

H.R. 17829. A bill to authorize preschool and early education program for handicapped children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 17830. A bill to authorize the acquisition and maintenance of the Goddard Rocket Launching Site in accordance with the act of August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. Dow, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 17831. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present a gold medal to the widow of Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 17832. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 17833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include the sintering and burning of clay, shale, and slate used as lightweight aggregates as a treatment process considered as mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR (for himself, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. HANLEY):

H.J. Res. 1303. Resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of October 13, 1968, as Salute to Eisenhower Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.J. Res. 1304. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the first week in March as National Housing for the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.J. Res. 1305. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp

in commemoration of 100 years of higher education for American women; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 1306. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee to Investigate Crime; to the Commission on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

350. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to seizure of American fishing boats off South America, which was presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 17834. A bill for the relief of Vladko Junic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 17835. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Zamakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 17836. A bill for the relief of Lugino Dario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 17837. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Perniciaro, his wife, Marie Francesca Perniciaro, and their daughter, Patrizia Perniciaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 17838. A bill for the relief of John T. Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17839. A bill for the relief of Daniela Auerbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 17840. A bill for the relief of Djurdjica Kuridza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 17841. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Edward Colgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 17842. A bill for the relief of Antonino and Nicolina Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 17843. A bill for the relief of Sister Isabella (Giovanna D'Aprile); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17844. A bill for the relief of Sister Maurilia (Raffaella Di Lella); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17845. A bill for the relief of Sister Corinna (Emilia Cecere); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17846. A bill for the relief of Sister Adelaide (Carmela Ricciardi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 17847. A bill to amend the act of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 1205), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a tract of land to Lillian I. Anderson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 17848. A bill for the relief of Orlando D'Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 17849. A bill for the relief of Della Gayla Avecilla; 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:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

343. Petition of Edward Moreland, Marietta, Miss., and others, relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

344. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of supervisors, County of Kern, Bakersfield, Calif., relative to elimination of welfare residence requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345. Also, petition of the board of supervisors of the county of Santa Clara, Calif., relative to welfare payments to nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CREATION OF A COMMISSION TO STUDY CAUSES OF VIOLENCE

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday, President Johnson issued an Executive order establishing a Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

I commend the President for taking this needed action.

This Commission, composed of outstanding Americans, will investigate the causes and prevention of lawlessness and violence in our national life. And who can doubt, in light of recent tragedies, that the insights provided by this Commission are desperately needed?

I have great faith in the wisdom of this Commission, headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower. It is composed of such out-

standing thinkers and leaders as Archbishop Terence J. Cooke, of New York; Philosopher Eric Hoffer; Judge A. Leon Higginbotham; Senators PHIL HART and ROMAN HRUSKA; Congressmen WILLIAM McCULLOCH and HALE BOGGS; former Republican Congressman Albert E. Jenner, and former Ambassador Patricia Harris.

All Americans join with President Johnson in wishing this Commission well. I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the text of President Johnson's Executive order establishing this important Commission.

The text of the Executive order follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, JUNE 10, 1968

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established a National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of:

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, *Chairman*, Congressman Hale Boggs, Archbishop Terence J. Cooke, Ambassador Patricia Harris, Senator Philip A. Hart, Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, Eric Hoffer, Senator Roman Hruska, Albert E. Jenner, Jr., Congressman William M. McCulloch.

The President from time to time may appoint additional members to the Commission, and may designate additional officers thereof.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. The Commission shall investigate and make recommendations with respect to:

(a) The causes and prevention of lawless acts of violence in our society, including assassination, murder and assault;

(b) The causes and prevention of disrespect for law and order, of disrespect for public officials, and of violent disruptions of public order by individuals and groups; and

(c) Such other matters as the President may place before the Commission.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Commission who are otherwise compensated by the United States for full-time service shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their full-time service; but they

shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law.

(b) Other Members of the Commission shall receive compensation in accordance with law when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. In addition they shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5703, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall have an Executive Director, appointed by the President, who shall receive such compensation as may be directed by the President in accordance with law.

(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint such additional personnel as it deems necessary, to fix their compensation in accordance with law, and to obtain services in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 3109.

COOPERATION BY EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission, acting through its Chairman, is authorized to request from any executive department or agency any information and assistance deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this Order. Each department or agency is directed, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, to furnish information and assistance to the Commission.

(b) The General Services Administration shall provide administrative services for the Commission.

REPORT AND TERMINATION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall present its report and recommendations as soon as practicable, but not later than one year from the date of this Order. The Commission shall terminate thirty days following the submission of its final report or one year from the date of this Order, whichever is earlier.

ERIC HOFFER COMMENTS ON THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the long-shoreman philosopher and newspaper columnist, Eric Hoffer, recently wrote a penetrating analysis of the situation facing Israel in Middle East and world politics. A number of citizens have brought to my attention this thoughtful column which I believe merits our reading. I ask that it be included herewith as part of my remarks:

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

ISRAEL, AMERICA'S BEST ALLY, MUST LIVE
(By Eric Hoffer)

The Jews are a peculiar people: things permitted to other nations are forbidden to the Jews.

Other nations drive out thousands, even millions, of people and there is no refugee problem. Russia did it; Poland and Czechoslovakia did it; Turkey drove out a million Greeks, and Algeria a million Frenchmen; Indonesia threw out heaven knows how many Chinese—and no one says a word about refugees.

But in the case of Israel, the displaced Arabs have become eternal refugees. Every-

one insists that Israel must take back every single Arab. Arnold Toynbee calls the displacement of the Arabs an atrocity greater than any committed by the Nazis.

Other nations when victorious on the battlefield dictate peace terms. But when Israel is victorious it must sue for peace. Everyone expects the Jews to be the only real Christians in this world.

Other nations when they are defeated survive and recover. But should Israel be defeated it would be destroyed. Had Nasser triumphed last June he would have wiped Israel off the map, and no one would have lifted a finger to save the Jews.

No commitment to the Jews by any government, including our own, is worth the paper it is written on. There is a cry of outrage all over the world when people die in Vietnam or when two Negroes are executed in Rhodesia. But when Hitler slaughtered Jews no one remonstrated with him.

The Swedes, who are ready to break off diplomatic relations with America because of what we do in Vietnam, did not let out a peep when Hitler was slaughtering Jews. They sent Hitler choice iron ore, and ball bearings, and serviced his troop trains to Norway.

The Jews are alone in the world. If Israel survives it will be solely because of Jewish efforts. And Jewish resources.

Yet at this moment Israel is our only reliable and unconditional ally. We can rely more on Israel than Israel can rely on us. And one has only to imagine what would have happened last summer had the Arabs and their Russian backers won the war to realize how vital the survival of Israel is to America and the West in general.

I have a premonition that will not leave me; as it goes with Israel so will it go with all of us. Should Israel perish the holocaust will be upon us.

Israel must live!

I AM YOUR FLAG

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, during the nearly 200-year history of our Nation many deep and stirring expressions have come from its citizens in tribute to our national heritage and our national symbols of freedom.

However, I have read very few which so accurately express the feelings of all dedicated and patriotic Americans as the poem, "I Am Your Flag," written by James R. Howerton, the chief of police of Middletown, Ohio.

This poem, Mr. Speaker, has been widely hailed in the 24th District of Ohio; and I include it in the RECORD so that everyone who respects the American flag can read it and meditate upon its profound and thoughtful message.

The poem follows:

I AM YOUR FLAG

(By James R. Howerton)

I have never transgressed upon foreign soil,
except to defend the dignity of man;
I have never flown over concentration
camps, except when they were free;
I have never flown over a grave except in
humble thankfulness;
I have left my shores with young men
eager for battle and returned saddened
by death;

I have fallen in battle—been grabbed up by
eager hands and carried on;

I have gone into battle with young boys and
returned with battle-hardened men.

I have draped the caskets of a million fallen
warriors—been folded gently and
handed to a weeping mother;

I have been carried in victory; but never in
defeat;

I have looked down upon kings and all the
great men of my time;

I have been burned, cursed, and spat upon.

Yes, you may be disgraced; but I have lived
in so much glory that I can never be
disgraced.

I belong to no one and yet I belong to every-
one.

For I am a symbol of your heritage of free-
dom.

And so I shall be as long as there is an
America.

A NONPOLITICAL SUPREME COURT

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, pertaining to the Supreme Court's self-transformed role in our governmental system, I recommend the following articles to Senators.

Prof. Philip B. Kurland's article entitled "Wanted: A Nonpolitical Supreme Court" appeared in the May issue of Nation's Business and is a most commendable essay on the results of a politically appointed Supreme Court. Mr. Kurland illustrates the error in the way of judicial appointments in that they are based on "political proximity to the Chief Executive." It is obviously apparent that many of the best qualified men who should be candidates for appointment are excluded from consideration to make way for an appointment based on political criteria.

In regard to these judicial appointments, an important point brought to light by Mr. Kurland is that the fault in these appointments "lies not alone with the President, for the Senators who treat lower Federal court appointments as personal prerogatives have been willing to leave appointments to the Supreme Court as the personal prerogative of the Chief Executive." Until the Senate exercises its constitutionally granted role of approving Presidential appointments in a manner that demonstrates a requirement for the best qualified men for the vacated positions, the Court will continue to be filled with men with political allegiances to the President.

Mr. Kurland further emphasized the "judicial activism" of the Court in its decisions which reflect an "egalitarian bent" and "the destruction of federalism in the American system by continued depletion of the power of the States." In these areas the Court is clearly legislating in that its decisions are often not supported by the authorities they cite or, otherwise, there is no authority to support a decision, and as stated simply, "the Court has not been honest in the means it has used to support its judgments."

Above all, stresses Mr. Kurland, the Court's decisions should be such to withstand "public scrutiny." Especially now, when everyone is clamoring about our society's respect for the law, the people "will respect the law only so long as the processes of lawmaking, whether by judiciary or legislature or executive, are worthy of that respect."

An excellent article entitled "Supreme Court Wrong Again on School Ruling," written by James J. Kilpatrick, was published in the June 4, 1968, edition of the Evening Star. The author emphasizes the Court's attempt to change "the law of human nature" in its rulings on school integration cases. Mr. Kilpatrick states that the Court has attempted to "coerce human beings into patterns of social behavior that are unacceptable to them" in their thinking that merely by saying "judgment reversed" they can make members of both the black and white races forget their ties and beliefs in the strength of their own race and perceive of only one race. This will never be accomplished by a decree—whether executive, legislative, or judicial.

Also along the same lines the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C., on June 7, 1968, published an excellent editorial entitled "Belief in the Law." The article discusses the Court's decision on the selection of juries as another "manufacture of law."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: A NONPOLITICAL SUPREME COURT
(NOTE.—A distinguished authority tells what has gone wrong with our Highest Court.)

Appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court are among the most important tasks assigned to the Presidency. And yet the appointments are generally made with the same bows to political expediency as the appointing of local postmasters.

The fault lies not alone with the President, for the Senators who treat lower federal court appointments as personal prerogatives have been willing to leave appointments to the Supreme Court as the personal prerogative of the Chief Executive. Not since Judge John Parker was rejected more than three decades ago has the Senate blocked a Presidential Supreme Court nomination. So seldom do nonpolitical factors play a part in judicial appointments that the surprise of the matter is that we have a Court which is not worse than it is.

The President ought to put aside politics and patronage and seek out only the best talents to staff the Court. Obviously, there is something wrong with a method that allows a Learned Hand to remain a judge on the Court of Appeals, while appointments are offered to a Frank Murphy, to allow a William H. Hastie to remain on a Court of Appeals but give a Thurgood Marshall a High Court seat. The shame of the matter has been that a long list could be made up of the names of those best qualified to do the task of a Supreme Court Justice who were never appointed because political considerations took precedence.

There have been times when a President acknowledged the appropriate standards, as when President Hoover appointed Benjamin Cardozo to the Court. But these have been rare.

It is somewhat strange that those who so vociferously denounce the advanced age of

Congressional committee chairmen are so unconcerned about the septuagenarian and octogenarian attainments of Justices of the Supreme Court. Perhaps these critics do not realize that Justice Hugo Black is 82; that the Chief Justice is 77; William O. Douglas, 69; John Marshall Harlan, 68.

When the "Nine Old Men" reached similar distinction, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed to Congress that a new Justice be added to the Court for each of those over the age of 70, on the ground that aged judges are incapable of performing their jobs.

Roosevelt did not need to succeed with his court-packing bill because time was on his side. During his long tenure he appointed eight Justices to the Court, in addition to elevating Harlan F. Stone to the Chief Justice's chair. So, too, is it likely that the next President, whoever he is, will be called upon to make several appointments to the high tribunal. It seems appropriate, therefore, to look at the appointive process now.

CHOOSING THE "RIGHT" MAN

History demonstrates that Presidents have not infrequently named persons to the Supreme Court because the appointees were expected to express judicial views sympathetic to those of the President. This basis for choice has resulted in disappointments.

Joseph Story was appointed by President James Madison to counteract John Marshall's rampant federalism. Somehow Story's Jeffersonian Republicanism disappeared as soon as he donned his judicial robes, and he quickly became Marshall's strongest and most effective ally.

President Theodore Roosevelt carefully checked with Henry Cabot Lodge about what he thought to be Oliver Wendell Holmes' political predilections before putting him on the Court. After one decision, Roosevelt was purported to have remarked that he could have put a banana on the Court with more backbone than Holmes had shown.

President Wilson's fighting, liberal Attorney General, James C. McReynolds, turned into an archreactionary on the Supreme Court.

If one looks at recent history, he will see that of the eight appointments by FDR, four have generally been lined up on the left: Black, Douglas, Murphy and Rutledge. But the other four have been thought to be on the right: Reed, Frankfurter, Byrnes and Jackson.

Of Eisenhower's appointees, Warren and Brennan would be classified as liberal, but Harlan, Whittaker and Stewart are usually regarded as conservatives.

President Kennedy appointed the left-leaning Goldberg, but he also appointed the more conservative White. Only President Truman's designees were all usually to be found to be on the same side. But Vinson, Minton, Clark and Burton were not on the side which Truman was believed to have espoused.

Life tenure for the federal judiciary frequently dissolves political allegiances.

President Johnson may expect that the ideals of the Great Society—whatever they may be—will be furthered by Justices Fortas and Marshall. But time has not yet borne out that judgment.

THE IRRELEVANCE OF RELEVANCE

The error of the way of Supreme Court appointments lies not only in the choice of individuals because of their political proximity to the Chief Executive. Geography, race, religion and the personal friendship of the President are among other factors that have played, but should not play, a part in the making of a Justice.

Nor will the currently proffered Congressional remedy, a requirement of prior judicial experience, afford a rational criterion. For the fact is that the Supreme Court is like no other judicial body. Some of our best Justices never served in a judicial post before appoint-

ment to the Court. Many of our worst Justices did have prior service on a lower court.

What is the Court's function? To whom is it responsible and for what? The disparate answers to these questions have made the Warren Court the most divided—and perhaps the most divisive—Supreme Court in American history.

Clearly if you regard the Court as simply another political branch of the national government, expected to make and effectuate policies that it deems desirable, you will seek the same qualities in Justices as you seek in legislators and executives.

The Court, however, is politically irresponsible. Unlike the President and Congress, it has no constituency on whom it relies for return to office. Judicial life tenure was granted, not because the Court was to be a partisan in the political strife that is endemic in our nation, but rather in order to permit it to be above such political contests. And if that basis is in fact nonexistent, then perhaps the time has come to recognize the political nature of the Court and subject its members to the same controls imposed on other political branches of the government. The conflicting ideologies about the function and responsibility of the Supreme Court have been conveniently labeled "judicial activism," on the one hand, and "judicial restraint," on the other.

Two points should certainly be made about this dichotomy. First, the difference between the two is a difference in degree, not in kind. Second, the contest has been one that has been waged throughout our history.

John Marshall faced President Jefferson over the same issues—and won. Taney's Court confronted President Lincoln over the same issues—and lost, although it took a Civil War and three constitutional amendments to establish the defeat of the Court.

The Roosevelt-Court fight derived from the New Deal's objection that the judiciary was engaged in writing their personal predilections into the Constitution. This, the liberals of that era made quite clear, was not the function of the Supreme Court of the United States. Holmes was their hero because he applied a doctrine of judicial restraint.

Things have changed. The liberals who once shouted about judicial tyranny and the usurpation of power by the Court are now proclaiming both the desirability of acknowledging the prime political role of the Court and its immunity from the exertion of political pressures from other branches of the government.

A simple assertion of the right to eat cake and have it, too.

BEHAVIOR OF AN ACTIVIST COURT

If there is one hallmark of the activist wing of the present Court, it is its conception that in Holmes' language constitutionality does turn on the question whether the law under review "may seem to the judges who pass upon it, excessive, unsuited to its ostensible end, or based upon conceptions of morality with which they disagree." There are now on the books a large number of opinions that adopt this position.

And, in the area of statutory construction, this group tends to regard Congressional legislation as a license to spell out its own notions of what the statute should contain. A statute that is unpalatable to the Court and can not be reconstructed to its liking is in danger of falling afoul of the limits of the new Constitution.

The hard core of the activist bloc is made up of Warren, Douglas and Brennan, although the Chief Justice and Brennan—unlike Douglas—are a little queasy about all that pornography, Justice Black was once considered a solid member of this group, but its speedy reconstruction of the U.S. Constitution has tended to leave him far behind.

The success of this bloc in the future will depend largely upon recruitment of Fortas

and Marshall, on both of whom the liberals are pinning great hopes.

What then are the general purposes to which the activists are committed? One can discern several major themes in the Court's recent efforts. Foremost is the Court's egalitarian bent. In recent years the Court's emphasis has shifted from the vagaries of the "due process" clause, utilized in the past to support business and individual rights, to the equally amorphous commands of the "equal protection" clause, used largely in support of newly created rights of socially and economically disadvantaged groups.

I do not mean to suggest by this that the Warren Court invented the "equal protection" clause as a device for the creation of new privileges that it espouses. Chief Justice Taft found in it a means of preventing state legislatures from restricting the use of labor injunctions.

There are, however, differences between the use of the "equal protection" clause by the Taft Court and its use by the Warren Court.

The primary difference is in the clientele on whose behalf the clause is invoked.

The second major theme of the Court's work is the destruction of federalism in the American system by continued depletion of the power of the states. There is no novelty in this, except in terms of the rate at which it is traveling. After all, there is a major difference between a car traveling at 30 miles per hour and a car traveling at 100 miles per hour.

It should be conceded, however, that if one looks at the role of the Court in American history, he will discover that the primary function of the Court has been to serve as a centripetal force in American government.

The more interesting aspect of the Court's centralizing tendencies has been its husbanding of greater and greater authority to itself, providing compulsory solutions for complex problems that heretofore had been considered beyond the domain of judicial competence.

On a less abstract level, the activist wing has shown its predilections, not in terms of principles, but rather in terms of parties. Between criminal defendants and prosecutors, its partisanship favors the defendants, except where they are such unpopular persons as James Hoffa.

As between labor and government, it favors government; but as between labor and management, it favors labor. Its choice is for the regulatory agency over the regulated industry, and for the tax collector over the taxpayer.

The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department must also win.

Property rights must fall before claims of civil rights

The major defect of the Court, to my mind, however, lies not in the conclusions it reaches so much as in the way that it reaches them.

As two Yale professors noted in the early days of the Warren Court: "The Court's product has shown an increasing incidence of the sweeping dogmatic statement, the formulation of results accompanied by little or no effort to support them in reason, in sum, of opinions that do not opine and *per curiam* orders that quite frankly fail to build the bridge between the authorities they cite and the results they decree."

This, to me, is the most serious charge leveled against the Court. To put it boldly, it is that the Court has not been honest in the means it has used to support its judgments.

The Court's political irresponsibility may be defended on the ground of the need to maintain its independence. However, since it is freed from any obligation to account directly to the electorate, the Court should be obliged to provide adequate explanation for its actions lest fiat be substituted for reason.

THE COURT AND ANTITRUST LAW

In no single area is the misguided direction of the Court more evident than in its development of antitrust law. Professor Milton Handler, one of our foremost experts on antitrust law, both as a scholar and practitioner, has repeatedly pointed out the Court's failings.

The fact would seem to be that this Court is either incapable or unwilling to express such policies as it purports to rest in deciding cases.

A prime example of the Court's behavior is afforded by its creation of the "doctrine" of "potential competition" as an argument for inhibiting corporate mergers under the Clayton Act. If the "doctrine" were a real one, the Court would be required to have and use a good deal more information about the economics of the problems it purports to resolve than it has yet displayed.

Writing in *The Supreme Court Review*, George and Rosemary Hale have appropriately characterized the Court's decisions:

"The Supreme Court's dislike for corporate mergers reached new heights in . . . *United States v. Continental Can Co.* . . . and *United States v. El Paso Natural Gas Co.* [in which] the Court made it pellucidly clear that the proscriptions of Section 7 of the Clayton Act extend to situations in which the parties to the proposed merger might become competitors as well as those in which the parties actually are in competition."

They appropriately concluded: "If, as may be the case, the Court is determined to block all mergers at whatever cost in efficiency—a position that is not wholly without merit on political grounds—then it would be preferable for the Court candidly to say so. Manipulation of the concept of potential competition so that plaintiffs invariably prevail can only lead to confusion."

The same criticism, that the Court places political objectives above legal ones, may be made of almost all its opinions in the area of economic regulation.

