to 58.)	Yes.	437	Dec. 12	H.R. 10595, prohibiting certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities: On conference report. (Agreed to 289 to 74.)	Yes.
426	Dec. 6	H.R. 6111, establishing a Federal Judicial Center: On conference report. (Agreed to 230 to 126.)	No.	439	Dec. 13	H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967: On conference report. (Agreed to 390 to 3.)	Yes.
427	Dec. 6	H.R. 12144, Federal Meat Inspection Act: On conference report. (Agreed to 336 to 28.)	Yes.	441	Dec. 13	S. 2171, the Subversive Activities Control Act: On conference report. (Agreed to 276 to 134.)	Yes.
429	Dec. 11	S. 2388, providing an improved Economic Opportunity Act and authorizing funds for continued operation of its programs: On conference report. (Agreed to 247 to 149.)	No.	443	Dec. 14	H.R. 13893, Foreign Assistance Act: On motion to recommit. (Passed 276 to 114.)	Yes.
				444	Dec. 15	H.R. 13893, Foreign Assistance Act: On passage. (Passed 198 to 158.)	No.
				445	Dec. 15	H.R. 14397, Supplemental Appropriations: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 108 to 254.)	Yes.
				446	Dec. 15	H.R. 7819, Elementary and Secondary Education Act: On passage. (Passed 286 to 73.)	Yes.
				447	Dec. 15	H.R. 12555, veterans pensions: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 353 to 0.)	Yes.

NOTES

1. This is the only strictly party vote of the entire session where Democrats vote straight Democratic and Republicans vote straight Republican. This is the key vote because the election of the Speaker determines the makeup of Congress by political party and all committee chairmanships are determined that way. In this case we refer to the Democratic Party as the majority party because they outnumber the Republicans and have complete control of the Congress, including which bills come up for consideration, etc.

2. A straight motion to recommit a bill means a motion to send it back to committee for further study. A motion to recommit with instructions means the bill was amended with certain language to change, add to or delete certain features. If such a recommittal motion is passed the committee does not meet but is instructed to report the bill back to the House "forthwith" and the bill is then passed immediately with the changes ordered in the recommittal motion.

3. These are only the "recorded" votes. These votes represent only about 1/4 of the total votes which are made by simply saying "yes" or "no" with no one knowing who said which. The Speaker listens to the voice votes and determines which sounded in the affirmative. There are other ways in which nonrecord votes are taken and should you be interested in a fuller explanation please let me know.

4. General pair, would have voted Yes.

5. General pair, would have voted Yes.

6. Paired for committal.

7. Paired against passage.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 16, 1968

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

Restore to me the joy of Thy salvation; and uphold me with Thy glorious spirit.—Psalms 51: 12.

O God and Father of us all, whose goodness never fails and whose love never fades, as we bow before Thee in this quiet moment, we pray that Thou wilt fill us with Thy spirit that we may be made ready with steady faith and steadfast love to face the shifting scenes of our modern day. In the discharge of our duties, enable us to be confident and courageous, keeping our trust in Thee, our concern for the welfare of our country, and our belief in good will among the children of men.

Make us ever loyal to the royal in life everywhere and send us out along the high road of creative adventure and constructive activity which will open the way for men and nations to live together in peace. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

IN RE POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001, AND 1505

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 9, 1968.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On this date I, W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and the Honorable Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., Sergeant at Arms of the United States House of Representatives were served with subpoenas issued under the authority of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. These subpoenas direct that Mr. Johnson and myself, as officers of the United States House of Representatives produce documents, papers and records belonging to the United States House of Representatives. The subpoenas were issued in connection with a Grand Jury investigation of possible violations of Title 18 U.S. Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505. It is noted that these subpoenas command our appearance and production of the House records mentioned therein on Thursday the 18th of January 1968 at 10:00 a.m. The subpoenas themselves outline the House records that we were requested to produce.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The subpoenas in question are herewith attached, and this matter is presented for such action as the House may deem appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoenas.

The Clerk read as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

THE UNITED STATES v. IN RE POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 AND 1505

The President of the United States to Hon. W. Pat Jennings, Clerk, or authorized Representative, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.; Report to U.S. District Court House, between Third Street and John Marshall Place and on Constitution Avenue NW., room 3812, Washington, D.C., and bring with you all original records of any nature, including vouchers and Form T-4 records, relating to travel from January 3, 1965 through March 1, 1967 of Former Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, his employees, including those of his Clerk-Hire Staff, and all employees, clerks and all other administrative personnel of the Committee on Education and Labor; all original records, of any nature including correspondence and memoranda originating at or received by your office, relating to telephone expenditures from January 1, 1967 to date on all accounts, including credit card W 225-4365-032, by or on behalf of Former Congressman Adam Clayton Powell; all original payroll sheets for the Education and Labor Investigating Committee for the months of August and September, 1966, reflecting payments to Sylvia J. Givens; all original payroll sheets for the months of January and February, 1966, reflecting payments to Carol T. Aldrich; all original memoranda and communications of any nature from January 3, 1967 to date between your office and Former Congressman Adam Clayton Powell or his former employees; all original Clerk-Hire Appointment Forms for Y. Marjorie Flores executed in the name of Adam C. Powell; and all original personnel records, including Personnel Affidavit Forms, Withholding Tax Certificates, Health Benefits Forms and Waivers for Life Insurance, exe-