Two generations ago, the American legal scene was flooded by observations of the legal realists demonstrating that the rules applied by the judiciary were neither inspired nor revealed but simply created. The cult of the robe came under devastating attack, especially by law professors, for two reasons.

First, because the notion of judges as a priesthood propagating the dogma of a faith was just too absurd to be supported by anyone who made a pretense of commitment to the truth.

And second, perhaps, because the courts of that period had tended to align themselves with the propertied elements of the community: "property" rather than "equality" was the shibboleth of the day.

The Supreme Court is no longer aligned with the propertied classes but is rather in the vanguard of the political forces that would elevate the heretofore disadvantaged. This does not, to me at least, mean that the judicial robe has once again become a magic cloak.

The faithful may, with a fervor not unusual among the newly converted, see the clothes on the naked emperor. I find the exercise of power by the current Supreme Court no less naked than the exercise of power by its predecessor, despite the change in clientele.

If that power is not to be denied it, the Court must justify its use, honestly. If there are reasons for the conclusions that the Court is reaching, they should be good enough reasons to stand public scrutiny.

If they are not good enough to stand public scrutiny, they are not good enough.

Wherein lies the fault for the indiscretions that the Court has committed?

First, of course, the responsibility lies on the Justices who have made the decisions.

Second, on the appointive power that has

failed to remove the Court from the political arena.

Third, on the national legislature that, in fact, delegates its role of making law to the executive and judicial branches of the government.

Fourth, on the states which have voluntarily become fiefs of the central government.

Ultimately, however, the responsibility lies with the people of the nation. For, as Adlai Stevenson was wont to observe, we tend to get the kind of government we deserve.

This nation, as we would know it, can survive only so long as its people respect the law. They will respect the law only so long as the processes of lawmaking, whether by judiciary or legislature or executive, are worthy of that respect.

As Justice Frankfurter once said: "Fit legislation and fair adjudication are attainable. The ultimate reliance of society for the fulfillment of both these august functions is to entrust them only to those who are equal to their demands."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 4, 1968]

SUPREME COURT WRONG AGAIN ON SCHOOL RULING

Fourteen years after its landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the U.S. Supreme Court is still unanimous when it comes to issues of school integration. Last week the court spoke with unanimity once more in virtually rejecting the principle of "freedom of choice."

The phenomenon ought to be marked. Of the nine judges who spoke with one voice in May of 1954, only three remain—Warren, Black and Douglas. Two of them—Reed and Clark—have retired. Four have died. The intervening years have seen a string of replacements—Harlan, Whitaker, Stewart, White, Goldberg, Fortas, Marshall. Yet the unanimity remains. If memory serves, not a single dissenting vote ever has been cast in a decision dealing directly with segregated schools.

It is hard to challenge that record. Yet, with respect, some of us who have followed these cases through the years will continue to believe that in one field of law, at least, the court has been unanimously wrong all the time.

This is not to rehash the old issues of constitutional law. It is a large assumption that the Fourteenth Amendment ever was validly ratified; but assume it. The polestar of constitutional construction, as Mr. Justice Black so recently and so piously observed, is the intention of the framers. In this field, the evidence is overwhelming that the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment never dreamed their handiwork would be construed as the court has construed it. Put that to one side as well.

The law that is violated by the court's rulings and especially by the ruling last week, is a different kind of law—a law of human nature. When it comes to ordinary law, the high court can make its writ run effectively. In matters of tax law, labor law, criminal law, no question about it: The court can work its will. But when the court undertakes to coerce human beings into patterns of social behavior that are unacceptable to them, the court is impotent. Fourteen years after *Brown*, fewer than 15 per cent of Southern Negro children are in integrated schools.

The issue last week involved the public schools of New Kent County, Virginia. There are not two schools in this small rural county—the New Kent School on the eastern side, the Watkins School on the west. The total school population, in all grades, amounts to only 1,290 pupils—740 Negro, 550 white.

These are not city-type children. The county seat of New Kent is barely 35 miles from downtown Richmond, but it

might be 35 light-years away. New Kent's people, most of them, have been there forever. The 1960 census found only 58 foreign born residents in the entire county. Ninety-nine percent of the people are native-born. There is no industry to speak of. Most of the residents, white and black alike, live as they have lived for generations, quietly on their land.

Three years ago, bowing to the new ordinances, New Kent officials instituted a plan of freedom of choice. All the white children had been going to New Kent School, all the Negro children to Watkins. Henceforth they were free to choose. In three years not a single white child has chosen to go to Watkins; only 115 Negro children last year chose to enroll at New Kent.

To the Supreme Court, the figures proved but one thing: "Freedom of choice" is a sham, a mere device by which the county maintains a dual system of schools. No such freedom is allowed. The court's Draconian suggestion was to draw an arbitrary line north and south across the county. All those on the east would be compelled to go to New Kent, all those on the west to Watkins. Next case.

Is it so simple, really to order the lives of human beings? The court's simplistic demand is that New Kent "convert promptly to a system without a 'white' school and a 'Negro' school, but just schools." Splendid! God, the high court and the Constitution look at New Kent County and do not see black people and white people, but "just people." Admirable.

Alas, this is not what the black people and white people of New Kent perceive. They see themselves as they are; and the great bulk of them want to spend their formative years with their own kind. There is no hatred in this, and no vicious sense of white supremacy. It is the way it is. "Judgment reversed!" says the court. But the court, in its own omnipotent fashion, might as well undertake to reverse the orbit of the earth around the sun.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 7, 1968]

BELIEF IN THE LAW

Mr. Justice Black put his finger squarely on the trouble. The court, he observed from the bench with excusable asperity, "is making new law." He could have said "again," for the manufacture of law has been the Supreme Court's chief occupation for some years.

Black's comment came as his colleagues ruled 5 to 4 that, in capital cases, trial courts may not exclude routinely from jury duty those persons who oppose capital punishment. To do so, said the court, is to deny the defendant his Sixth Amendment right to an impartial trial.

The presumption here, of course, is that the defendant is entitled to be tried by persons who disapprove of the law, a thing the Sixth Amendment's framers surely never contemplated—and for good reason. Their interest was in impartial juries, and impartiality is what the Constitution commands.

That is all it commands. It does not require juries made up, half and half, of Republicans and Democrats. It sets no standards with respect to whether the jury accurately mirrors the community sentiment. It guarantees the right to "a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury." And the courts have held, since 1820, that impartiality requires the exclusion, in capital cases, of persons who admit to prejudice against the legal punishment.

Now the Supreme Court, which appears to enjoy nothing so much as setting a judicial precedent on its ear, has imposed new standards. Are they standards of impartiality? Of course they aren't. How could a juryman with

scruples against capital punishment be impartial in a case where capital punishment might be imposed? He couldn't be.

But just for sake of argument, let us assume the court was correct in holding that defendants in capital cases ought to be tried by persons who are, as practical matter, prejudiced against the prosecution. The court so ruled, in part, because studies show that so-called "death qualified" juries fail to represent a cross-section of the public, 30 to 50 per cent of which is said to oppose the death penalty.

Let us skip the obvious objections: that the framers never heard of Dr. Gallup and were concerned, not with popularity, but with justice. Where does this leave us? Public opinion likewise is divided on, for example, narcotics law enforcement. Some contend that narcotics addiction is a sickness and, therefore, that addicts and even narcotics peddlers (many of whom are addicts) should not be charged with any crime. Is every dope pusher entitled to be tried by those who are persuaded that the case should be dismissed?

And down in Mississippi, is every defendant accused of lynching entitled to have a Klansman in the box?

The court does not say. It does not say because it has embarked on another of its sociological field trips, in which expeditions, matters of law and logic have no place. This is to be regretted, as Justice Black suggests. For the court is engaged in social work precisely at a time when the law is most in need of jurists on the bench.

INVESTIGATIVE DETENTION AND SEARCH OF PERSONS SUSPECTED OF A FEDERAL CRIME

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a rare show of near unanimity, handed down an 8-to-1 decision confirming the right of a law enforcement officer to stop and search suspicious persons for a weapon. I am certain that most of us applaud this action by a Court which too often has coddled the criminal and ignored the dangers faced every day by law enforcement personnel and our citizens.

Chief Justice Earl Warren in writing the Court's opinion summed up the situation facing many law enforcement officers. He said:

We cannot blind ourselves to the need for enforcement officers to protect themselves and other prospective victims of violence in situations where they lack probable cause for arrest. It would be unreasonable to require that police officers take unnecessary risks in the performance of their duties. American criminals have a long tradition of armed violence, and every year in this country many law enforcement officers are killed in the line of duty.

I find myself in agreement with the Chief Justice. Perhaps we can take this decision as an indication that the Court has finally "seen the handwriting on the wall" and is awakening to America's need to return to a solid foundation of law and order.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will, in effect, write into

the United States Code the guidelines handed down by the Supreme Court in this landmark decision.

My bill provides for the investigative detention and search of persons suspected of involvement in, or to have knowledge of, Federal crimes. Basically it provides authority to a Federal law-enforcement officer to stop and detain a person for no longer than 20 minutes if the officer has reason to suspect that the person is involved in a crime. He may search any detained person for a weapon to the extent necessary to protect the officer and others in the vicinity from bodily harm.

During the period of detention the Federal officer may interrogate the detained person only to the extent to request the person's name and address, an explanation of the person's actions, to relate any material facts relating to the crime in question, and to verify the above responses by readily available information.

The bill does provide authority for the law-enforcement officer to use such force as may be reasonably necessary under the circumstance to stop and detain any person. It also allows evidence obtained during the detention, questioning or search of any person admissible in a court of law provided that such evidence was obtained under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today carefully follows the guidelines handed down by the Supreme Court. I think it is important that the Congress lend its support to this decision by putting its principles into the statutory law of the land. I urge that Congress take favorable action on this measure.

ILL-ADVISED BANK BILL

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch dated June 7, 1968, entitled "Ill-Advised Bank Bill."

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

ILL-ADVISED BANK BILL

For nearly a quarter of a century, the Export-Import Bank has played an important role in fostering world trade by lending money and guaranteeing or insuring commercial loans to finance international commerce. The service it provides has become all the more crucial in recent years in view of our balance-of-payments difficulties.

To make its services more effective in combating those difficulties, Congress expanded the bank's lending authority last summer, by raising the ceiling on the loans it can make from \$9 billion to \$13.5 billion. That was a sound move.

But now the administration is asking Congress to permit the bank to liberalize its lending policy so that it can begin to finance much riskier trade ventures than it has been

allowed to underwrite in the past. The proposal is contained in a bill (S. 3218) which has already been approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

The bill would permit the bank to make loans and commitments up to \$2 billion to underwrite export transactions which "do not meet the test of reasonable assurance of repayment." In the event of any losses, the taxpayer would pick up the tab. (Although the bill specifies that the bank itself would bear all losses up to \$100 million, and the U.S. Treasury would absorb whatever is required over that amount "without fiscal year limitation," the money would still come out of the same pocket. Both the bank and the Treasury derive their funds from the taxpayer.)

Virginia's SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD JR. has assailed the proposed legislation as unwise. He notes that the requirement that loans and commitments must meet the test of "reasonable assurance of repayment"—which the bill would eliminate—"has been a basic part of the bank's charter since 1945."

Without that requirement, and with a new policy of underwriting very risky ventures, SENATOR BYRD fears that "hundreds of businesses could spring up overnight to take advantage of this bonanza." "And how," he asks, "would the bank draw the line—unless it drew it along the lines of political pressure?"

While the proposal for liberalization is advanced by the administration and its congressional sponsors as another means of attacking our balance-of-payments problem, SENATOR BYRD doubts that it would accomplish that objective. The problem, in fact, would be adversely affected by loans that are not repaid.

A better way to attack the balance-of-payments problem, SENATOR BYRD submits, is to control inflation right here at home. And since government spending is a major cause of inflation, it would hardly be wise to authorize up to \$2 billion in additional spending to back up risky trade ventures for which there would not be any "reasonable assurance" of repayment.

However well intended, the proposal to liberalize the bank's lending policies is unsound—especially at a time like this when we are in the midst of a fiscal crisis and face a huge deficit even if taxes are increased and spending is cut. Congress should listen to the gentleman from Virginia and reject S. 3218.

IRAN

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, His Imperial Majesty, the Shahanshah of Iran will be visiting this country this week. During the course of this visit he has been invited by President Johnson to meet with him.

Though he has been a visitor to our country on many occasions, the most recent being last August, this is the first visit he will have made since his coronation on his 48th birthday last October. Each of the visits has strengthened the bonds of friendship with the United States and its citizens. His coronation was not only a memorable and historic event for the nation which he governs, but for all nations in which free men strive to achieve individual dignity and a higher standard of living as their rightful heritage. This royal event commemorated a reign of more than a quarter cen-

tury devoted to national growth marked by increased economic, industrial, social and agrarian reform, and improved interchange of trade with the Western World.

It is not often that a nation, its government, and population, in the brief span of 25 years can realize such multiple effects of enlightened leadership as an unprecedented rise in per capita income; the establishment of new industries; the expansion of exports; the introduction of low-cost housing and urban renewal; the growth of hydroelectric power through new dam construction; the broadening of agricultural production, and increased educational opportunities for the entire population. The image is an unmistakable one, that of a people moving forward to take their place in the forefront of nations.

Iran's past, as we all know, was glorious and the birthplace of many great leaders, from Cyrus the Great and Darius, who brought fame and honor to this great country. It is a nation whose 2,500-year history has produced an almost legendary outpouring of delicate art, rich rugs and miniatures, and glittering mosques.

In 1965-66 the "7,000 Years of Iranian Art" exhibit was shown in many of the important cities throughout the United States and literally millions of Americans flocked to see this beautiful and important show. These were the traditional arts of Iran across an almost unbelievable range of 7,000 years. Varied as the many art forms and artistic expressions were, the preference for certain media, the many recurring themes and the closeness to nature in spite of all stylization, supplied a strongly felt unity without a break or a jarring note. These arts were a brilliant testimony to the vitality and resilience of a nation that—in spite of its more than usual share of invasions, pillage, and other hardships—always rose again to cheer its people and the whole world with the undying beauty of its art.

Iran today is an example of social reform and economic development of the Shah and his people on a contemporary path to the necessary changes needed by all developing countries today. Here the basic reforms needed to solve the typical problems facing these countries have been put to work and have made the country a beacon for all to follow. The Shah has led his people on a far-reaching reform program which in less than a generation has brought his once feudal land far along the road to modern democracy.

Among the recent changes which have taken place in Iran are the following:

More than 2,400,000 farmers today are owners of land they have tilled under the old feudal system which has been liquidated;

Profit-sharing arrangements have been worked out to insure a higher income to urban workers in rapidly expanding industries;

Women have been allowed to vote, under the revised electoral laws which has also resulted in a broader base of better informed voters with a wider choice of candidates. To symbolize the equality of women, there was a double coronation when he placed a crown on the head of

his beautiful and talented wife, Empress Farah, the first Shahbanou, or Empress, formally crowned since Iran embraced Islam.

Side by side with the emancipation of women came an all-out attack on illiteracy. In 1962 the Shah estimated that 80 percent of his people could neither read nor write. It was, he felt, a national disgrace in a nation which had traditionally prized learning so highly that the Prophet Mohammed had once exclaimed:

If knowledge were to be found only in heaven, the Persians would still strive to attain it.

To help them attain it this side of paradise, the Shah in 1962 created a literacy corps. Young men who graduate from secondary school have the option, when they reach the military conscription age of 21, of serving in the corps rather than the army.

Those who enlist are given 4 months' training and then are transferred to the Ministry of Education which sends them to villages, preferably near their own homes. There they teach for 20 months and then are eligible for discharge. Significantly, in the more than 4 years of the corps' existence, 30 percent of discharged corpsmen have volunteered to continue teaching.

When the corps began to work, Iran had 17,000 rural schools with some 675,000 pupils. Today more than 1,320,000 students are studying at 22,000 rural schools. By 1969, the Shah has predicted, 50 percent of his people will be able to read and write.

Industry, too, has benefited from the enlightened administration. Primed by \$605 million in U.S. aid since 1952, new dams have increased the supply of electrical power, scores of light industrial plants have been established, and the foundations have been laid for a petrochemical industry to utilize waste products from Iran's oilfields.

So successful has the U.S. aid program been that in November 1967, it was terminated by mutual agreement with grateful appreciation by the Government and people of Iran. Marking the close of the U.S. aid program, the President of the United States said, in part:

Since the dark years following World War II, we have moved from emergency economic support to exciting development efforts which have now paid visible dividends. Careful joint planning has had much to do with the success we mark today.

We cannot depart one area without looking toward another that lies ahead. The similarity of needs and mutuality of purpose that Iran and the United States have long shared do not stop simply because Iran's well-being enables it to shoulder greater burdens. Now is the time when even stronger ties become possible.

We will turn our hands now to new fields of cooperation. Exchanges in science and technology, expanded business relations, continued cooperation in development and common determination to work for peace and security—these are but a few of the ways in which Americans and Iranians will phrase their new plans for cooperation.

I join all of you in marking a past that has been so successful. I ask those of you present to begin planting for a new harvest of friendship, trust and shared hopes.

In commemoration of our support, the Shah of Iran has established the Pah-

lavi scholarship for American students. This will make it possible for 81 American students to go to Iran to study in their universities and live among their people. It is rare and unusual for a country we have aided to say: "Thanks for your magnificent help to restore our economy so that we are now self-sufficient to carry on our economic and social programs with our own revenue"—the objectives of our foreign aid program.

As a result of these reforms great progress has been made, almost from the start, with the result that Iran today is well on the way to joining the more advanced industrial nations of the world. This is due to wise stabilization of its economy and the Government's utilization of its valuable resources. This model chapter of progress is a lesson for all countries to follow.

The gross national product of the country has risen, prosperity and stability have been gained, and, coupled with its great potential, much foreign capital has been invested in this rapidly growing country. It now is a billion-dollar market.

Having completed its third development, the country is already on schedule for its fourth development plan—1968-72.

The fourth plan, covering the years 1968-72, promises to be the most important era of Iran's modern history. Success in those 5 years should take the country to that pinnacle of development that makes sustained growth possible. Quantitatively, the objectives of the fourth plan are to achieve an 8-percent annual growth of GNP; with sectoral targets of 4-percent annual increase in agriculture, 15 percent in industry, 13 percent of oil, and 16 percent of electricity and gas. Social targets are as follows: educational services for 92 percent of urban and 55 percent of rural school-going children at elementary level, doubling the number of university students, tripling the number of students in vocational schools, adding 14,000 hospital beds, and so on, in a word, the per capita income will rise from about \$240 at the beginning of the fourth plan to \$320 at the end of the plan.

Nonetheless, it is the qualitative objectives of the plan that are of particular importance:

First, the plan aims at solving the perennial problem of the developing countries, that is, the widening gap between the living standards of the rural areas and the urban centers. Since Iran is at the threshold of a momentous change in the economy and have the benefit of other nations' experience, the plan consciously aims at increasing production and productivity as well as social standards in the rural sector. Rural health and educational programs, agricultural sharing companies, and expanding agricultural services to villages are means to that end.

Second, industry, exclusive of oil, will, at the end of the plan, develop to a point where its total share in the economy will be over 18 percent. This calls for a major effort quantitatively, but more importantly, attention will be paid to diversifi-

cation and substitution on the one hand and emphasis on export-oriented industries on the other. At the same time that heavy and basic industries are created, petrochemical and aluminum industries and an export gas pipeline will be constructed. Thus, by the end of the fourth plan, the structure of the economy will be modernized to allow a higher share of industry in GNP.

Third, preservation of water for industrial and agricultural as well as for generation of electricity is a major target of the plan. The main shortage in Iran's natural resources is water. Therefore, the construction of dams, both small and large, are of strategic importance in Iran's future and long-range development. But water resources should be preserved in areas that are most suited to development requirements; that is, regions of high development potentially must be selected and water must be preserved for such regional development. The fourth plan will emphasize regional development by way of selecting such poles of development which will create a cluster of activities in selected regions.

Fourth, basis to development and tantamount to growth is power generation and consumption in the country. The fourth plan commits itself to change the profile of the country by nearly doubling the generation capacity of the country; it likewise will establish a telecommunication network, microwave system to insure the communications requirement of a modern nation.

All in all, qualitatively the economy will rise to the level of sustained growth and the society will approach the borderline of conditions of advanced societies.

The Iranian people realize that much of the credit for its advancement, prosperity, and worldwide respect belongs to the leadership of the Shahanshah, and they are quick and eager to acknowledge this and to bestow their respect and affection on him and his family.

The United States recognizes this great leader as a true friend of all the free people of the world and is happy to welcome him once again to our shores. We are grateful to count him and his country among the all to few true friends this Nation has in the troubled world today.

DOLLARS AND SENSE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C., published an excellent editorial on Saturday, June 1, 1968. I recommend it to Senators.

The article, entitled "Dollars and Sense," challenges us to examine our present fiscal policy and to beware of the consequences which may follow our current trend.

The editorial points out that the recent tax-and-trim bill will improve America's financial rating and help to strengthen the free world's monetary

system, but that more is needed in the future.

The present administration's economic philosophy, while theoretically prosperous for our country, is, in fact, dangerously inflationary, and is a failure as a political philosophy, the same as the Socialist in Great Britain and the Gaullist in France.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DOLLARS AND SENSE

With a well-prepared answer to an obviously anticipated press conference question, President Johnson casually but sadly capitulated.

Yes, he would sign a bill linking a tax increase with a \$6 billion cut in spending. The spending cut was \$2 billion more than the President wanted. It would take the wind out of some of his heralded Great Society programs, a bitter decision for him in his last year.

It is a decision he was able to make because he is not running for office; it is a decision he had to make or face the fate of Herbert Hoover.

The international monetary community is watching closely to see if America can reduce its bloated budget and stiffen the backbone of the dollar.

Assuming Congress now sends him this tax-and-trim bill, America's financial rating will be improved and the Free World's monetary system strengthened at a time it needs all the help it can get.

But questions will remain: Is it too little and too late? Has America already gone too far down the road to bankruptcy to turn the tide? Indeed, can even a stronger dollar, by itself, bolster the crumbling monetary base of the Western nations?

These are questions full of foreboding. One only has to scan the news from Western Europe to see why they must be asked.

You can't peddle a French franc in the money markets. The strikes, the government crisis, the rioting in the streets, the general chaos in that country have created such uncertainty that nobody wants the billions of francs being offered.

You don't need a seismograph to see the tremors caused by the fracturing of the franc. The devaluated English pound, for one thing, dipped to a new low.

Future troubles lie ahead for all three currencies—franc, pound, and dollar. Labor's across-the-board demands for higher pay and expensive fringe benefits are a major factor in the picture. Powerful unions in the United States, Great Britain and France are either fighting for large boosts or are girding for all-out attacks on basic industries. Union members are so restive that even those responsible labor bosses who would use restraint seem powerless. The trend is decidedly, dangerously inflationary.

What we are seeing here, among other things, is the partial failure of pet economic theories that government can cool and heat up their economics at will by employing various devices. One problem is that no major government operates in a vacuum; another is that the masses have never seen an economics text.

We are also seeing the failure of political philosophies—Socialist in Great Britain, Johnsonian in America, Gaullist in France.

The mischievous machinations of Charles de Gaulle are perhaps as responsible for all of these monetary problems as any other single factor. Now he is getting his comeuppance. But we can't afford to gloat; we're too involved. Only the Communists can smile.

CONSTRUCTION AND THE ECONOMY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and the newly elected president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. Winton M. Blount, delivered an address to the labor seminar of the Associated General Contractors, on May 20, 1968.

Because I felt Mr. Blount's timely and informative speech, "Construction and the Economy," would be of interest to my colleagues and the American people, I commend his speech to the attention of the House and the readers of the RECORD:

CONSTRUCTION AND THE ECONOMY

It's been a pleasure to be here with you tonight. This is my first occasion to speak since becoming President of the National Chamber, and I'm happy that it is with members of my own industry.

There is one drawback, however. An expert is one who is away from home. Since there are so many familiar faces in the group tonight, I can't be an expert. But this shouldn't be too much of a problem—I don't think there are any experts in the field of construction labor relations anyway.

Nevertheless, I would like to muster up my courage and guide you on a brief tour of this battle scarred area tonight in hope that we may find some promising pathways and directions toward improvements in the future.

The need for construction labor reforms is chronic enough, but it has been aggravated to crisis proportions by the nation's current economic difficulties.

It might be well for us to briefly review the current economic situation as a background for a discussion of construction industry problems.

1968 is a year of decision for the economy—decisions by business, labor and government.

The President started the year by asking unions and business firms to use "rigorous restraint" in their wage determinations this year. He also asked Congress again to enact his tax surcharge bill, and Congress in turn asked the President to cut his \$186 billion budget.

Meanwhile, the economy has continued to pick up pace in the face of serious danger signals, the cost of living has continued to edge up and the balance of payments position is further deteriorated. I submit that the American people are ready for some decisions to be made.

As you well know, during this decade America has enjoyed unprecedented economic expansion and prosperity. Starting from a slack in 1960, the economy climbed at a fairly steady pace through 1964, with prices moving up at about one per cent per year.

An upsurge of military spending in mid-1965 upset this balance and increased the demand on the economy. The labor market got tighter and prices started moving up at the rate of 2 to 3 per cent. The demand eased off in the first six months of 1967, but since then—for the last three quarters—it has moved ahead with tremendous momentum, breaking records left and right, and prices have been climbing at the rate of 4 percent.

The excessive demand which in 1965 initiated acceleration, has created a climate of market power for unions and business, and excessive high wage settlements have created a wage-price spiral which threatens to continue for several years to come.

Higher wages tend to push up prices.

Higher prices in turn, reinforce demands for higher wages. And so the spiral can continue on its own momentum even when the demand moderates.

A further complication which arises from inflation is that the prices of our goods in the world market also creep up and hurt our competitiveness in the world market. Imports on the other hand, become more attractive. Exports have fallen off in recent years and our traditional trade surplus of exports over imports has deteriorated, further damaging our balance of payments position.

The current problems are the result of the administration's expansionist spending policies and the resulting huge deficits, which have served to keep demand on the economy high. Certainly, the effect of the Vietnam war must be taken into account, but until very recently, there has been little if any tightening of the belt at home as we poured billions into Southeast Asia, and at the same time without restraint continued to pour additional billions into our domestic economy.

There must be a setting of national priorities. We cannot continue to react to every problem that comes up by just creating another federal program that costs billions of dollars without re-examining all of the other things we are doing and balancing our spending with our income. We must add up our needs and lay that against our income and decide which ones we are willing to pay for and not do the rest. In fact, I think it would be tremendously valuable to have a law that we must have a balanced national budget and that would force the discipline of priorities on the government.

We have been spending as if we had all the money in the world and now the consequences have caught up with us.

The best and most effective start on a course of remedy will be the tax surcharge and an accompanying reduction in spending. The administration should exercise some "rigorous restraint" of its own in this area. We are a nation in a hurry. We want to solve our problems now. But in the light of present circumstances, this is just now possible. The only logical approach is a program of government spending priorities, coupled with continued efforts to involve the private sector to a greater degree in public problem solving.

But as we mentioned before, even if the tax increase and spending serve to dampen the demand factor, the momentum of the wage-price spiral could continue, with its adverse effects, well into the future. Thus, the need for more moderate wage settlements.

But as we near the half-way point of the year, there is no indication that unions are responding to such appeals. George Meany told the AFL-CIO convention in Miami, in effect, to get all they can while they can, because wage-price controls may be on the way. In the face of the current economic situation, this sort of attitude is sheer folly and irresponsibility of the highest order, and both business and labor will be feeling the effect of it for years to come.

Certainly, the building trades unions are showing no restraint.

The fifty-three settlements reported to the AGC this year have averaged 9.8 per cent.

Operating engineers in Kansas City got an increase of \$2.90 over 3 years—a 20 per cent increase.

Painters in Cincinnati got \$1.55 for 2 years—a 17.5 per cent increase.

Plumbers in Medford, Oregon got \$1.75 for 3 years after a 14 day strike—a 10 per cent increase.

Pipefitters in Boston struck to get \$2.26 for 3 years—a 15 per cent increase—and so on for all crafts in all sections of the country.

Much of Michigan's construction industry is tied up with strikes. The electricians are

asking \$10.22 per hour and the iron workers want \$10.54. How does \$100 per day for an electrician sound to you?

The Michigan trades unions are asking an average increase of 26.2 per cent.

The impact of construction wage-price developments on the rest of the economy is so vital that the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability was prompted two weeks ago to issue a statement of "strong concern" at the acceleration of the inflationary spiral which could result from the negotiations in construction in such cities and states as Detroit, Toledo, Idaho, Oklahoma, Washington, and Wisconsin.

After the Cleveland settlements last year at 40 per cent over a 3-year period, a Cleveland machinery manufacturer said later: "Once the construction industry settlement became known, our offer of 6% and 7% per year over 2 years looked like peanuts. Our men struck us for 41 days before they took the offer."

Cleveland Transit System officials blamed the construction industry for their own high settlement of 8 per cent. They had to raise bus fares a nickel after that contract—a good example of the way wage increases directly affect prices and the public.

In 1967, industry-wide construction settlements exceeded 7 per cent—about one-third larger than the average of 5½ per cent for the entire economy.

The amazing thing is that these increases are coming in the face of the poorest productivity record of any major industry in the nation.

Figures compiled by the Council of Economic Advisers show that output per man-hour in the field of contract construction actually declined three-tenths of a per cent during the period from 1959 to 1966. No other industry showed a decline in productivity and most showed gains in the neighborhood of 3 to 5 per cent.

The poor productivity is due to a number of factors, including strikes, work stoppages and slowdowns; featherbedding and work restricting practices, use of overtime to meet schedules, inefficiency of workers who knew they can hop to another job easily, the increased age of craftsmen, and others.

Despite this poor record, construction wages have risen faster than in other industries, even when there was a slack in demand. During the same 1959 to 1966 period, compensation per man hour increased an average of nearly 5 per cent per year, and has been even greater in the past two years.

This pattern of low productivity and high wage increases spreads inflation throughout the economy, pushing up the cost of industrial plants, homes, stores, schools, hospitals, and other buildings.

Construction is characterized by economists as one of the so-called "bottleneck" industries which, because of low productivity and high wages and prices, particularly aggravate inflationary trends.

There has been some urging of federal regulation of these bottleneck industries, and I fear that unless we are successful in bringing construction trade unions under control and holding down wage settlements while at the same time opening the way for technological advances, then we will soon lose our industry to federal controls.

At this point, the idea of bringing wages under control—even if by federal regulation—may sound attractive to some. But I believe this would create far more troubles for the industry than good. The problems we face are so far-reaching and complex, so interrelated with a number of various factors, that they cannot be dealt with by government edict. Controls would cripple rather than liberate the industry.

We would, however, welcome government efforts that would help us solve our own problems, working with the industry to find

broad solutions. Government could make worthwhile contributions, for example, by anticipating adverse trends, suggesting various correctives and helping to create enabling machinery.

In seeking solutions, I believe there are three broad areas where we need to concentrate. First, we must strengthen our bargaining position; second, help ease the manpower shortage; and third, increase productivity.

Many of our industry problems stem from the very nature of the construction industry, and from various factors which have given the unions such bargaining leverage that today, collective bargaining in construction is nothing more than a farce.

The industry is tremendously fragmented. Contractors are divided and sub-divided into at least 28 national associations. There are some 19 major unions and numerous lesser ones to deal with.

In years past, contracting was largely a local business, and it was natural for collective bargaining to be conducted on a local scale. In recent decades, strong regional and national trends emerged as companies grew in size and expanded their operations over broad geographical areas. In order to avoid the tangle of local agreements, they have negotiated national contracts.

This background has, as you all well know, produced some of the chronic problems which we are having to deal with today. Here are some of them:

1. Exorbitant settlements emerging from the 8,000 local bargaining situations in the construction industry do not attract public attention, for example, the way the national steelworker negotiations will later this year.

2. There are inevitably cases where strong unions and weak associations result in unusually high settlements, and these settlements tend to set the pattern for subsequent negotiations in other areas.

3. When strikes do occur, it often works no particular hardship on the workers. Construction workers are more individualistic, and more mobile than other crafts, and are more likely to pick up and move to another area or state where they can work until the strike is settled. Or, they may be able to go to work in the same area for a contractor who has a national agreement, or individually negotiated agreement, and is not affected by the strike.

4. Whether they have a national agreement or not, contractors from other areas do not have a long-range stake in the outcome of local negotiations and, they often bring pressure for a quick settlement.

5. Because there is a new bid submitted for each new project, it has always been easy for contractors to pass on the higher labor costs to owners.

6. Owners themselves have tended to take a short-range view of construction strikes, pressuring the contractor to get on with construction rather than hold the line against wage demands.

However, I think owners are now fully aware of the terrific impact high construction costs are having on their operations. They are having to examine plant-expansion projects carefully and build only what is absolutely necessary or add units which economically justify high-cost work. Owners are not going to sit idly by and watch construction costs continue to soar without trying to do something about it.

U.S. Steel closed down its Pittsburgh construction projects last year, although it could have continued because of a national agreement. But isolated action here and there is not enough.

There was much fanfare and publicity recently about negotiation of no-strike pledges by construction unions with two companies that wanted to build plants in the St. Louis area and threatened to go elsewhere. This was a farce and a sham. The union contracts

already had no-strike provisions and all they were doing were saying they would abide by the provisions of the contract as long as the companies would agree to pay retroactively—in the event of a local strike—whatever ultimate settlement the local bargaining unit happened to make. This just cut the legs out from under the local AGC bargaining group and it simply is a strike-breaking gimmick. This kind of approach by owners is what has made a major contribution to the uneconomic wage increases in the construction industry. Admittedly, owners building multi-million dollar facilities are in a real bind to complete their facility and start getting their money back. But they must be made to realize the very adverse consequences of such a position and that it is in effect, a major contributor to high and increasing construction costs.

What we need from the owners is coordinated action, a solid front in the face of construction demands and strikes. With this in mind, I intend to look into the possibility of the Chamber of Commerce sponsoring a conference of major contractors with chief engineers from the major corporations, to seek more effective methods for owners to help keep wages in line.

I was happy to hear a report from Bill Dunn that we are presenting a solid front in Detroit, that the unions are astounded by the unity there.

It's time for a showdown. It's time for us to realize how weak we are in our splintered condition, and how difficult it is to resist these demands.

If we are not successful in holding down costs, gentlemen, the construction industry is going to suffer. Some major national corporations have decided to channel all their major building to non-union contractors or to set-up construction divisions of their own, and both of these could become larger trends.

How else can we strengthen our bargaining position?

I believe most of us accept the need for elevating collective bargaining more to state and regional levels, and possibly even to a national level. This is, of course, easier said than done. The AGC has been working to widen the geographical scope of the bargaining situations, but progress has been necessarily slow. Efforts have also been made to achieve simultaneous expiration of dates for all contracts in a given area. This is the case in Michigan, where all but one contract expired at about the same time.

These efforts should continue and could stand careful examination to see if there are ways we can speed up the process.

Certainly, one step in the right direction would be to strengthen the ties between the many associations in the industry. The proposal that the industry form a National Federation of Construction Industry Associations certainly deserves the most serious consideration from all of us, and especially from the association themselves. Our fragmentation is part of our vulnerability.

We also should examine new ways that the national AGC headquarters could prepare local negotiators for the bargaining session. Negotiating kits with proposals and counter proposals which have worked in other areas, statistical information to use in arguments, and other resource material, would be tremendously helpful.

Labor unions use this tactic. When they go into a bargaining session in Montgomery, Alabama, they have information on how the local in Kalamazoo obtained its high settlement, and other information from national headquarters. Some of the unions are using computers in their headquarters to compile and correlate this sort of information.

We might also give renewed consideration to the possibility of providing floating labor experts for assistance to local negotiators who request it. You can just bet that when the unions come into a bargaining session, they have done their homework and in face

of the general unpreparedness of the contractors they will win the bargaining.

We also need to get rid of exclusive hiring halls. J. M. Graney, president of the National Constructors Association, has proposed that hiring halls and referral systems be placed under joint administration and located outside union headquarters and employers' offices.

We also need better industry machinery for settling disputes and for controlling the size of wage hikes.

Graney has also proposed two actions in this area:

1. establish a national, joint arbitration board to keep wage settlements within reasonable limits; and

2. strengthen the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes by imposing sanctions for violations of its procedural rules.

The number of jurisdictional disputes and the resultant picket lines which flagrantly violate the union contracts are disgraceful. The cost effect of this tactic on the part of unions is tremendous. It is not unusual on a job to have one jurisdictional dispute after another in some areas of the country. Even though you appeal to the Joint Board you may get work resumed in three or four days or a week, but the damage is already done. There should be stringent and automatic penalties for these disruptions and costly practices.

Jurisdictional disputes are doing as much as high wages to stifle the industry. William J. Cour, chairman of the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes, bluntly told members of the building trades unions convention in Miami that if they don't cut down the number of jurisdictional work stoppages, they will commit economic suicide.

He said the large industrial construction customers are "getting fed up with work stoppages and picket lines" and threatening to get rid of the contractors and the building trades unions.

Cour pointed out that 15 years ago the Building Trades Department adopted a policy written into the Joint Board's rules forbidding jurisdictional picket lines and directing non-involved crafts to ignore such lines they are set up. But locals continue to violate this policy.

Cour told them most of the jurisdictional problems could be solved if the unions would adhere to the Joint Board's procedural rules. The problem, he said, demands immediate leadership.

Let's hope that this advice will be effective on the union leaders who heard these statements by Cour.

Construction and industry in general need a law which would authorize federal courts to issue injunctions to force unions to honor no-strike, no lockout contract terms. At the present time, an old law, enacted for a different purpose entirely, prevents federal courts from issuing injunctions against unions. And unions have been effective in getting cases in state courts transferred to federal courts.

These are only a few proposals for strengthening our bargaining position. I hope you will come up with more during this seminar. Certainly we need creative thinking in this area.

The tight labor market is another factor which has given the unions added power to make large settlements. Alleviating this problem should be high on the contractors' list.

The AGC held a conference on this last year, and is working with some of its state and local branches to develop training programs. But too few contractors are involved in this area.

In Philadelphia, contractors and labor unions agreed to sponsor a program, financed through a federal grant, to seek out young Negroes, tutor them to pass aptitude tests,

and get them into such trades as sheet metal work, carpentry, plumbing, and other building trades.

A similar program was formed in San Francisco by representatives of labor, community, city and federal organizations, but no contractors are participating.

One of the most successful programs is that of the Workers Defense League, which originally started in New York and now has programs in several large cities.

The group has opened an office with a private grant of \$32,000 in 1964 and has since placed a number of young Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the New York City building trades apprentice training programs.

The program consists of recruiting young men, tutoring them for four weeks—3 hours a night, four nights a week, plus half a day on Saturday—in such areas as verbal analogies, math and spatial relations, to pass the tough apprentice entrance test, as well as providing information to help them get by the personnel interviews.

I cite this example to show the difficulty many of the unemployed persons face in getting into some of the higher craft unions. Contractors who get involved in sponsoring these programs stand to benefit from the added manpower supply, and make a positive social contribution.

Now, briefly, the third area where we need to concentrate is in increasing productivity.

Construction is one of the last handicraft industries, and despite progress in development of earth movers, cranes and other machinery, it has largely remained an unmechanized field.

On the other hand, modern times are bringing about an unprecedented demand for new building. The United States will need 20 million new housing units alone in the next ten years. By the year 2000 we will need double the number of buildings that exist today, plus rebuilding the existing ones. The urban populations in Asia, Africa and Latin America are expected to rise five or six times their present numbers by the year 2000. There are those who have serious doubts about the construction industry's ability to meet these demands.

These expected demands, coupled with the high cost of present construction and other factors, have prompted a significant amount of research—something we have not seen much of in construction. Many technical changes are just around the corner. Much of the research is centered around standardization of components, building systems, greater on-site prefabrication, new materials, more use of computers and more effective management. Large material manufacturers and aerospace firms are showing some interest in entrepreneurial building, slum renovation and construction of entire new cities. Mobile housing manufacturers are making some breakthroughs. These changes should shake us up and we had better be aware of them.

The construction industry must determine not to impede progress or be bypassed by it. We welcome progress. But unfortunately, our unions often do not.

Vested labor interests are opposing the introduction of new materials and methods. Many unions insist on dismantling and reassembling goods that have been preassembled. And the Supreme Court has backed up the case of carpenters who refused to install prefabricated doors. Work limiting quotas are commonplace.

Efforts should continue to obtain legislation strengthening the ban against secondary boycotts and outlawing restrictive measures and featherbedding. Meanwhile, it is important that the highest priority be given to seeking elimination of these factors through negotiation. Unions must be made to realize such tactics are hurting the industry in the long run, and rather than eliminating jobs, technological advances and increased productivity will provide more jobs.

Construction's labor problems while unique in many ways, are but a reflection of labor problems throughout industry.

Despite the fact that labor unions have a strong and established role in our economy, they still have largely not developed mature and responsible attitudes. Labor leaders continue to promote the concept that unions are fighting for the economic under-privileged.

Our body of labor law, developed in an earlier time when labor was the economic underdog, has enabled labor to grow in power and stature until today—it has achieved a position of dominance over management. The ability of industry to withstand strikes is decreasing and the ability of unions to withstand strikes is increasing.

Guy Farmer, former chairman of the NLRB, was quoted as saying: "Unions today are the most powerful private institution that exists in our society."

The general public, which has had to suffer through an increasing number of strikes in recent years, has a right to expect industrial peace, and certainly it is in the best interest of the economy.

Congress needs to take a serious look at industry-wide collective bargaining today. Sen. Robert P. Griffin of Michigan has introduced legislation to set up a bi-partisan legislative committee to make such a study.

More specifically, legislation is needed to reform the NLRB and remedial legislation is needed to reverse certain of the Board's decisions.

Among the trends which have emerged from Board rulings in recent years is a tendency to give unions a voice in management decision-making; a trend to expand the scope and impact of strikes, through approval of coalition bargaining and other rulings; and a trend to submerge individual rights in favor of the unions.

We do not seek anti-union legislation. It is important to recognize the tremendous good unions have brought about in raising the standard of living, inducing industry to greater efficiencies, stimulating labor-saving innovations, and opening new market opportunities. The unions had better develop some responsibility for the public interest or some drastic changes will be made.

To achieve a more realistic labor policy, some 40 trade associations, including the Chamber of Commerce and the AGC, banded together in a program of labor law reform. These associations enlisted 150 labor law experts from throughout the United States to prepare proposed revisions in our laws and to document the reasons why such revisions are necessary. These laws are not anti-union, but will provide fair treatment for both sides.

Hopefully, their enactment will help us regain a balance of power in negotiations and make collective bargaining the effective tool it was intended to be.

By way of summary, gentleman, the construction industry is not going to solve its problems overnight. It is moving in the right direction, but it must move faster. It must continue efforts to strengthen its bargaining position, ease the manpower shortage, increase productivity and enact labor law reform.

The health of our industry is in jeopardy. Much depends on your efforts, and all our efforts, to solve these problems. The consequences of failure are too serious. We must succeed. I wish you luck in your efforts here.

RHODESIA: DEEPER U.N. MEDDLING

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an edi-

torial entitled "Rhodesia: Deeper U.N. Meddling" which was published in the Norfolk Ledger-Star of June 8, 1968, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RHODESIA: DEEPER U.N. MEDDLING

As was the case with all the earlier punitive actions taken by the United Nations against Rhodesia, the latest turning of the sanctions screw will probably not be as effective as the harsh language indicates.

Enforcement will turn on member nations' individual decisions, for one thing; and for another, the Rhodesians have proved themselves adept at adjusting to the various moves against them and finding means to circumvent the barriers.

Even so, the unanimous action by the Security Council—calling for total severance of trade and travel links with the break-away British territory—is the most sweeping yet. And for that very reason it must be considered the greatest lapse of good judgment yet on the part of the U.N. powers that approved the intervention—including the United States.

At either of two levels, the United Nations' attempt to bring down the government of Prime Minister Ian Smith is intrusion into internal national affairs that are beyond any rightful authority of the organization.

At one level, this is a matter strictly between the British home government and a member of the British system which has chosen independence. Whatever Whitehall chooses to do about its rebellious offspring is its own business, unless the action infringes upon some other member of the international community. The mere fact that Prime Minister Wilson wants U.N. chastisement of Rhodesia to help him bring the African territory under British control again is no reason at all for the U.N. to comply.

Considered at another level—which is closer to the reality of the Afro-Asian demands which have plunged the U.N. so deeply into the situation—this is a matter of outside action to change the internal policies of Rhodesia itself. It is the Rhodesian political arrangement, with its system run largely by whites in a predominantly black country, which has brought most of the angry agitation from beyond Rhodesia's borders. Not that Rhodesia doesn't have a timetable for enlargement of the Negro role but it is too slow to suit the African nationalists and others who think all racial problems should be solved immediately.

But the fact is that racial relations all over the world are in various stages of development, and it is the sovereign prerogative of each nation to work out the matter for itself.

It is not the business of the U.N. to police the activities of any of its members in this or any other internal matter.

HOW BLACKIE AUGER KEEPS HIS HEAD ABOVE WATER

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, unusual business success stories are of profound interest to everyone. One of the most outstanding examples of such success in recent history is that of Blackie Auger, the Washington restaurateur. Harriet Doudy depicted this American success story in the May 19 issue of Potomac magazine.

The article follows, and I commend it to my colleagues:

HOW BLACKIE AUGER KEEPS HIS HEAD

ABOVE WATER

(By Harriet Douty)

In the summer of 1946, Ulysses G. (Blackie) Auger and his wife, Lou, came home to Washington, borrowed \$2000 on his mother's home and went into the restaurant—actually, noontime hotdog stand—business at 22d and M streets n.w., just across from where his present, 1000-person-capacity House of Beef stands today.

Auger, now 47, recalls that he didn't like the business—"it was very depressing". He has retained some of this love-hate feeling about it ever since. His immigrant father had watched "at least 10" restaurants collapse in ventures around Washington during Blackie's youth (failures which Blackie ascribes to his father's desire to do everything instead of "using a system"), yet he had been insistent that his son go into the business himself.

But it took a strike at the Los Angeles *Examiner* in 1946, putting pressman Auger out on the street, to get him behind a hot stove at The Minute Grille.

Today Blackie Auger's assets may be well over \$10 million. There are two new Cadillacs in the family every year (license plate UGA on one).

Over the years, he has acquired 21 restaurants and coffee shops, two-and-one-third apartment houses, one-tenth of the Mayflower Hotel (where he had once worked as a busboy), 65 pieces of property (listed on the 1968 tax rolls), plus part interest in around 16 others ventures with close friends D. F. ("Nic") Antonelli (the parking lot magnate), Angelo Puglisi and William Cohen (realtors), and others. He also acquired considerable stock in various Panamanian concerns, and 50 per cent in the Swiss Budget-Rent-a-Car.

This spectacular rise would put Blackie at the head of his Central (Cardozo) High School class—if he hadn't dropped out of it at the age of 17.

Between 1946 and 1958, however, when what is now called Auger Enterprises began to skyrocket, were long years of privation, rooming houses, uncertainties, and Friday afternoon dashes over to Rosslyn to borrow enough money to meet the payroll.

In those days, Lou, a first-generation American of Danish and French stock who was poorer in her childhood than Blackie and perhaps more ambitious, owned one black skirt and one white blouse, her uniform in the restaurant. Today, casually draped in fur, Lou Auger has the natural grace and concern for others that form the basis of good breeding. Today, she asks rhetorically: "What did I need a lot of clothes for? We spent every waking moment in the restaurant."

Sleeping moments were spent there, too. Until 1956, when they moved into their first home, the Augers, like many small shopkeepers, lived above the restaurant. Their bedroom was where the upstairs ladies room is today. Now they live in a twelve-room house on Normanstone Drive, in the wooded area between the Shoreham Hotel and the British Embassy. Their neighbors include former Postmaster General Larry O'Brien and Inter-American Development Bank President Felipe Herrera. John Lindsay, when he served Congress, lived a few doors down.

If the restaurant, with its heavy furnishings, Tiffany lamps, old song sheets, paper money and autographed pictures of Hubert Humphrey and others, is Blackie's domain, Lou holds sway in the home. Everything is white, light, airy, an incongruous setting for the dark, stocky Blackie, who looks like a former prizefighter or football player despite a lifelong disregard for athletics.

Delicate chandeliers hang from the ceiling. Reproduction statuary studs room and lawn. In the study, still Lou's domain since Blackie's one relaxation is gin rummy, the bookshelves are filled with good intentions unrealized—uncreased Book-of-the-Month-Club selections on *The Age of Voltaire*, George F. Kennan's thick *Memoirs*, *The Territorial Imperative*. Tucked between these heavy tomes is an assortment of modern novels that has been carefully inspected by Lou Auger. Lou Auger is in the revision stage of a 560-typewritten page novel she has written about an ambitious young woman who makes good.

The original restaurant, The Minute Grille, was more properly a diner than a restaurant, featuring everything, specializing in nothing and existing on a hand-to-mouth basis for three years. Then the lease was terminated.

With the financial help of Floyd D. Akers, then, as now, president of neighboring Capitol Cadillac-Oldsmobile, Blackie and Lou rented the place across the street—at double the rent for double the seating capacity.

Auger's recollection of this first introduction into the higher realms of Washington big-wheeling financing is revealing. A little of his personal style and more than a little of his life-style are apparent in the anecdote. He still calls longtime business associate Akers "Mister Akers."

When he operated The Minute Grille, "Mr. Akers'd come in every solid single day," Auger now recalls. "I'd take care of him to the best of my ability. . . . He eats ketchup on everything. In those days, you'd buy ketchup by the No. 10 can. But I'd run down every day and buy a 28-cent bottle of ketchup. . . . every day. . . . because Mister Akers would put half the bottle on his 25-cent egg-salad sandwich. . . ."

"But, you know," Auger says now, "you're very honored to have a man of this caliber eating in your place every day. Well, Hawkins, I think his name was, owned the land where the Grille was and one day he said 'You have first option to buy for \$55,000' and I didn't know what first option meant. . . . and I asked Mister Akers what it meant and we got to talking. . . ."

"Sometime after that, I found out I couldn't continue the place going on account of health problems and I found out I could buy across the street and I talked to Mister Akers and one day I got into this big chauffeured automobile and he just said, 'How much do you have, boy?' . . . I was just 26 years old. . . . and I didn't own a suit. . . . I had to borrow a coat from a cook in a place down the street and we got into his car to drive to The American Security & Trust and Mister Akers, after three years of my waiting on him every day said, 'What's your name, Blackie?'"

In 1968, Blackie Auger's two family Cadillacs come from Mr. Akers's auto firm.

At the new site across the street, the Grille continued on what Blackie now recalls was still a hand-to-mouth existence until 1953, when he hit on the moneymaker: beef.

The timing was right. Meat, which had been in short supply during the aftermath of the Second World War and Korea, was coming back on the market. From 1953, Blackie specialized in beef. In 1955, he developed the "set" (unchanging) menu, now a feature at many steak houses. The set menu calls for beef, beef, and more beef, and never mind about the vegetables—baked potatoes and peas, plus a salad laced with "Blackie's own" French dressing which tastes little different from the bottled kind.

Blackie bought a cut of beef and sold it barely above cost. His customers, who had been used to poring over menus "as thick as the telephone book" were told, gruffly, "You eat beef or you don't eat nothing." They ate beef. They told their friends about the little restaurant that sold beef cheap.

In 1955, the restaurant, for the first time, was open for supper. Blackie used to stand out on the sidewalk and hustle in people who took one look at the then-small restaurant with its outsized sign and turned up their noses. "Come on in," he would say. "If you don't like it, I'll pick up the tab."

Today, businessmen invade the place at lunch, tourists and suburbanites flock to it in the evening. Blackie still prides himself on giving value for your money, a fact not disputed by more serious restaurateurs who regard Blackie's success with a mixture of envy and disdain. Blackie looks at it this way: "You can get a rug, a tablecloth, a free parking place, a drink, and a steak for under five dollars."

Although this formula may not appeal to the serious diner, it does appeal to thousands of meat-and-potatoes people who like their steak plain and find the startling juxtaposition of objects appealing: the deeply carved Spanish chests next to the Victorian chairs bought at the dismantlement of the Capitol Theater; the mellow Old-Masters-type paintings alongside inexpensive French art; the stained-glass windows from Christ Church, Washington, letting in light to illuminate the Tiffany lampshades brought for \$8 apiece when nobody else wanted them. Much of the furnishings are acquired, cheaply, through Blackie and Lou's friendship with "the wreckers," who often give them advance notice of an approaching demolition. One leading gastronome invariably takes his mother-in-law to Blackie's whenever she's in town. "Tourists want to feel that they're in a big city," he reports. "They like the decor at Blackie's, the crowds. Blackie's makes them feel. . . . urban." Many would probably be surprised to discover that, gastronomically, Blackie's ranks low on the list of Washington restaurants.

In fact, Blackie is not so much a restaurateur as a manager. "I can go into a restaurant and in three minutes tell someone what he's doing wrong," he states. Although Blackie struggles for words, he sometimes comes up with telling analogies. "Take an artist. He can capture someone's looks in three seconds while it might take someone else three hours and he still wouldn't get it right. It just doesn't come natural."

"I'm in the restaurant business because it comes natural," says Blackie (who picked up his nickname in the Army from a group of southern boys who couldn't pronounce Ulysses. . . . Hey, you with the black hair. Hey, Blackie!) "I'm offered four restaurants a week, but I'm not interested anymore. Buying old restaurants is like buying someone else's headaches. I only want new restaurants in buildings. And they must have parking."

If a restaurant does not pay for itself, Blackie gets rid of it. He recently got rid of the Black Gun, one of his first acquisitions after it developed personnel and equipment problems. As he did also with Pierre's, an old French restaurant at Connecticut and Q streets n.w., which Blackie took over in 1966 (along with the Oyster Bay and the DeLuxe) in payment of a debt.

Critics who for years had said, in effect, "Blackie is fine as far as he goes, but I'd like to see him run a real restaurant," watched with satisfaction as the service and food at Pierre's, never up to its elegant decor, deteriorated, then stopped. After two months and with a \$125,000 loss, Blackie closed the restaurant, attributing his failure to old equipment, rats and parking difficulties.

Now he concentrates on what he calls "fast-service restaurants," in reality cafeterias doctored up to give the feel of a restaurant. These are often combined with a separate bar, as in the Black Bird, the Black Beret, and the Black Russian, a concept that got him an innovation award at the 1964 Chicago Restaurant Show.

The year 1954 marked the first of 12 expansions at Blackie's House of Beef which have left the original restaurant far behind. It's the foyer today. "There were too many lines," Blackie says, recalling the wait to get seated, to reach the restrooms, to pay the bill. "We had to expand."

Expansion was risky business. To the casual eye, it indicated prosperity; indeed, it was a sign of prosperity of a sort. But much could be wiped away if Cities Services, which owned the property Blackie's stood on, decided it wanted the land for its own use. To feel completely secure, Blackie had to own the land, and this did not happen until 1961, by which time he had put more than \$200,000 into the restaurant. "The day before I got the land, my business was worth nothing. The day after, it was worth one million dollars." Today he estimates it is worth \$1.5 million, although it is mortgaged at \$600,000.

To insure himself a place to move should the lease not be renewed, Blackie bought his first piece of property in 1956, catty-cornered across from the restaurant. He has been buying land ever since. The instinct by which he runs his life dictated that the run-down area bordered by Connecticut Avenue and Georgetown, Pennsylvania Avenue and P Street nw., would be valuable one day. Two-thirds of his property is in that area.

Slum land meant cheaper land. Slum land also meant land that was zoned for two-story private dwellings—a factor that keeps Blackie's land taxes low, which suits him just fine. The combined assessed value—generally 55 per cent of what assessors consider the real value—of Blackie's 45 properties in that area listed on the 1968 tax rolls, amounts to \$878,669. "If they think the land's worth \$20 a square foot, that keeps my taxes low. But I wouldn't sell the land for \$20 a square foot. I wouldn't even sell it for \$30 a square foot. But at \$40 a square foot, the land would be worth an estimated \$3.9 million.

Most of the land is heavily mortgaged. Take, as an example, an M street property Blackie "bought" in 1959 for \$149,000. He paid \$2000 down and hasn't paid a penny since. He has, however, forked out \$90,000 in interest, which is tax deductible. Today, he figures, the land is worth \$642,000, so if he sold it tomorrow, he'd make a profit of \$403,000.

Blackie calls this procedure "buying by note," or an "Auger-Antonelli deal with no money down," memorialized in an Auger Enterprises corporation, A-A, Inc.

This kind of operation requires good credit and a cash-flow business with enough money coming in to cover taxes and interest. Nick Antonelli gets his from the parking lots. Blackie get his from the restaurants. Blackie's land philosophy is "buy and hold"—hold until the zoning regulations change and the land is ready to be developed. No real developer himself, he's no slum landlord either. "I can't spend my time collecting rents. Anything that takes too much time is a liability." He lets houses sit as they are until "trouble develops with the D.C. code." Then he tears them down. An official at the Licenses and Inspection Department reports: "As far as I know, he's not in the slum business."

For a man in his income bracket, Blackie feels that the only way to make money today is through capital gains tax and depreciation. Land is not depreciable, but the profits from the sale of property used for exchange or business purposes (as opposed to speculative purposes) are taxed at a rate as much as 55 per cent lower than ordinary income. Apartment houses, restaurants, and the like are depreciable. The first Blackie-conceived-and-built apartment house, Embassy Square, at 20th and N streets nw., will be open for rentals this month. Blackie tries to keep an inventory of depreciable items to keep his income low.

Despite this wheeling and dealing, one gets

the impression that it's just paper money to him, that despite his statement that he hates the restaurant business, his only real love is the original place, the House of Beef, which he nurtured along.

He still puts in 12 hours a day (to Lou Auger's 6 or 8) at his restaurant office, behind a screen of receptionists and secretaries that makes him about as accessible as an Oriental Potentate. What drives him on? "Just trying to make a living." He expands: "Everybody has their own vicious circle. I build apartment houses to get depreciation to offset the revenue from my restaurants. I probably don't eat any better than most people. I'm just trying to keep my head above water."

Blackie Auger is so busy trying to keep his head above water that he hasn't time to get involved in the civic activities that attract many successful businessmen. "I think most people turn to civic activities when they've organized their lives so much that there's not much left for them to do."

Still, he does his part, through contributions to the Maret school where he has sent his three children to insure them the fine education that he lacks.

(His eldest son, Gregory, now at Denver University, is about to go off to the famous Hotel Restaurant school in Lausanne, Switzerland—"And I never pushed him," says Blackie. "I think that's one thing I didn't like about the restaurant business when I was young . . . my own father and mother always telling me to go into the business. But I've never said a word to my boy.")

This past year, he played a role in the United Giver's Fund but, as a rule, Blackie Auger, uneasy in public, likes to operate from behind the scenes. "Look at it this way. If I get on the City Council, or on the board of my church, I end up with a lot of people hating me. But if I help someone I know get on the Council or the board, then I don't get a lot of people hating me.

"Look at it this way," he repeats. "I feed 5000 Republicans and Democrats a day. How can I get involved?"

JOBS FOR THE UNEMPLOYABLE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia, S.C., Record recently published an editorial of significance on unemployment which I would like to call to the attention of Senators.

The editorial, entitled "Jobs for the Unemployable," dated May 27, discusses the unfavorable consequences that can arise from the "nationwide effort to supply gainful occupation to the poor" unless the employment programs are properly administered. As pointed out, the problems which accompany the lowering of job standards in order to provide jobs for unqualified unemployed are often absenteeism which "slows down production, increases expense, and lowers quality," increased turnover of workers, and lack of discipline. The deficiencies of the workers thus result in increased and added expenses to the companies employing such improperly administered programs of employment.

The emphasis of the editorial pointed to more favorable results that can be achieved when employment programs

are supplemented by proper training of the employees.

Therefore, the creation of jobs for unemployed because they are merely unemployed is not the right solution, but previously unemployed persons must first be sufficiently trained before given new jobs or additional training should be given these persons upon starting the job in order to qualify them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JOBS FOR THE UNEMPLOYABLE

During the early rush of World War II construction at Fort Jackson, many marginal workers employed for the six-day week did not show up on Saturdays. A council on the problem produced a solution by raising wages. But when the pay was increased, the hard-core unemployable, as they are called today, stayed off the job not only on Saturdays, but on Fridays also.

As a nationwide effort to supply gainful occupation to the poor, the unskilled and the unskilled gains momentum, absenteeism is one of the greatest obstacles. It slows down production, increases expense, and lowers quality.

The Wall Street Journal tells the story of a home appliance plant in the Chicago area which turned to the hiring of "disadvantaged" workers when its traditional manpower pool ran dry.

In order to qualify more applicants, it lowered hiring standards in education, physical fitness and morality, but as slum workers multiplied, turnover in the hourly ranks leaped from an average of 18 per cent to 61 per cent. At one point, the company was losing 8 per cent of its newly hired workers after one day of work and 22 per cent were leaving after the first week. Daily absences jumped from 2 per cent to 8 per cent.

Lack of discipline was another headache. Some men slept on the job, some drank, some either consumed or peddled narcotics, and some engaged in heated arguments or fist fights in wash rooms and parking lots.

Deficiencies of the workers cost the company hundreds of thousands of dollars for scrap, rework and training. Administrative expenses also soared to keep up with absences, turnover and garnisheed earnings.

Many of the difficulties were lessened by changes in employment and training practices. Workers were more thoroughly indoctrinated in their jobs by personalized instruction. A counseling program was established. Regular attendance was stressed. New educational and training opportunities were opened.

Turnover and absenteeism were substantially reduced. Quality of workmanship improved. Performance still did not measure up to the period before "unemployables" were hired, but the work force is becoming increasingly stable and competent.

One of the most effective programs for helping the people of the ghettos is conducted by the Opportunity Industrial Center, which is headed by the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, a Negro pastor in Philadelphia.

While it offers education, training and orientation, it particularly emphasizes to its clients that they must be regular and punctual in their work and turn in a full day's job every day.

Much has been said about the value of schooling and skill, and these cannot be overrated. But many jobs are looking for people with only the primary requisites of punctuality, diligence, loyalty and honesty. Employment is going begging for men and women who will measure up to these simple qualifications.

BALANCING ORDER WITH LIBERTY

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, during the past 7 years, crime in this country has increased by 88 percent. And during the last year, crime increased 16 percent. Crime is a serious problem.

In this time of crisis, it is gratifying to hear that the Supreme Court has given its stamp of approval to reasonable tools of law enforcement. Last Monday, the Supreme Court, in an 8-to-1 decision, upheld the power of the police to "stop and frisk" suspicious persons.

Although these decisions might have come as a surprise to some, I proudly point out that the thrust of these decisions was anticipated by the 13 cosponsors of H.R. 16908—all Republicans and led by the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], and the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

The bill which they introduced on April 30, 1968, lays down clear guidelines for law-enforcement officers which pass the test of constitutionality with flying colors.

I hope that the insight that my Republican colleagues showed on April 30, and the Supreme Court showed on June 10 will finally come to the Democratic side of the Judiciary Committee so that we are given a chance to act on H.R. 16908.

There are many fancy theories about the crime problem. But perhaps if we caught more criminals, there just might be less crime.

Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post there appeared a timely editorial on this vital issue. The editorial gives a good analysis of the issues inherent in "stop and frisk" practices. I share with the author of this editorial the hope that some day we will find that crime is a small problem so that in the land of the free we will find freedom from fear.

Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

BALANCING ORDER WITH LIBERTY

The idea that the Supreme Court is unconcerned about the crime situation in the country and spends its time finding new ways to set criminals free ought to be laid to rest by the decisions Monday involving so-called "stop and frisk" laws. Indeed, the opinions by Chief Justice Warren are clearly designed to help policemen stop crime before it occurs and to protect themselves in the process. Those opinions strike a careful balance between the arguments of those who contend the police need vast new powers to stop people on the street and those who contend that granting such powers would lead the Nation towards a police state. As such, the Court's decisions provide a standard which is unlikely to be fully acceptable to either side but which seems to be a wise answer to the problems that exist today.

The rule the Court has established is that a policeman can stop a suspicious person if the evidence on which the suspicion is based would convince a man of "reasonable caution" to take similar action. Having stopped a person, the policeman can "pat him down" if he has a reason to think the person is carrying a weapon. The Court makes clear that what constitutes sufficient reason

for such a "stop and frisk" will be worked out on a case by case basis. But the manner in which the rule was applied to three situations this week indicates it will give the police greater flexibility on the street while providing considerable protection against harassment of innocent persons.

The problem of the "stop and frisk" laws arises because the Constitution bars arrests unless the police have "probable cause" to think a particular person has committed a crime. Since probable cause means more than just suspicion and since any forcible stopping by the police could be considered an arrest, a "stop" based on mere suspicion comes close to being an unconstitutional arrest and a subsequent "frisk" comes close to being an illegal search. By putting some flexibility into this situation, the Court has refused to be caught in a dual trap. If it had said the police need "probable cause" to stop anyone, the patrolman's ability to head off crime would be almost nonexistent. If it had said the Constitution does not apply until a formal arrest is made, the police would have unlimited discretion to stop anyone for any reason. By ruling that a standard of "reasonableness" governs the legality of a stop and that a cursory search only for weapons may follow, the Court can balance the two great interests of society—stopping crime and preserving some of the essentials of personal freedom.

It is unfortunate that the crime situation is so bad that police are forced to think in terms of "stop and frisk" laws. It is, indeed, a gross infringement on personal liberty to be stopped and searched, even minimally, on the street merely because a policeman thinks you may have committed or are about to commit a crime. It is particularly unpleasant to have such power in the hands of the police when it will be applied inevitably to the poor more frequently than to the rich. But, as the Chief Justice points out, the Court cannot stop the harassment of minority groups by some policemen. Its task is to judge the investigative standards the police apply. Its decision that "reasonableness" ought to guide police action in this area is a proper balance between the demands of order and of liberty. Perhaps, some day, we can live in a society where crime is so small a problem that the demands of liberty can be safely elevated.

LANCASTER CLEFT-PALATE CLINIC

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Lancaster Cleft-Palate Clinic, in Lancaster, Pa., founded by Dr. H. K. Cooper in 1938, is famous throughout the world as the pioneer in the modern treatment of cleft-palate deformities. Under the direction of the founder's son, Dr. John A. Cooper, the clinic today is the best equipped and most modern of its kind in the world.

The remarkable story of this clinic and its great achievements is told in an article in the May 1968 issue of Today's Health. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NORMAL LIVES FOR "CRIPPLED MOUTH" VICTIMS
(By Jean Carper)

(NOTE.—Each year, in the United States, about 7000 babies are born with cleft palate

and "hare lip." Remarkable strides in the management of these defects now enable these infants to grow up to be completely normal in both appearance and speech.)

One out of 700 babies—7000 a year in the United States—comes into the world with a cleft lip like an open wound and a gaping chasm in the roof of the mouth. Unless corrected, those defects will condemn the child to silence or to unintelligible, garbled speech.

Cleft palate has crippled more people than cerebral palsy and polio put together. Yet, while we are fairly knowledgeable about the causes and treatment of these cripples, our understanding of cleft palate is still clouded by ignorance, superstition, and hopelessness.

For many years, the unfortunates born with "crippled mouth" were thought to be freaks of the parents' genetic strain and only partially salvageable. Perhaps all of us at one time have looked uncomfortably away from a person with "hare lip" or have been shocked when a normal-appearing person opened his mouth to emit only a nasal jumble of sounds.

Today's cleft palate babies, however, face no such dreary future as social misfits. Thanks to remarkable strides in understanding the causes of cleft palate and in treating its victims, the cleft palate baby can, with proper medical treatment, now grow up to be completely normal in appearance and speech.

The miracle of turning the congenitally deformed into normal human beings is accomplished daily at nearly 100 cleft palate clinics throughout the country. As little as 30 years ago, the usual method of treating a cleft palate victim was simply to sew up the palate and lip or turn him over to a succession of specialists at various stages in his life: to a surgeon; then, later, to a speech therapist; then to a dentist. Such efforts were uncoordinated and often were unsuccessful.

Today's cleft palate children are best treated in clinics which depend for their success on a modern team approach—coordinated, long-term treatment by many specialists working together, including plastic surgeons, pediatricians, orthodontists, prosthodontists, audiologists, speech pathologists, sociologists, psychologists, otolaryngologists, and laboratory technicians.

Harold Westlake, Ph.D., professor of communicative disorders at Northwestern University, who also is associated with the University's Cleft Palate Clinic, has this comment: "Fortunately, the team approach has been generally adopted throughout the country, and no matter where a cleft palate victim lives in this country there is somewhere—usually a clinic—within a reasonable distance where he can go for competent treatment."

(Anyone in doubt about where to take a cleft palate victim for treatment can receive information on local facilities from the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, 2023 West Ogden Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60612. Information also can be obtained through the Society's state and local affiliates, listed in phone directories as Easter Seal Societies. There are 1400 Easter Seal affiliates throughout the country.)

The team approach to rebuilding cleft palate victims was pioneered by Dr. H. K. Cooper, an orthodontist and now director emeritus of the Lancaster Cleft Palate Clinic, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Doctor Cooper founded the clinic in 1938. Today, under the direction of Doctor Cooper's son, Dr. John A. Cooper, the clinic is recognized internationally as the foremost center of knowledge on cleft palate.

Although Doctor Cooper's pioneering inspired dozens of other clinics, Lancaster is still the only clinic in this country which operates full time—five, and sometimes six, days a week. Other clinics, such as the outstanding ones at the University of Illinois, Northwestern University, the University of Florida, the University of North Carolina,

Johns Hopkins University, and New York University, are in operation part-time, one day or a few days each week.

The Lancaster Clinic now has a staff of 50. In 30 years it has treated more than 14,000 persons who have had the misfortune to be born with cleft palate.

Normally, during the sixth to eighth week of pregnancy, three wedges of tissue—two at the sides and one in front—unite to form the upper jaw and roof of the mouth. If the fusion is incomplete, cleft palates of various types result. For example, a cleft may occur only in the soft palate—the curtain of muscle tissue that you can touch with your tongue at the far back of the roof of the mouth. Or the cleft may run through both the soft palate and the hard tissue in the forward roof of the mouth, known as the hard palate. In severe cases, the three wedges may not meet at all, leaving a Y-shaped cleft palate, often accompanied by a double cleft of the lip. In any cleft abnormality, the baby may or may not have a cleft lip. Sometimes he is born with a cleft lip only and no deformity of the palate.

Although the Lancaster Clinic accepts patients of all ages, the happiest results are achieved when the patient is received as a baby and treatment can continue throughout childhood and adolescence. With the team approach, the group of specialists sees the baby as soon after birth as possible to determine the most effective treatment for the specific child and deformity.

Typical of the Lancaster Clinic's cleft palate babies is Patti, born in Pennsylvania in 1944 with a single cleft in her lip and a gaping hole the size of a silver dollar in the roof of her mouth. Her mother recalls when Patti was first placed in her arms: "I went into shock; it was horrible. I had heard of cleft palate, but didn't know what it was, and that it should happen to my child seemed impossible."

When Patti was nine weeks old, a surgeon meticulously repaired the lip. Later surgery to close the palate was unsuccessful because there was not enough tissue to form a proper palatal arch. However, without an intact palate that could completely shut off the flow of air through the nose, Patti was doomed to the nasal, wheezing, cleft palate speech. (More than three-fourths of our speech sounds depend upon the integrity of the palate for perfect enunciation.)

The only solution for Patti was an artificial palate—a removable "speech appliance." Resembling an upper plate, the appliance clamps around the teeth and stretches to the back of the mouth, making speech possible. With the help of speech therapy, Patti learned to talk—not only adequately, but admirably. Today, at 23, Patti teaches speech in a high school. The small scar on her upper lip looks as if it could have come from a childhood fall.

Other patients do not seek help at the clinic until they are older—sometimes after a series of unsuccessful operations and years of futile speech therapy. One boy, age 14, who came to the clinic a few weeks ago had undergone 19 operations on his palate and still could not talk. Another child was referred to the clinic after 10 fruitless years of speech therapy; it was discovered that he had a very short palate which was then extended by surgery. Without this operation, 100 years of speech therapy would have been useless.

Sylvia, a dark-haired beauty from New Jersey, came to the clinic at age 21, hardly able to make herself understood. She had received no previous medical attention, for her parents had been told it was hopeless. She was fitted with a speech appliance and, after only eight weeks of speech therapy, achieved nearly perfect speech. Prior to treatment, Sylvia, whose abnormality had tortured her through her formative years, was shy and able to obtain only a menial job in a factory. Today, she is an executive secretary in one of our biggest corporations.

Last year, a woman of 65 arrived at the clinic for her first treatment for cleft palate. Since reading of the clinic in a magazine article 15 years before, she had saved every spare penny for treatment, finally accumulating \$400. She and her husband drove nearly 1000 miles to offer their life savings, "if only something could be done." With the help of a speech appliance made at the clinic, she is experiencing for the first time the joy of talking and being understood. The clinic refused to accept the elderly couple's \$400.

Usually, the cost of the clinic's specialists is comparable to that of specialists in other medical fields—several thousand dollars to treat one cleft palate patient from birth to age 18. However, through special funds from individuals, organizations, and the state of Pennsylvania, the clinic treats thousands of indigent patients. "We have never turned a patient away for lack of ability to pay for treatment," declares Dr. H. K. Cooper.

Undeniably, much of the credit for progress in cleft palate treatment goes to improved surgical techniques, made possible by new and better anesthesia, suture materials, instruments, and overall medical progress. Previously, it was common in cleft lip cases simply to stitch the flaps of the cleft together in a straight line from nose to lip. The result was what we readily recognize as the repaired "hare lip"—a flat upper lip, slightly askew and lacking the cupid's bow.

Children at the Lancaster Cleft Palate Clinic attest to the fact that today's plastic surgeons can correct "hare lip" so that it is barely noticeable. The old "straight seam" approach has been replaced by the "geometric" method in which surgeons may actually draw a zig-zag design on the baby's lip to guide the suturing. Callipers are used to measure the distance from nostril to the vermillion border of the lip on both the non-cleft side and the cleft side, to be certain the points of the lip are in perfect alignment.

Dr. Robert L. Harding, plastic surgeon at the clinic, points out that another tell-tale sign of cleft lip used to be the missing cupid's bow. "In cleft lip babies, the cupid's bow is pulled up into the cleft," he says. "Today, we use our artistic sense to restore both the cupid's bow and the normal pout of the lip."

The pout—the slight upturn of the lip—which we all have, was invariably destroyed by the old-fashioned straight-line closure, giving the lip a flat, artificial look. Today's broken-line repairs lessen skin tension, preserving the pout. Modern techniques produce less scar tissue, although doctors cannot completely, erase the scar. But when the shape of the lip is normal, the small scar is quite insignificant. The operation to close a cleft lip is usually performed when the baby is two or three months old or weighs at least 10 pounds and is in good health.

A child today has astonishingly better chances of success for not only surgical repair of his lip, but also of his palate. For years, early closure of the palate—before the child was four or five—was considered inadvisable. Surgically forcing the palate together in infants sometimes caused growth disturbance in the mid-third of the face—between the bridge of the nose and the upper lip—producing far greater deformities than if the split palate had been left untouched.

As the normal growth process pulled at the bones of the upper jaw, the surgically-closed palate refused to yield, leaving the oral cavity misshapen and filled with grotesquely misplaced teeth. The upper ridge of front teeth and other bony structures sometimes collapsed so that the upper jaw sank inside the lower one. With the midpart of the face underdeveloped, even a normal jaw appeared monstrously prognathic. Youngsters who had their palates stitched as babies often resembled toothless old men or were described, as one woman put it, recalling her cruel childhood nickname, as "dishface."

To avoid such deformities, surgeons held off operations on the palate until the bone formation was well under way—at about age four or five. However, by this age, the child had begun trying to talk, making the only pathetic sounds his damaged palate allowed. Speech pathologists found it difficult to correct these early speech habits, even after the palate was repaired.

Because of surgical progress, plastic surgeons are now able to repair cleft palate in babies without the dire risk of facial malformation later—usually operating to close the palate when the child is about one year old. (Doctor Harding reports he has operated on babies as young as six months.)

Throughout the later critical stages of development, the child is carefully observed and is given supportive dental work or additional plastic surgery to prevent distortion. For example, a prosthesis is sometimes used to expand the dental arches in which the teeth are embedded, keeping them in proper shape. The newest technique is the use of bone grafts—in the alveolar ridge or the hard palate itself—to stabilize the palatal segments.

If the soft palate is still too short to permit proper speech after the initial operation, a secondary operation may be performed to lift up a strip of tissue, called a pharyngeal flap, on the back of the throat and fasten it to the soft palate. In cases where the soft palate is only fractionally short, the surgeon may inject a layer of Teflon under the tissue covering the back of the throat, pushing the throat wall forward to insure the contact with the soft palate, necessary for non-nasal speech.

Doctor Harding does not deny that "there may be some slight tendency to growth interference by early surgery in the mid-third of the face." But anyone who sees his patients—those who now are in their teens—would be unable to detect a growth deformity. Unlike the patients with the sunken faces who were operated on as infants some 40 years ago, today's youngsters appear completely normal. Only the trained eye of a doctor or specialist would be able to detect that there had been a congenital deformity.

Fortunately, there is also new hope for those whose cleft palates were repaired before the recent surgical developments. Although surgeons agree that the chances for success are always best in the first surgery—and thus the first operation is a critical one—subsequent or "secondary" operations on older patients can lessen disfigurement.

According to a recent report by three plastic surgeons of Norfolk, Virginia: "Some revision of the lip scar, a shift of tissue perhaps, or correction of an associated nose deformity can do much to decrease the disfigurement in such cases. An old palate repair may be short, scarred, and immobile or have multiple oral nasal fistulae. Many of these can be greatly helped by additional surgery using the newer techniques, resulting in an improved appearance, better speech, and overall function."

It's preferable to close the palate by surgery, but when this is impossible, speech appliances are unhesitatingly used at the clinic at an early age. Previously a youngster had to wait until he was five or six to get a speech appliance—by which time his speech and his personality might have been irreparably damaged. Today, tots of two and a half and three are being fitted with temporary speech appliances to enable them to form words correctly from the very beginning. As the child's mouth grows, he receives new temporary appliances. When fully grown, usually about age 16, he received his "adult" appliance.

Only in rare cases is the child who is given a speech appliance able to instinctively rattle off sounds and words perfectly; for the appliance does more than bridge the palatal gap. Attached to its back tip is a clear plastic bulb, about the size and shape of an unshelled pecan. Individually designed for each

wearer, this bulb helps to fill up the space that cannot be closed off by the soft palate.

In normal speech, the uvula and soft palate press against the throat wall in rapid, bent-knee fashion, closing off unwanted nasal sounds. There must be a complete seal between the uvula and the back of the throat wall or a stream of air will escape through the nose, producing a wheezy accompaniment to every word. Thus, youngsters must learn to grip the bulb with their throat muscles, cutting off the air stream. Speech therapy is usually required to learn the correct degree of muscle contraction required to achieve various sounds.

There is no doubt that the appliance affords perfect speech. One little girl, age 11, slipped out her appliance to recite the 23rd Psalm—which contains the difficult *s* and *sh* sounds—with the characteristic wheeze: "Whnthe huhLord whis mmy huhshp-whherd . . ." She then replaced the appliance and repeated the words with impeccable diction.

A young woman who was recently hired as a long distance operator called to tell Doctor Cooper the news. "I really fooled them, didn't I, Doc?" she asked. "Without her appliance, she can't talk at all," explained Doctor Cooper.

In the last few years, the clinic has also been making an increasing number of speech prostheses for people whose palates have been destroyed by cancer. "These men and women have cleft palate too, even if they weren't born with it," says Doctor Cooper. "And losing their speech can be a terrifying experience. They need help learning to talk again, too."

When a baby is born with cleft palate, the first step is to treat the mother—who often becomes hysterical and may reject the child. Dr. Veronica Tisza of the Cleft Palate Institute of Tufts University describes the common reaction of mothers who give birth to cleft palate children: "Mothers react with strong feelings of hurt, disappointment, and helpless resentment to the revelation that they have a congenitally deformed child. They are in a state of acute grief because they have lost the perfect baby nurtured in their imagination and received instead a damaged child which they regard as a symbol of their own inadequacy as mothers."

A primary worry is that a child who is physically deficient is also mentally deficient—a fear that is unfounded. Parents of a cleft palate baby often blame each other for "defective genes." More than one husband, unwilling to accept any responsibility, has denied that the baby is his. In cases where the marriage is already unstable, divorce is not an uncommon consequence of the birth of a cleft palate baby.

The first agonizing question for any parent of a cleft palate child is: "What caused it?" In a study of cleft palate families now underway at the Lancaster Clinic, parents of cleft palate children were asked what they thought caused their child's deformity. Amazingly, several said, "punishment for sin."

A little more than 20 years ago, it was believed that cleft palate, like other congenital anomalies, was 100 percent hereditary. That figure has gradually been shaved down through the years, until research now shows that only 10 to 15 percent of all cleft palate births can be genetically traced. Eighty-five to 90 percent—nine out of 10 cleft palate cases—are linked to injury of the fetus during the critical six-to-eight-week development period. Through collection of data on humans and experiments which produce cleft palate in animals—dogs, chickens, mice, pigs—it has been determined that any number of chemicals can derange the enzyme systems, producing the deformity. "There must be thousands of substances that could cause cleft palate in animals," reports Dr. David Coursin, chief of research at Lancaster

Clinic. "In humans," he says, "there are many factors that can cause it: x-rays, hormone shots, lack of oxygen to the baby being carried. It's possible, we know from animal experiments, that it could be caused by some dietary deficiency, by injury, the stress of pregnancy, and by many different drugs one might take, for example, cortisone and even aspirin in excess."

To cause deformity, the incident must occur during the six to eight weeks that the palate is forming; at this early stage, few women even realize they are pregnant. Doctor Coursin believes, therefore, that the ultimate prevention of cleft palate lies with basic research. Under a \$3.5-million grant from the National Institutes of Health, the largest ever given for such research, the Lancaster Clinic is attempting to unlock the secret of molecular action that causes the abnormal cell growth.

Although the large infusion of research money has expanded Lancaster Clinic's research facilities and projects, the clinic has been discovering and pioneering new methods of handling cleft palate since its inception. It is no idle claim that the clinic is the best equipped of its kind in the world. Not only does the staff have access to the usual tape recorders and x-ray machines, they also have such sophisticated equipment as an "oral manometer," which measures and compares the amount of air expelled through the nose and the mouth when a person speaks; and a "sound spectrograph," which converts the patient's voice into a picture, called a sonogram, enabling him to see the wrong sounds he produces.

A cleft palate victim is often unable to hear his own mistakes, for his way of speaking sounds normal to him and the normal method sounds abnormal. Black streaks on the sonogram depict the normal way of saying, "Bessie came and stayed all summer"—a sentence chosen for its difficulty of *s* sounds. Then the machine records a picture of the patient's rendition of the same sentence. Eventually, through imitation, the patient learns to talk so that his speech picture is nearly identical to the model on the sonogram. Nor is every youngster taught pure Pennsylvania! Local dialects are preserved. If, for example, a boy comes from the South, the speech therapist uses a sonogram with a picture of what is considered a "normal" Southern accent.

Most remarkable of all the clinic's equipment is the cineradiographic apparatus—essentially a 16-mm. motion picture camera and sound system—that takes x-ray motion pictures. To guard against excessive radiation, the camera photographs not the person directly, but the x-ray image on a special tube which intensifies the light 3600 times. Previously, doctors could observe the vocal process only in fixed position by x-ray. Now, they are able to see it actually functioning—an invaluable aid in diagnosis and treatment—as they observe the movement of the patient's tongue, throat muscles, palate, and total oral mechanism as he speaks, swallows, breathes.

Through the use of x-ray motion pictures, the clinic staff recently solved a mystery that has long plagued speech therapists. The doctors studied a whole new group of cleft palate sufferers—those who have cleft palate speech although a visual examination of the palate shows no sign of a cleft. It was widely believed—and still is by many—that these youngsters had no physical deformity, but were simply lazy, sloppy talkers who could be cured by speech therapy. "We used to take one look at their palate, find it normal, and let them go," says Doctor Harding.

X-ray motion pictures revealed that these puzzling speakers did indeed have a deformity, now called "velopharyngeal inadequacy." Although their palate is intact, it is partially paralyzed or is too short to make necessary contact with the throat wall during

speech. Consequently, air squeezes between the opening and out the nose when they talk, producing the familiar cleft palate sounds. Often, this deformity is not noticeable until after the adenoids and tonsils are removed. Their absence creates an even bigger gap between the soft palate and the throat wall, worsening the nasality.

Doctors at Lancaster have found that in some of these cases speech therapy alone is successful; in others, the palatal muscles need to be strengthened by massage and exercise. Quite often surgery is required to lengthen the soft palate or to raise a pharyngeal flap on the back of the throat. It is certain that there must be thousands of these undetected victims throughout the country. "We have seen more of these youngsters and discovered more about this problem in the last eight years than we learned during the previous 30," commented Doctor Harding.

Years ago, Doctor Cooper tacked on the wall of the clinic this prayer: "Give me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; the courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference." During 30 years of single-minded determination to save cleft palate victims, Doctor Cooper, his staff, and those at other clinics have changed many things, including the very concept of what is possible and impossible in transforming "hopeless" cripples into normal human beings.

TELLING ALL TO A FACELESS AGENCY

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, every 10 years the Federal Government conducts a census of the population of the United States. The justification for this is found in article I of the Constitution. The purpose is to determine the apportionment of the seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. Title 13 of the United States Code empowers the Secretary of Commerce to take the census and ask anything deemed "necessary and proper" of the citizens of the United States.

The 1970 census will contain over 120 questions. All compulsory, many intruding on personal privacy. These questions will include such matters as income, dollar by dollar, from all sources including public assistance, alimony, unemployment and disability insurance, pensions and investment; value of property and amount of rent paid; educational, marital, employment and military history; and with whom bathroom and kitchen facilities are shared. Those who refuse to answer the questions face a 60-day jail sentence and a fine of \$100.

Mr. Speaker, today I join Representative JACKSON BETTS in protesting the inclusion of such questions among those answered by individuals on a mandatory basis. The constitutional purpose of the census is to count people. The gathering of a hundred other facts about them is only a secondary objective. With the 1960 census failing to count an estimated 5.7 million people, it can only be expected that the 1970 census will be even less accurate unless the forms are simplified.

The bill that I introduce today will simplify the 1970 census and keep it

within the bounds of its constitutional objectives. Mandatory questions would be limited to name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, race or color, marital status, and visitors in home at time of census. The response to other questions, not essential to the basic enumeration of population, but deemed useful to Government agencies, might be made on a second form on a voluntary basis, or in some manner that will protect the privacy of the individual. I see no justification for the mandatory requirement that forces citizens to provide such personal information about themselves and their households.

At this point, I enter into the RECORD an editorial from the June 4, 1968, Wall Street Journal which points out quite clearly the necessity for the Congress to act on this matter:

TELLING ALL TO A FACELESS AGENCY

Unless Rep. Jackson Betts of Ohio is successful, you may find yourself faced with a maximum of a \$100 fine or 60 days in jail if you refuse to answer more than 100 nosy questions planned for the 1970 census.

As it stands now, the census will contain about 120 questions a citizen must answer, or else. It will be mandatory for each person to provide such information as his income, dollar by dollar, from all sources—including public assistance, alimony, unemployment and disability insurance, pensions and investments.

He must also put down the value of his property or the amount of rent he pays; educational, marital, employment and military history; with whom he shares bathroom and kitchen facilities. And he must take a complete list of household items including dishwashers, television sets, radios, automobiles and second home, if any.

Now, as Rep. Betts observes, the Constitutional purpose of the census is to count people, and he argues that a good deal of information the Census Bureau seeks to pry from citizens in 1970 properly is a matter for either annual sample surveys or for private research organizations.

Last fall he introduced a bill to limit the mandatory questions to seven—name and address; relationship to head of household; sex; date of birth; race or color; marital status, and visitors in home at time of the census. In House and Senate, 28 members are now sponsoring bills to remove the penalty provision from all but those seven items.

To be sure, some people with plenty of time on their hands and who do not regard intimate questions about their incomes or plumbing as an invasion of their privacy, would be happy to answer all 120-odd questions, whether they are mandatory or not.

For those who view so probing and massive a questionnaire as harassing, Rep. Betts sensibly proposes that the Census Bureau, while limiting its mandatory questions to seven, include a separate form marked "voluntary" containing the remaining questions. Thus a citizen could answer these or not, as he chose, without penalty.

But unless Congress acts soon, before you know it 1970—and the insulting demands of a faceless agency—will be here.

WIN FIRST—THEN NEGOTIATE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 4 issue of the State, a newspaper of

Columbia, S.C., carries an editorial entitled "Time To Retaliate."

The editor points out how the President's reduction in bombing has created a kind of sanctuary in North Vietnam. On the other hand, the recent attacks against South Vietnamese civilians by the Communists are evidence that there is no such sanctuary south of the 17th parallel.

The editor argues that while our negotiations continue in Paris, the Communists are taking a bloody toll through their aggression against South Vietnamese cities and our Armed Forces. The time has come, he says, for us to demonstrate that there is no doubt about our ability to bring North Vietnam to its knees, and he asks the question:

Are the lives of the South Vietnamese less valuable than those of the North?

He urges that the President permit our military forces to win the war first, and then negotiate the terms of settlement.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this thoughtful editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD.

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

TIME TO RETALIATE

While diplomats tip-toe through the niceties of "negotiation" in Paris, bloody Communist aggression continues to take a heavy toll of military and civilians in South Vietnam.

While Uncle Sam (Uncle Sucker) holds off bombing all but a small area of North Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh dispatches thousands of regular troops and abundant supplies across the border into South Vietnam.

While timorous Americans bleat of our allegedly unwarranted presence in Vietnam, hundreds upon hundreds of young men give their lives in that remote land in order to thwart the spread of Communism and sustain the validity of American commitments to our allies—not only in Southeast Asia but throughout the world.

But perhaps more to the immediate point than any other of the amazing inconsistencies of this war is the continuing and accelerating slaughter of South Vietnamese civilians by the Communists—whether Viet Cong guerrillas or North Vietnamese regulars. Having enlisted sympathy for the plight of North Vietnamese who may have been killed, injured, or threatened by American bombing raids, the Communists are absolutely ruthless in dispensing death and destruction to the civilians of South Vietnam.

But where are the full-page ads denouncing such rank terrorism? How many "peace" rallies are held to urge Ho Chi Minh to call off his butchers? Who are the politicians, the preachers, and the public agitators who are concerned about the preservation of the South Vietnamese against a merciless enemy which has invaded their land.

War analysts who recall the days preceding the French debacle at Dien Bien Phu and France's subsequent withdrawal from Indo-China say that the current onslaughts against the villages, towns, and cities of South Vietnam are aimed at bolstering Communist strength at the conference table.

The United States is caught up in the idiotic business of trying to fight a war on the enemy's terms, on terrain of the enemy's choosing, under restraints to the enemy's liking. The continued sacrifice of life, liberty, and property to the Communist invaders of South Vietnam is both culpable and criminal.

We are in a war. Let us WIN THE WAR and then negotiate the terms of settlement.

If this be true, and if marital ferocity be the measure of influence in negotiations, let us have a fling at it.

Let the Johnson administration cease the temporizing which resulted from domestic politics and foreign propaganda. Let the full force of American military might—on land, sea, and air—be unleashed against North Vietnam for just one week, or just one day, to show Ho Chi Minh and the world at large exactly what could be done if the United States decided to WIN the war.

There would be howls of anguish from a devastated North Vietnam, cries of horror from pacifists and peaceniks in this and other countries, and outraged denunciations from Soviet Russia and other nations of the Communist bloc.

But there should be no lingering doubts about our ability to bring North Vietnam to its knees in short order. Civilians would die, but civilians are dying now by the hundreds in South Vietnam. Are their lives less valuable than those of Ho Chi Minh's Communist followers in North Vietnam?

RISKY WAY TO STIMULATE TRADE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial from the Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Star, dated June 11, 1968, entitled "Risky Way To Stimulate Trade."

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

RISKY WAY TO STIMULATE TRADE

It may seem odd for Virginia's Senator Harry Byrd to oppose a bill to increase U.S. exports, which are so very important to the maritime state he represents. But it isn't odd at all, considering the nature of the particular measure before the Senate.

The plan is to liberalize the lending conditions under which the Export-Import Bank operates. The bank would be authorized to use up to \$500,000,000 to finance export transactions which could not otherwise be financed. That is to back deals which other lenders do not consider safe.

The idea is to build up the over-all export traffic, which has been low enough recently to threaten the nation's balance of trade. A larger margin of exports over imports, so the arguments go, would be healthy for the economy and would improve the dangerous balance of payments situation.

On the surface, this would also appear to be good for Virginia and its ports here at Hampton Roads. Most general trade increases offer the prospect of boosting these communities' economies.

However, there is something much larger at stake here, and Senator Byrd has put his finger on it. The loans to be authorized by easing the bank's present requirements of "reasonable assurance of repayment" would be very shaky lending ventures. Why, asks the Virginia Senator, should the bank's money "be diverted to marginal transactions which carry with them a high risk of default?" And when the money is not repaid, this, in actuality, "would adversely affect our balance of payments," the very opposite of the proclaimed objective.

The Export-Import Bank, an operation which has so far kept healthily in the black, is not a foreign aid agency set up to ship things abroad regardless of whether the transactions are sound business or not.

Neither was it meant to be another sink-hole for the taxpayers' dollars which, since the Treasury would pick up the tab for all unpaid loans beyond \$100,000,000, is exactly what it could become.

A STRANGE ATTITUDE AT RESURRECTION CITY

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, of all the many words that have been written and spoken about the Poor People's Campaign, both pro and con, none is quite so telling as those that appeared in a news story in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, June 10. The article, entitled "Plumber Gets No Aid From Poor He Helps," by Chris Wright, tells of the efforts of a well-meaning volunteer to assist the residents of Resurrection City and their refusal to do any work to help him help them. It has been variously suggested that the plight of many of the poor people now camping out in Washington could be remedied by a simple act, that of going to work. This article would indicate that this is one of the last things some Resurrection City campaigners want to do. The article follows:

PLUMBER GETS NO AID FROM POOR HE HELPS (By Chris Wright)

James H. Clark stood shoulder-deep in the freshly dug trench, sighting down the line of black sewer pipe he had just laid between two rows of Resurrection City's plywood shacks.

Clark is not a resident of the poor people's encampment. He is a licensed plumber with his own business in Washington.

Yesterday he was at Resurrection City laying a sewer line so the showers would have drains and not create a quagmire. He was doing the work free, and asked the encampment officials about the possibility of help.

Periodically the public address system would ask for volunteers—for an unspecified task. Clark would look up once in a while, shrug his shoulders and bend back down into the trench.

No volunteers came.

"These people don't want to work," he said.

When the motor of the earth-mover idled, transistor radios could be heard inside nearby shelters. From time to time a group of men would gather around the ditch and watch Clark work.

Once Clark looked directly at a big man who seemed to be a leader and asked him to get some help and begin filling the trench behind them.

The man looked surprised. "Brother, I came down here to get away from shovels," was the reply.

By late afternoon the line was about halfway to the showers. Someone obtained a second earth-moving machine but only began to haphazardly fill the trench. He soon went away.

As Clark worked, he said he has very little use for the Poor People's Campaign, personally. But he feels sorry for the people in the camp—and he likes to see a job, especially one done by Negroes, done right.

HELPED BY COUSIN

"I sure would like to regrade that last section," he said, apologizing for his use of rocks instead of brick to support the pipes.

The afternoon sun beat down. He walked off down the trench carrying his red level.

Clark, of 431 10th St. NE, donated his time for the project. He also got his cousin to help, and guaranteed payment for earth-moving machinery, that was supposed to be rented out of campaign funds.

He got started on the pipe-laying on Saturday after a friend called him and disclosed that the tent city was in trouble because of its nonexistent sewer system.

No stranger to weekend work—"You can drive down the street and see people sitting on their porches, but I usually find something to do"—he got organized and was digging before the city's residents seemed to realize he was there.

As the day went on his pipeline progressed steadily through the hot, sun-baked clay toward the plywood shower stalls in the center of the camp.

Clark and his helper ignored camp residents who jumped the trench, kicking dirt where they were working.

RAIN FILLS TRENCH

As huge thunderclouds began to blot out the sun at about 6 p.m., Clark looked anxiously at his handiwork and the mostly unfilled trench.

A few big drops fell, making dark spots on his green denim shirt.

"I'm a damn fool," he threw down the shovel in his hand.

"But I've been one—brought up that way." He picked up the shovel and finished bracing the pipe joint.

The rain clouds got darker. "The least they could do is fill up this hole."

He jumped out of the ditch. "Take this shovel and put it in our truck," he told his cousin. "I'm going to do something about this."

Clark strode off between the plywood houses. His cousin disappeared in the other direction.

Time passed. The rain began to fall in sheets across the camp.

The hole began to fill with water. The loosely piled earth on the sides turned to runny mud.

At the other end of the camp three men in yellow rain slickers experimented with one of the earth-moving machines. They didn't know who Clark was.

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR ROBERTO SÁNCHEZ-VILELLA

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, most Puerto Rican people have known poverty at some time during their life and many of them during their entire lives.

It is natural, then, that Puerto Ricans in New York City and surrounding areas with relatively easy access to Washington would want to give a visible endorsement of the Poor People's Campaign. They have coordinated their efforts and will travel to Washington for a single day visit, about 5,000 of them, in an entourage of buses next Saturday, June 15. In a series of activities near and at the Lincoln Memorial, they plan peaceful manifestations of their purpose to call attention to poverty amongst Puerto Ricans.

Puerto Rican people, by their nature, abhor violence, and extreme precaution has been taken to insure that there will

be no violence in connection with the visit to Washington. Consequently, it may be expected that the manifestations of this group to call attention to the poverty plight of Puerto Ricans will be peaceful.

In this connection I include a statement made in New York City on June 2, 1968, by the Honorable Roberto Sánchez-Vilella, Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR ROBERTO SÁNCHEZ VILELLA

Some questions have arisen regarding the exact relationship of the Puerto Rican Government to the plans of some Puerto Rican groups in the United States to participate in the Poor Peoples March on Washington. It should, parenthetically, be made clear that the Puerto Rican involvement in the March, while partaking of the general movement, would be a separate undertaking.

The Puerto Rican Government believes in the constitutional prerogative of all people to assemble peacefully and petition for redress of grievances. It has, for decades, waged its own war against poverty with success, and will continue to do so. Moreover, it holds in great esteem the nonviolent ideals of Dr. Martin Luther King, the originator of the Poor Peoples March.

It cannot, however, officially participate in any of the activities of the March and neither can any officers of this government, acting in their official capacity.

TOMATO HARVEST CHANGES DEMONSTRATE HOW SCIENCE AIDS FARMER, CONSUMER

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, truly amazing progress is being made in agriculture to meet the ever-increasing problem of obtaining sufficient labor to harvest crops and at the same time reduce the Nation's food bills.

This has come about through the development of new harvesting machines and machine-tolerant crop varieties.

The California tomato industry offers a good example of how engineering and plant-breeding skills can be blended to advantage. Scientists began working on a mechanical tomato harvester about 25 years ago. Focal point of the endeavor was the University of California's Davis campus. It was obvious at the outset, however, that no ordinary tomato would withstand machine handling. So, at the same time, work began on development of a tomato to fit the machine.

By the early 1960's, scientists had the tomato they wanted: a firm, oblong fruit that resisted bruising. Mr. G. C. Hanna, an olericulturist at the university's agricultural college, is credited with perfecting the new strain now planted in most California tomato fields. Simultaneously, engineers were also putting the finishing touches on their mechanical picker, a device that picks up tomato vines, strips off the fruit, and leaves the debris behind.

In 1965, about a fourth of California's processing tomatoes—24.7 percent—were picked by machine. In 1966 the amount climbed to 65.8 percent and in 1967 it was 81.8 percent. The cost of mechanical

harvesting runs about \$10 per ton, compared to \$17 for handpicking.

These developments were of particular importance to the 15th Congressional District covering San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, which I represent. Traditionally, San Joaquin County has produced about 25 percent of the State's total acreage of processing tomatoes and Stanislaus County about 5 percent. California's total production consistently has been 60 to 65 percent of the Nation's entire output.

Only a few years ago, it was necessary to bring in tens of thousands of farmworkers from Mexico to augment the work force of harvest hands recruited from States west of the Mississippi. Last year the total number of supplemental workers from Mexico was only 6,175 and would have been less if bad weather had not prevented planting the crop in intervals to enable maximum usage of machines.

Because hand labor is scarce, growers of most handpicked crops are calling for mechanization, and scientists in the USDA's Agricultural Research Service are trying to meet the demand. Beans, peas, cucumbers and potatoes are among vegetables that are being bred for machine-proof qualities at various locations throughout the country. Mechanical harvesters for all these crops are either in use or in the development stage.

In the orchards, progress in mechanical harvesting has been equally dramatic. Throughout the fruitgrowing regions of the country, new and sometimes weird-looking reapers are coming into use. Here are a few examples of what is being done to speed harvest of some of the more important fruit crops:

CITRUS

A machine has been tested that shakes oranges and grapefruit from trees, catches the fruit, and conveys it to baskets. Another machine, available commercially, is the power ladder; it utilizes hand labor, but more efficiently than ever before. This machine is a tri-cycle-type vehicle with a fixed boom. The worker rides on a platform that moves up and down on the boom; he regulates the vehicle with his feet and has both hands free for picking.

APPLES

Engineers have designed a tractor-pulled vehicle for the picker to ride on. The picked apples are dropped into conveyor systems and carried to boxes without danger of bruising. Picking efficiency was increased 25 percent with the machine. Also, it enables women to do the work.

BLUEBERRIES

A machine is being tested that would enable a worker to triple his picking capacity. The machine has two spindles mounted vertically, each with 160 rubber fingers. As the machine travels along the row, the revolving spindles move through the bushes. Mature blueberries are shaken off the plants and are caught in wooden boxes at the base of the machine.

CHERRIES

Shaker-type mechanical harvesters have proven quite successful and are being used by an increasing number of

growers. About 50 million pounds of cherries are harvested annually by machine.

DATES

"Date towers" have been built, featuring catwalks that can be raised the 30 to 50 feet necessary to reach the tops of date-bearing palms. Dates can be harvested in bunches by pickers on the catwalks. Most of the California date crop is now harvested this way.

Most of the improvements in fruit harvesting have been brought about through mechanical genius. However, other lines of attack are being pursued. One ARS researcher, for example, has had some success at making oranges drop from trees by spraying the trees with ascorbic acid. And scientists in Washington are experimenting with a growth retardant that delays maturity of apples and would permit growers in labor-short areas to harvest over a longer period of time.

As the consumer population grows and the food-producing work force diminishes, harvesting researchers will provide valuable tools to help insure a steady flow of products from field to market.

THE POWER OF THE PEN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, James L. Knight, a newsman, recently addressed a group of his fellow publishers in New Orleans.

His speech is illustrative of the concern and discontent prevalent among our people today.

The American people are due some answers in plain straight talk. They no longer accept more assurances and see through the hocus pocus of intellectual jargon. Their paycheck deductions and a dollar that continues to buy less and less is genuine education that something is wrong.

I know of no one better qualified than Mr. Knight and his fellow publishers to bring to the American people the answers they are entitled to receive—merely the facts.

And all the newsmen need only start writing their own stories for exchange through their associations. They will be surprised to find that a ready-made distribution system awaits the power in their pen. Two hundred million tongues can overcome any controlled communications system.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Knight's speech:

TALK BY JAMES L. KNIGHT TO PUBLISHERS RECENTLY IN NEW ORLEANS

A song called "Give Me Some Old-Time Religion" may represent what is needed in the U.S. more than any other single factor.

I'm certain that most of us here today are just plain shook-up when we try to comprehend the things that go on around us. Neither do we understand the attitudes of our public officials.

In all segments of our daily life we see things that cause us to draw back in sheer disbelief.

Is there anyone in this room for instance,

who wouldn't blow his cool should he learn that his at-school daughter was shackled up with a fellow? Parental displeasure in this famous case, I thought, didn't reflect much concern. Nor did the Barnard College official family when they adopted a policy determined by a Judicial Council—which is a group of students and professors!

Linda, you may recall, had some pretty modern ideas of an ideal relationship with her boy friend. For her expressions and ideals, the power structure of the school set down a rock hard ruling that this young lady should be denied cafeteria privileges for a couple of weeks!

Weren't you baffled a bit when a group of young anarchists took control of five buildings in the Columbia University complex? School officials did nothing to throw the bums out while they watched these toughs desecrate the school. At Northwestern University you witnessed a group of Negroes command the school to agree to provide them with "segregated housing." Imagine a group of white students demanding and imagine them receiving approval of "segregated housing."

Let's take a look at our national image. Do you recall the famous deal that the U.S. made with Castro? We paid over a billion in ransom to effect the release of 1500 Cubans from their own country.

Recently we watched another of our national images smashed when the Pueblo surrendered without a struggle to a bunch of Koreans who mounted their attack from small patrol craft. Wonder what sort of twirling goes on in the graves of our great naval heroes—Perry, Farragut, John Paul Jones.

Are there any in this room today who got much comfort out of LBJ's several recent attempts to deny the American people knowledge of facts concerning our foreign commitments?

Quite a few here had an opportunity to see and hear, at the AP meeting in New York, Horst Faas and Peter Arnett describe conditions in Vietnam. They brutally portrayed the bloody sickening mess that exists in that nightmare spot, 500,000 good U.S. service men were still being pushed around by small bodies of dedicated Viet Cong. While this went on the so-called government of Vietnam was making off with untold millions of U.S. supplies and money.

Horrible as was the picture of the Vietnam situation, it sort of paled in comparison to the mealy mouthings of Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, who, during a luncheon session, assured each and every one of us that things were going just fine over there.

We are now advised that arrangements are being made to effect the release of the Pueblo crewmen—and that President Peterson of Barnard announced last Thursday that Linda LeClair would be allowed to continue as a student in school. As a footnote—may I observe that President Peterson made the announcement after a sit-in by 35 Barnard students who presented petitions from the student body. Whatever you think of President Peterson is your business—maybe you agree—but I'm troubled that Mr. and Mrs. LeClair haven't made some simple little move of their own with respect to their daughter's attitude.

These executive clinics have served our industry very well over the years. We have a better relationship within the newspaper ranks—and with particular emphasis in the South. There are few—if any—southern publishing plants that couldn't continue functioning if the publisher would do so.

Surely most of you realize that while I may appear here as a dragon slayer—you need but to look a bit to the North and you observe our Detroit Free Press has been shut down a little over 6 months. Let me expand that and say that during the last five years the Detroit newspapers have been shut down more than one full year out of the last five.

What's the answer to this problem? I must confess that I don't know. Sometimes I think

that maybe if I had been in Detroit, I'd be inclined to try to publish. Well—I'm not there—and we have a competent staff there—so I shall refrain from second guessing.

We all have feelings about governmental, sociological and business problems. I think we all instinctively feel that something is wrong in labor matters. Government rules almost universally favor the unions—but this does not create peace. We watch the railroad unions, the airline unions, the telephone unions, the steel unions, the rubber unions and dozens of others strike nationwide to stop commerce.

No one seems to get excited about the mess—those of who experience a moment of inconvenience sputter a little, but that's about the extent of complaining.

From where I sit there are a couple of things that give me a feeling of dread and insecurity—can it be possible that, in our haste to make a few bucks so we can dash off to the country club for a martini and a round of golf, we are completely oblivious and blinded to realities? Are we so sure that our democratic processes are impervious to erosion that we fail to keep a watch at the gate? Do we dismiss these college rumbles as a thing of the time? Are these "Poor Marches" spontaneous? Are the efforts of the Department of Justice completely innocent of destructive motivation? Are the lies handed out about our international relationships caused by stupidity, or is there something more sinister? Is there any fairness to the American society which approves Negroes demanding and getting segregated quarters when his white brother is denied the same? Is there any reason to be suspicious about a government that permits the dollar to be weakened at a time when fiscal discipline should be hard?

Is it a coincidence that the Reardon report should make its appearance and rule that the courts should deny reporters from commenting on their actions? Is it only a happenstance that the people of this land are denied the truth about our military progress overseas? Never has a nation needed discipline, social, fiscal and governmental more than at this moment—and never have we had so little!

I am reminded of the following quotation of Lenin from John Stormer's book "The Death of a Nation."

"First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall into our hands like an overripe fruit."

The Communists, you recall, have stated that the conquest of the United States would be achieved by the elimination of religion, the destruction of the family unit and a lack of national fiscal discipline. There are several other elements that they expected to cause unrest. If these are really the agents of our destruction—then let us recognize that we are pretty far down the road.

I conclude by praying that, God willing, we may return to this meeting next year under circumstances that are obviously improved. That we try a little more flag waving and that we have a lot less synthetic mourning for a non synthetic trouble maker. That we obtain some leaders who know the truth and use it.

WHAT CAN WE DO IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, serious students of the history and problems of the Panama Canal understand the interac-

tion between that interocean artery with the other great strategic waterway, the Suez Canal. Significant happenings at one make their impact on the other.

The maintenance, operation, sanitation, protection, and defense of these two vital channels of commerce since World War I have emphasized the necessity for both to be controlled by great powers. Only in that way can they be administered on terms of equality for all nations, with tolls that are just and equitable. At the Panama Canal today, it is being efficiently operated on these principles; at the Suez Canal, it has been blocked by Egypt since the Arab-Israeli war of June 1967, dislocating world trade between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, encouraging the construction of super-vessels designed to avoid Suez transits throughout the indefinite future, and emphasizing the strategic importance of southern Africa for the defense of Western civilization.

As regards the Suez Canal, the entire region of the Red Sea is geographically significant. Nations have fought for its control over many centuries and the present situation there is one of the gravest peril.

It was, therefore, with the highest interest that I read a most illuminating recent article on the major geopolitical questions involved by Sir John Bagot Glubb, former commander of Jordan's Arab Legion and renowned authority on the Middle Near Eastern area. In dealing with his subject, he shows the disciplined thinking and insight of the able professional military officer.

Because of the value of Sir John's article as regards the Suez Canal area and its implications for the Panama Canal, I include its full text and commend it for reading by all Members of Congress and others concerned with foreign policy questions:

[From *American Mercury*, summer 1968]

WHAT CAN WE DO IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

(By Lt. Gen. Sir John Glubb, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., O.B.E., M.C.)

(NOTE.—Lt. Gen. Sir John Bagot Glubb, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., O.B.E., M.C., is the father of Jordan's Arab Legion, which he commanded from 1939 to 1956. His experience in the Middle East began in 1926, and he is internationally recognized as a foremost authority on this area. Glubb has authored books on the Mideast and, since his retirement, has travelled and lectured extensively.)

The Arab-Israeli confrontation may be considered from two viewpoints—that of world balance of power, especially between the United States and Russia, and that of a local struggle between Israel and her neighbors. We will commence with the first aspect of the problem.

Egypt occupies a position almost exactly in the center of the three continents of Europe, Asia and Africa, if we omit China, which has always gone her own way. Throughout the five thousand years of recorded history, the greatest empire at any given period has always held Egypt. The reasons for the immense importance of Egypt in the world balance of power are:

(1) The wealthy trade route from India, Africa, Indonesia, China and Australia to Western Europe, passes through Egypt. Thus, any great power in control of Egypt has the economy of Western Europe at its mercy.

(2) A great power firmly established in Egypt can move into Africa, Asia or Europe as it feels inclined and conversely, can prevent its enemies from moving from one con-

continent to another. Egypt has been rightly called "the crossroads of the old world."

Moreover, such movement does not only mean the movement of armed forces in war, but also the spread of propaganda and political influence in peace. Egypt is the ideal base for the extension of political influence into Asia and Africa.

WESTERN INFLUENCE GONE

Twenty years ago, the whole of the Middle East including Egypt was completely associated with the West—the United States, France and Britain. Today the majority of these countries are, to a varying degree, associated with the Soviet government. The influence of the United States and Britain has almost disappeared from this, perhaps the most important strategic area in the world.

Take another example. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was built in order to resist the spread of Russian influence over Europe. The southerly members of NATO include Italy, Greece and Turkey. All three of these countries are surrounded on three sides by sea. When NATO was formed, the Mediterranean was an Anglo-American lake, and the Western Allies were perfectly capable of guarding the shores of Italy, Greece and Turkey. Now Russia has, in the Mediterranean, as many warships as the United States and the position of the southern NATO states is precarious.

NEW SOVIET BASES

Moreover, since June 1967, the Soviet fleet enjoys the use of many of the naval bases and airfields in Arab countries built by Britain and France to defend these countries. Not only so, but the Russians did not seize all the bases and installations by force. On the contrary, Egypt and Syria, out of fear of Israel, have welcomed the Russians as their defenders against Israel and (as they believe) against her sponsor, the United States. These developments have brought about a major change in the world balance of power in favor of the Soviets, of which we have by no means yet seen the full results.

No sooner did the British evacuate Aden than the Russians invited the Republic of South Yemen to send a delegation to Moscow. British aid was quickly replaced by Soviet aid in South Arabia.

At the moment the Suez Canal is blocked by the presence of the Israelis on the East bank, but as soon as it is re-opened we may expect to see Russian warships in Aden and in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, where lie the world's richest oil deposits, most of them at present being exploited by American oil companies.

Sea power is the key to world power and Soviet fleets are rapidly expanding into the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. When the British Empire fleet began to decline, it was assumed that the United States would replace it. Now the Russians seem to be more and more taking over the position once occupied by Britain. One of the most alarming aspects of the present situation is the speed with which Soviet influence has been advancing since June 1967.

SOVIETS STIR UP CONFLICT

There appears now to be no doubt that the "Six-Day War" was contrived by the Russians, who "warned" Egypt of an intended Israeli attack on Syria. Arabs and Israelis alike have since investigated this report and both sides agree that it was fictitious. The only conclusion seems to be that the Soviet government invented this alarm in order to start trouble.

For two hundred years the Russians have fought war after war in order to break through into the Mediterranean, but they have always been foiled by the powers of Western Europe who had no desire to see a Russian fleet off the shores of southern Europe and controlling the trade route through Egypt.

Three years ago, a prominent German diplomat expressed the opinion that Germany

had lost both World Wars because she had failed to seize Egypt. "But mark my words," he added, "Russia is not going to make the same mistake. She has her eye on Egypt all right."

In the summer of 1967, with the United States bogged down in Vietnam, Russia saw her chance. Her secret report to President Nasser set her plans moving. The Egyptian army crossed the Suez Canal to "threaten" Israel and thereby prevent her "attacking" Syria.

ARABS ARE WEAK

Every professional officer who had served in the Middle East knew that Egypt could not possibly defeat Israel. The Arabs themselves were aware of the fact and had agreed to avoid a clash with Israel. Presumably Nasser was bluffing or was relying on the active support of Russia, for he did not even inform the other Arab countries what he was going to do. Only Russia seems to have known and sent her warships through the Bosphorus to "support" him.

The Russian plan was in two phases:

(1) Phase one was to make the United States come out openly in support of Israel. This was essential to the Soviet plan, as it would sever relations between the Arabs and the United States and make it impossible for America to assume the role of the neutral mediator who might stop the war. The United States innocently fell into the trap, followed by Britain.

(2) Phase two of the Soviet plan was to get the Egyptians defeated and helpless. This the Israelis accomplished and appeared on the banks of the Suez Canal, just as the Russian fleet arrived in Alexandria and Port Said, where it was hailed as the savior of Egypt.

RUSSIANS MOVE IN

With the Egyptian army disorganized and demoralized, the Israelis on the Suez Canal and the United States believed to be the ally of Israel, there could only be one outcome. The Russians took charge of the defense of Egypt. Russian officers took over the command and reorganization of the Egyptian army. Russian warships lay in the former British naval bases of Alexandria and Port Said.

Like all great plans, the Soviet plan was quite simple. It all went off with exemplary smoothness and before anyone in the West knew what was happening, the world balance of power had swung across in favor of the Soviets. Not a single Russian had been killed or wounded or indeed had fired a shot. Russia had achieved her two-hundred-year-old objective.

ARAB AND ISRAELI INTERESTS

I do not propose to discuss the rights and wrongs of the Arab-Israeli conflict. My intention is to be entirely practical and objective. If any "interests" are considered, they will be in the interests of the United States and Britain.

In June 1967, the Israelis gained a swift and dramatic victory. But unfortunately, victory is a heady wine. To be humble in victory is perhaps the most difficult test of character in life. The Israelis were naturally excited, elated, perhaps even arrogant. For several weeks, they waited for the Arabs to surrender and throw themselves on their mercy. But nothing happened. They deliberately avoided introducing any mediators or asking for outside help to bring the two sides together. The Israelis wished to accept the surrender of their enemies and themselves to dictate the peace terms.

In point of fact, both Egypt and Jordan were badly shaken and seemed for a time to be ready to concede much. I cannot personally avoid the impression that, if the United States had intervened in October or November 1967, peace might have been concluded, but I may be wrong.

Since Christmas, however, the situation

has deteriorated. The idea of guerrilla resistance has gained ground among the Arabs, partly as a result of the example of Vietnam. Chinese propaganda has made some progress in Syria. They are still extremely inefficient at guerrilla operations and their efforts have produced little effect. It takes six or seven years to train a civilian population to guerrilla resistance, which involves incredible suffering and the ruin of the countryside.

If, however, all the Arabic-speaking peoples are sufficiently determined, Israel can never achieve peace. It is not yet certain that the Arabs will show sufficient resolution, for ethnically they are many different peoples which share a common religion, culture and language but do not belong to the same stock.

SEARCH FOR VICTORIOUS END

Israel could occupy Amman, Beirut or Damascus, but what then? Wherever they stopped there would still be a battle line in front of them. And, of course, the further they went, the longer would be their communications through hostile country. Moreover, with every military advance the intensity of the hatred opposed to them would increase. Thus if (and here there is an element of doubt) the Arabs are tough enough, vast areas of the Middle East may be laid waste, great numbers of civilians may be killed, but the Israelis will still not achieve peace.

The mistake which the Israelis may be making has been made many times before in history. The northern races, from Russia to Britain and North America, have a centuries-old tradition of standing up and slaughtering one another in pitched battle. They consider this the proper role of the soldier and they look with contempt on an enemy who will not "stand up and fight." But when the great technological military machine has rolled over the country, ostensibly flattening all opposition, the northerners discover that they still have not won.

No enemy leaders come forward to surrender. Nobody cooperates with the victors. Sabotage and assassination increase. In other words, any great power can conquer an Arab country but it is only after victory that the trouble begins.

To win the peace in Asia requires a knowledge of and sympathy with the people. It also needs wisdom, humility, compromise, perhaps even love. "Arabs are sub-human; the only argument they understand is fear," an Israeli said to me.

PEACE ONLY IF IMPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES AND U.S.S.R.

As I have said, I am not taking sides between Israel and the Arabs, but I fervently desire peace in the Middle East. But if peace necessitates sympathy and compromise, it seems unlikely that the Arabs and Israelis are going to get together. It seems to me that things have now gone so far that peace can only be achieved if the United States and Russia agree on what are fair terms and then together exert such pressure on both sides as is necessary to secure acceptance. When such a settlement has been reached, the two powers must guarantee its continued observance.

PEACE MAY NOT COME

If peace is not achieved now, spasmodic fighting may continue for twenty, fifty or a hundred years. In Asia, the U.S. is believed to be a hundred percent on the side of Israel. This may be exaggerated or incorrect but it is universally believed. The longer hostilities continue with Israel militarily dominant, the more Arab countries will call in the Russians. Moreover, the same tendency is already spreading to non-Arab Muslim countries. The CENTO Treaty, designed by the Western powers to hold back the spread of Soviet power, is already shaken. Turkey, one of the stoutest allies of the West, is now almost surrounded by Russia.

Unless peace can be established in the Middle East now, ever-expanding areas of Western Asia and North Africa may despair of the West and throw in their lot unre-servedly with Moscow.

SAVE US FROM ALL OUR "SAVIORS"

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of Robert Kennedy has evoked much comment on causes and cures but none quite as poignantly true as that of my good friend Arthur Hoppe, in the Evening Star, June 10, 1968:

SAVE US FROM ALL OUR "SAVIORS"

The anger grew. As the tiny figures swirled and eddied across the television screen and told their conflicting stories in shock and horror, the anger grew.

That this should happen once again to the Kennedys. That this should happen once again to all of us.

It was an all-encompassing anger. It encompassed the sickness of our society, the unfairness of life, it questioned God.

"I did it for my country," a news announcer quoted the gunman as saying. "I did it because I love my country."

Suddenly the anger focused. It focused not so much on the gunman as on all those like him among us—those who know what is good for the rest of us, those who push and shove and trample and shoot and kill in the righteousness of their own glorious cause.

Save us, dear Lord, from those who would save us.

For no man consciously does evil. Each man must justify to himself what he does. And how easy that is for those who know they serve in a righteous cause.

How easy for the assassin to pull the trigger, for he knows what's good for his country. How easy for the Nazi to strangle a Jew, for he knows he builds a Reich that will last a thousand years. How easy for a Communist to purge a dissenter, for he knows he creates a brave new world.

How easy it is for the Christian or the Moslem to butcher his fellow man, for he is the repository of divine truth. How easy for the Viet Cong terrorist or the Saigon police chief, for each knows he kills to save his nation.

How easy for the Klansman to lynch a black, for he knows he saves the Southern Way of Life. How easy for a Black militant to cry, "Burn, baby, burn," for he knows this will make his people free.

How easy for the radical left to strive to tear down this sorry scheme of things entire, for they know our society is destroying our souls. How easy for the radical right to form secret guerrilla bands, trained to shoot and kill, for they know they must save us all.

How easy it is. How easy it is for the righteous to justify what they do.

So the anger grew. And with it the hatred. I hated. We must somehow save ourselves from these hateful people who would march militantly over us to save our society, our nation, our world.

In my own self-righteousness, I hated more than I can remember ever hating before. In my own self-righteousness, I could gladly have seen them all destroyed. In my own self-righteousness.

And now, in reflection, I am more convinced than ever in what I have long believed:

If I would remake the world, I had better start with me.

FIRST LADY'S CONTINUING EFFORTS TO BEAUTIFY AMERICA

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the First Lady for her continued leadership and participation in her nationwide campaign to beautify America.

Mrs. Lyndon Johnson spoke at the annual awards ceremony of the Committee for a More Beautiful Capital at the White House this week, and praised the committee for its work in improving the Nation's Capital. Mrs. Johnson said:

Your accomplishments are important—to your families and neighbors who are so proud of you—and very much so to me. This is a time when we recognize the power for good that each citizen has.

The First Lady presented awards to Mrs. Sylvia Shugrue and Mrs. Lucille Johnson, members of the committee, for inspiring and guiding students in their beautification projects.

I insert in the RECORD Mrs. Johnson's remarks at this ceremony:

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE ANNUAL AWARDS CEREMONY OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A MORE BEAUTIFUL CAPITAL, THE WHITE HOUSE, JUNE 11, 1968

It is a pleasure to welcome all of you here today, for you are the people who have been working day in and day out, with your hands and your hearts, to improve this city—our Nation's Capital.

You are the doers—you do not dream idly nor give up in despair! You are showing all of us how each person can contribute something of positive value.

Your accomplishments are important—to your families and neighbors who are so proud of you—and very much so to me. This is a time when we recognize the power for good that each citizen has.

One entry I recall so well included a line that is a message to us all. This lady wrote, "I made the first move and asked the children to join me and they have."

Yesterday I drove around the city to see some of your accomplishments first hand, and I was delighted with the variety and extent of your efforts.

Some of you have cleared out vacant littered lots to provide much-needed recreation space in your neighborhoods. Others have cleaned up and planted their yards and places of business. Even such challenging ones as service stations and a warehouse—have been brightened with shrubs and flowers.

I'm delighted that we are recognizing some 15 filling stations in the District of Columbia which have landscaped their stations and made a real contribution to their neighborhoods. I want to thank a member of my committee, Mr. Adam Rumoshosky with the American Petroleum Institute, who has done much to stimulate oil companies to encourage stations in this effort.

There are 215,000 stations in the nation, and 400 in Washington. They are located in well-traveled spots by the very nature of their business.

I'm delighted that a beginning has been made. One of the winners here has told me

that the landscaping has brought forth compliments and more business. Everyone takes an interest in the station's appearance and expresses appreciation for what has been done to make it a real asset to the neighborhood.

At the Twin Oaks Demonstration Center, children have been raising flowers and vegetables, and I am sure no corn ever tasted as good as that which you raised and enjoyed at your corn feast last summer!

A variety of projects have been carried out in the schools, ranging from the topographical map of the new Braille Trail at the Arboretum which the children of Webb School made, to the forcing and planting of bulbs by the children at Logan School.

Today we are presenting individual awards to Mrs. Sylvia Shugrue and Mrs. Lucille Johnson, who have inspired and guided students in their beautification projects. What a difference a determined, enthusiastic teacher, particularly in art and science, makes in creating the desire to get a workable school project underway.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Awards Jury, chaired by Mrs. Ezekiel Stoddard, and the staffs of the D.C. Beautification Office, the Department of Highways and Traffic, the Department of Recreation, and the National Capital Park Service, who have worked with you to improve the city.

I was especially glad to see that your projects carried over into the surrounding neighborhoods—I noticed yards across from some of the schools were spruced up.

What all of you have done to make your neighborhoods, your schools and your businesses more attractive is well worth applauding, and these awards show that you care and we salute you for it.

Nationally, we are on the way to a better environment, and when you set to work in your neighborhood, you are helping to improve the national environment and helping to change national attitudes in a very positive way.

Thank you for all you have done for your hometown—Washington.

SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE— CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE, of Massachusetts, delivered the following masterful address to over 1,800 graduates at Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS: PRELUDE TO CHANGE

(Commencement address by Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE, at Catholic University, Washington, D.C.)

We meet at a somber moment. We come together benumbed and grief-stricken, bewildered and anxious. The buoyancy and hope which should mark this occasion are overwhelmed by the depression which envelops our nation. The spirit of reason and humanity which animates this great university, the spirit which has inspired the forward movement of civilization itself, is clouded by the brutality and inhumanity which have once more stricken this land.

Dickens familiar words now seem prophetic: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredu-

lity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair." In the United States of 1968, despair hangs heavy.

The murder of Robert Kennedy brings more than anguish in its wake. It brings many profound questions. How can America continue to sustain the recurrent shocks of violence against its public men and its public order? Can we as a people endure the emotional exhaustion of repeated national tragedies without losing the sensitivity and concern for individual life which is essential to political stability and social progress? How can the violent impulses which threaten the country be curbed and the traditions of non-violent change nourished?

Senator Kennedy's life suggests the only possible answers to the questions raised by his death. His faith in the goal of a compassionate society and his dedication to concrete measures to build such a society reflected the kind of commitment which all Americans must undertake. From this stunning tragedy and those which preceded it, we must derive a new sense of community in America. The passing of great men is our common loss; the burden of great problems is our common lot. Neither is bearable unless we join our hearts and our hands to carry on the mission of this nation.

As we contemplate that mission, and as we mourn for one of its most vigorous proponents, it is easy to be disillusioned. Indeed, it is even fashionable. In our time, as in all the ages past, there abound the cynics and pessimists who denounce the brotherhood of the hopeful as foolish, who deride the fraternity of the active as futile. But cynicism and pessimism do not constitute realism. I hope and I trust that you and your peers will have the moral insight to discern the difference.

To be sure there are plausible grounds for the gloomy views of the world which your generation will inherit and which it is called to transform. Riots at home and wars abroad are not a likely basis for optimism. Poverty in every continent, injustice in every nation, social discord in every state, these are grim omens. They must be faced and they must be relieved. Yet those who see only these features of the terrain are as mistaken as those who wallow in a sea of personal euphoria. Both groups are equally deserving of Sir Francis Bacon's trenchant comment:

"They are ill discoverers
That think there is no land,
When they see nothing but sea."

I am convinced that the drastic changes which have shaken the social and physical orders of this planet during the first two thirds of the twentieth century can portend a golden age for mankind. You and your children can inaugurate that era. It is not only that the human race has acquired a growing mastery of the material universe, a mastery which can enable all men to have the material necessities of life. While modern science and technology are by no means unmitigated blessings, they do permit us to face the future with the reasonable expectation that we can, with prudent management, meet the physical needs of all those on earth. Moreover, they hold some promise of correcting the unwanted byproducts which they themselves generate. Thus, it is through research that we have the greatest hope for controlling the environmental pollution which has arisen from application of modern technology; it is through research that we may hope to find cures for the physical and mental traumas which arise from the stresses of modern society; it is through research that we may even be able to find some of the most effective safeguards against the actual use of the destructive technology which defines the nuclear age.

Yet it is not the physical prospects raised by contemporary science which lead me to bet on the future. I believe that the truly encouraging trends for the inhabitants of

Spaceship Earth are social and psychological in nature. The trends to which I refer are running most strongly in this country and they are epitomized by members of your generation. These trends are complex and difficult to describe briefly, but I would suggest that their principal effect is to increase our collective capacity to adapt to social change. Among the young elite of America, those who will bear the major responsibility for guiding this nation through the turbulence which lies ahead, complacency is giving way to concern, apathy to involvement, self-seeking to self-sacrifice. While you have been growing up, a vast shift in social attitudes has been under way in this country. We are becoming, in my considered judgment, a future-oriented society, a nation acutely aware of the past failures and present defects and determined to alleviate them in the years ahead.

When compared with the uncertainty and anxiety which always accompany significant change, "the good old days and the good old ways" have powerful appeal. But if one succumbs uncritically to that appeal, the practical result is to gloss over the shortcomings of the existing social order and to deny the possibility of improving it. One is drawn to resist change on the general assumption that it may not be helpful, rather than to accept or discourage change according to a pragmatic appraisal of its probable effects in comparison with the status quo.

While Americans have been less constrained by tradition than other peoples, I believe that the attitudes now coming to prevail in our society are far more receptive to change than those which dominated in past decades. Furthermore, there is developing a heightened awareness of the inequities which still plague our society and a stronger determination to make the changes necessary to deal with them. I believe that the outcome will be a more responsive and a more responsible community.

This psychological revolution has its parallels in other countries, both in the West and in the East. It is of the utmost consequence to us all that the Soviet Union, as the other power with primary influence on the questions of war and peace, has shown that it too is adaptable to the realities of our time. Until former Premier Khrushchev repudiated the Leninist doctrine of the inevitability of war between capitalist and communist states, the risk of a thermonuclear Armageddon was real and increasing. That risk has not disappeared—far from it—but the shift in Soviet attitudes has made possible a number of constructive innovations in the international political system.

Although the arms race continues, there can be no doubt that the realization that nuclear war would be mutually suicidal has contributed significantly to the possibilities of peaceful accommodation between Moscow and Washington. One may hope that a similar maturity will emerge in China, as the Chinese become more familiar with the awesome implications of the nuclear forces they are developing.

Perhaps the most important result of the altered psychology of Soviet-American relations has been the restraint shown by both countries during the struggle in Vietnam. However brutal and painful the war in Southeast Asia has been, the seeds of global strife which it contains have not been allowed to sprout. While no one can rejoice at what has happened in Vietnam, what has not happened is certainly cause for prayerful gratitude. The prudence exhibited by the United States and the Soviet Union can provide us time to identify and develop our mutual interests, and in those mutual interests lies the world's best chance for long-term security and prosperity.

A different kind of psychological environment has evolved on the domestic scene. Here at home the disposition has become not one of caution and restraint, but of rapid and

energetic action to promote social change. This activist attitude has come increasingly to the fore in the last decade. It is well-matched to the needs of the nation. The new activism has begun to zero in on the critical requirements of modern America, on the pressing need to improve life in our urban centers, to relieve the lingering injustice from which too many suffer, to provide a decent standard of living for all citizens.

The upwelling of social concern is creating a new ethic for the American people. If I judge the matter correctly, the new ethic will retain the traditional American reverence for the individual personality but it will temper the harshest overtones of our Puritan heritage. That heritage has tended to see individual failure in the economic sphere as a reflection of personal corruption and has tended to discourage community action to assist the disadvantaged members of society.

Mr. Dooley once observed that the Puritans had celebrated Thanksgiving to give thanks for being preserved from the Indians and that we celebrate it to give thanks for being preserved from the Puritans. His conclusion that we have been so preserved was premature, for we have never fully shaken the Puritan suspicion that an individual who could not provide for himself was not quite worth being provided for.

We are at least beginning to understand that the operation of a complex economy often wreaks havoc on the fortunes of individuals. Through no fault of their own, some people have little opportunity to become self-supporting, much less to make a full contribution to society.

If we had not fully appreciated that this was true, the shocking evidence of Resurrection City should be conclusive. The three thousand participants in the Poor People's Campaign have brought the message to the heart of the nation's capital and, I hope, to the heart of the nation. They are raising up the reality of poverty in America, a reality compounded of inadequate education, unemployment, miserable housing, and malnutrition.

Recognition of these facts has brought increasing numbers of Americans to support the principle that society has an obligation to its less fortunate members. As this principle wins wider acceptance, and as America's abundant resources make possible a larger investment in programs to attack the root causes of poverty, the possibilities for effective social reform rise proportionately. Clear, workable solutions to these perennial problems are not yet in hand, but many of the central difficulties have been identified and promising approaches are being explored.

The emergence of this new perspective on poverty is a watershed in our history, but no one can state with confidence exactly what will be required of us, or over how long a period of time, to succor the distress we now perceive. That is why the activist bent of you and your generation is so essential to our country. The task of designing and implementing a sound strategy to cope with these momentous problems is bound to take our best efforts for many years. The nation desperately needs a special breed of tough-minded idealists, men and women who are prepared to enter the long campaign which lies ahead.

Fresh troops are needed in all the fields of social service. We will have to find dedicated and inspired teachers to undertake the difficult burdens of instruction in the ghetto schools. To control the disruptive tendencies of many of our disadvantaged families, competent and credible social workers will be needed. To help map the way out of the cluster of dilemmas which frustrate millions in our center cities, we must train and employ the most capable urban planners in history. In all these fields and others, the challenges of the coming decades will demand a total commitment from those brave enough to accept them.

But a constructive attack on these crucial social ills will require more than individual commitments to specialized pursuits, however worthy those pursuits may be. Each American will have to guide his service by constant reference to the general requirements of a free society. We must have, as Walter Lippmann so eloquently argued a decade ago, a revival of appreciation for a public philosophy in this country, a renewed respect for the public interest. It will not suffice, in a nation whose citizens have developed a hitherto unknown interdependence, for each man to pursue his own desires without regard to the rights and needs of others.

To function as a democratic society America will have to devise new modes and instruments for the voluntary coordination of the manifold activities which engage the energies of her people. This will be the supreme test of representative government, but it will also be the ultimate challenge to all the institutions which comprise the private sector. Business, labor, churches, universities, families, and individuals in every sphere of our national life must learn to act in full consciousness of the implications of their actions for others in the community.

To state this is merely to state the obvious prerequisite of life in a modern nation. Our political, social and economic organization has now grown so complex that each of us survives quite literally at the mercy of dozens of others. By the same token each of us has come to hold a kind of veto power over the happiness and well-being of many of our fellow citizens. All of us are driving down a crowded highway, and the fact of every passenger is linked to the behavior of every other. We must surely learn to guide ourselves, for there is no invisible hand wise or powerful enough to do the job for us.

The odds are good that most of you will be here to greet the next century. Between now and the year 2000, America and the other nations of the world will undergo the most stupendous changes in all their history. No one from my generation can tell you how to grapple with the future. Personal fulfillment does not come out of a do-it-yourself kit, any more than social progress proceeds from a pat formula set down by the elders of the community.

But I can tell you of my faith that the United States is girding itself to meet the massive transformation of the next three decades. The revolution in social attitudes through which our nation is passing will, I am confident, make us a more sensitive people. I believe it will prepare us to plunge ahead, in good spirit and in the right direction, to remedy our domestic wrongs and to lead the way to a more equitable and more stable international system.

It is not so much the radical innovations of science and technology as the changes in human attitudes and institutions which will shape this future. If we are to build a better world for ourselves and our posterity, we must find our salvation, not in mother nature, but in human nature.

In this perpetual quest you and other Catholic Americans have a very special contribution to make. Not only do you bear living witness to the capacity of a noble institution to adapt to change while retaining its integrity, but you represent a tradition with one of the most sensible and hopeful perspectives on human nature. Your view of man is bright, not bleak. You come equipped with the understanding that, though often flawed, the human personality is capable of mighty deeds.

This is a faith which all Americans need. It is a faith helpful in prosperity and essential in adversity. Without this faith the aspiration of men to be free must perish; with it that aspiration will fuel a surge of human accomplishment that will capture the future and make it our own.

IT IS NOT TOO LATE—YET

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, Americans throughout this country are deeply concerned about the problems, the tension, and the general troubled atmosphere that prevails today. I know that each of our colleagues has this same impression from his visits to his district, and from the hundreds of letters he receives each week. Our people are worried and disturbed about the situations that exist in America. One of the best expressions of this feeling was included in an editorial in the Birmingham News of Sunday, June 9, 1968. I would like to share this editorial with the House, and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

IT'S NOT TOO LATE—YET

One voice alone will not make the difference, not this voice or any other.

But the chorus of voices swelling up from this land—voices of the famous and the anonymous, of public officials and private citizens, of editorial writers and the "man in the street"—will be heard.

The President of the United States cannot fail to hear it. He must not fail to heed it.

The voice—this anguished national voice, full of tears and full of concern for the future of a country which two centuries of blood and love and work built to greatness—demands that the President use all the power and the persuasion of his office to put an end to permissive tolerance of conduct which threatens to reduce the United States of America to ruin.

On May 8, 1963, *Birmingham News* Publisher Clarence B. Hanson Jr. sent a telegram to President John F. Kennedy. It said, in part:

"Birmingham expects that you as President of all the people will use your office to encourage maintenance of law and order at all times."

Birmingham had just voted to change its form of government and had just elected a new mayor, Albert Boutwell, who had pledged immediate attention "to resolving the difficulties that face us" as soon as the new government's authority—then being challenged in court by the former government—was undisputed.

But Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders refused to halt street demonstrations to give the new government time and opportunity to act.

Then-Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy said that the demonstrations were ill-timed; that law and court orders must be sustained; that questions of justice should be settled in court, not in the streets. Atty. Gen. Kennedy acknowledged publicly that Mayor Boutwell "already has made clear his intention to resolve the difficulties facing (Birmingham)."

"That is the 'picture' today, Mr. President," Mr. Hanson's telegram said. "But apparently if there is to be order, and respect for law, and proper procedure through the courts as well as sincere white effort to meet this problem cooperatively, you, Sir, must be the one to bring it."

President Kennedy did not act to end the demonstrations, which in time led to violence and which set off a wave of "civil disobedience" which plagues the nation to this day.

In the five years since that telegram was sent, lawlessness and disorder have grown yearly. And the greatest tragedy of all is that

Americans have come to shrug their shoulders, to count themselves helpless to do anything about it.

President Kennedy is dead, the victim of an assassin's bullet.

Dr. King is dead, the victim of an assassin's bullet.

And now Robert Kennedy is dead, the victim of an assassin's bullet.

Are assassins to be the determinators of America's future? Is unchecked lawlessness to destroy a system founded on respect for the law? Is license to undermine responsible exercise of rights?

The Birmingham News believes now as it believed five years ago that the President of the United States has the responsibility and the power to act decisively to insure domestic tranquility.

That action must be more than appointment of a commission to examine the source of flames which already are licking at the national structure. It is good and useful to study the causes of the fire—but it is urgent, in the meantime, to turn the hoses on it.

The murder of Robert Kennedy is only the latest stinging wound to a lacerated national body. How much more must we suffer before someone has guts enough to stand up and say "Stop!" to those who slash and spit in the face of America?

President Lyndon Johnson can begin with those who have massed in Washington to shake their fists at the country.

Tell the leaders of the Poor People's Campaign, Mr. President:

—That the United States *does* care about the poor; *does* pledge itself to programs to give every American a richer share in its material wealth as well as its freedoms.

—That they lie who claim that efforts have not been made, are not being made, will not be made by "white America" to eliminate discrimination, to improve the lot of minorities; who say that conditions for black men in America not only are no better than they used to be but are worse and more hopeless than ever.

Tell them, Sir, that the nation is sympathetic to the legitimate grievances of the poor, but that the nation is tired of the abuse some of the leaders of this campaign heap upon it.

Listen to Rev. James Bevel: "I feel no responsibility to a nation-state. I represent conscious energy, which is a universal phenomena. As a result, I don't get too excited when I see a rag on a stick called a flag."

Tell him, Mr. President, for all the Americans who *do* feel a responsibility to America and who *do* "get excited" by the American flag, that he goes too far.

See Rev. James Groppi, a priest, point his finger at the U.S. attorney general and say: "If we have to turn the capital upside down—brother, I'm all for it."

Listen to the cheers which fill the attorney general's office when a Puerto Rican promises that "we haven't got any money, dad, but we got matches."

Tell them, Mr. President, what you told the American people after the murder of Sen. Kennedy—that unless Americans learn to live under the law, then all we cherish is imperiled, all the hopes of doing something about the problems which face us will evaporate.

Ask then, Sir, if there are no voices of respected, responsible leaders of both races which will speak up for reason and order in our national life.

The people of the United States are in no mood for more of the misconduct of an extremist few—whether they are on college campuses seeking to terrorize an administration into submission or in city streets burning property and looting stores or assaulting citizens.

The people *demand* that the President make it clear that the time for looking the other way is past: That from this day on those who violate the law, however "moral"

their motivation, those who sow subversion and disorder, must expect to be dealt with accordingly.

We *cannot* let go unchallenged those who seek to destroy America, who attack the foundations of a system of government which, for all its imperfections, is the best ever devised—and which still has the devoted support of an overwhelming majority of Americans of every race and creed and political persuasion.

If something is not done to check extremism, to rally Americans to a new sense of patriotism and purpose, then this country is in grave trouble.

It is the President's responsibility, and the responsibility of every American who values America, to do *now* whatever can be done to shake the nation to its senses.

The best possible monument to Sen. Kennedy would be the restoration of a climate in which every American could feel safe in his person and his property and his right to hold and responsibly express political views; in which our differences can be aired reasonably and decisions made reasonably and reasonable steps be taken to make a great nation even greater for all its citizens.

It is not too late—yet.

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1968

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to put myself on record in favor of the extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. I hope this does not suggest that I believe this legislation will save rural America. I view the bill as a holding action, as our way of telling the American farmer that we are not forgetting him while we continue to look for other solutions to the ills of the countryside.

Many of my colleagues are threatening to vote against this bill for no reason other than their pique at the Agriculture Committee's indifference to human needs and human problems. I share the concern of these members with the past performance of the committee. As a member of the committee, I know all too well its unconscionable foot dragging on the food stamp bill and its shocking tabling of the Stennis emergency food and medical assistance bill.

Nevertheless, if House Members vote against the food and agriculture bill to punish the Agriculture Committee, they may in fact hurt the very people they wish to help. Our rural areas are already in a sorry condition; they are characterized by high unemployment rates, low incomes, a general lack of opportunities and high rates of outmigration.

But any bad situation can get worse. The defeat of this bill would serve the interests of the farmers enemies; namely the agribusiness complexes who have sufficient capital to operate regardless of Federal programs. The American Farm Bureau Federation which opposes the bill, has already predicted and welcomed the demise of the family farm. The defeat of the bill would be playing into the hands of this gigantic insurance company since it would accelerate the mortality rate for small farmers.

Today's big city ghetto dwellers lived in rural slums before they became residents of city slums. The lack of opportunity and the frustration of these poor people remains the same. The only difference is the population density. It is difficult for a riot to start out in a field but a rock thrown in anger through a store window can be the spark which ignites a whole community in a densely populated area. Our cities have become pressure cookers of discontent and at the root has been our lack of attention to the problems of our rural residents.

Quite apart from this inevitable out-migration, the defeat of this bill would lead to wild fluctuations in food prices. While some, such as the Farm Bureau lobbyists, argue passionately for something called the free market, I for one can see no virtue in unstable prices. An economic free-for-all would merely afford a golden opportunity for the large conglomerate corporations to assume monopoly control of food prices.

For those Members who are annoyed at the conservation coalition may I suggest that there is an alternative to obstructionism. The honorable gentlewoman from Missouri, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, has introduced a bill to provide a permanent and expanded food stamp program. By joining with Mrs. SULLIVAN in cosponsoring the bill we would be urging the members of the Agricultural Committee to reassess the priorities which they have placed upon legislation concerning products versus legislation concerning people.

Another suggestion might be a little friendly harassment of the bureaucrats within the Agriculture Department who always seem to find numerous reasons why they can't inject as much enthusiasm and flexibility into administering the food stamp, commodity surplus, and FHA housing loan program as they do into tobacco research and cotton subsidy programs.

What I am saying, in short, is that the techniques many of us are proposing to accomplish our goals may be self-defeating. The poor are in Washington today because we have not responded to their needs. Defeating the food and agriculture bill would do little to help them.

FARM PARITY STAYS AT LOW LEVEL

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, farm parity remained locked at 73 percent for the month of May, the same as for April, and 1 percent under May 1967.

Rising costs for farmers were again listed as the culprit as farm prices actually edged upward, but farm costs also increased, thereby holding parity to the same low level.

Farm production goods increased by 1 percent from mid-April to mid-May, while the total index of all farm purchases is 3 percent higher than a year ago.

The following table lists the parity price percentages for various agricultural products for April and May 1968:

Parity percentages		
Product:	April	May
Cotton	44	47
Wool	45	46
Wheat	52	52
Barley	71	73
Corn	65	66
Butterfat	76	76
Milk	87	90
Flax	73	73
Oats	78	78
Sorghum	70	70
Soybeans	76	76
Beef	80	80
Chickens	65	67
Eggs	61	63
Hogs	75	73
Lambs	89	90
Turkeys	59	60
Average parity ratio	73	73

ELECTORAL CRISIS LINGERS IN PANAMA

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in statements to the House on March 28 and May 28, 1968, I discussed at length the perils involved in the May 12 presidential election in Panama.

Dr. Arnulfo Arias, a two-time former President, has now been declared the victor by one of Panama's electoral bodies by more than 40,000 votes, but the dangers inherent in the situation still lurk.

A summary of current conditions in the Isthmian country by James Nelson Goodsell, Latin American correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor in Panama City, follows:

ELECTORAL CRISIS LINGERS IN PANAMA

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

PANAMA CITY.—Panama's electoral crisis is far from over.

Although Dr. Arnulfo Arias, the two-time former President of Panama, has been declared elected by one electoral body, the nation's other electoral group calls the action illegal—and seems determined to tap David Samudio, a former finance minister, as president-elect.

Still, Panama's National Guard, the nation's small but well-trained military force, appears to support Dr. Arias. And this support probably is enough to get him into the presidential chair again.

The big problem in this is the continuing unwillingness of the government of Marco A. Robles to relinquish the presidency to Dr. Arias. In the May 12 election, Mr. Samudio was the government candidate.

Both Dr. Arias and Mr. Samudio claim to be president-elect.

Most independent observers here say there is little doubt that Dr. Arias did in fact win the elections with at least 40,000 more votes than Mr. Samudio. But a pro-Samudio newspaper, *El Mundo*, this past week ran a full-page editorial summary showing a Samudio win by slightly more than 4,000 votes.

WILL OF THE ELECTORATE?

Thus, the basic split between the Arias and Samudio forces remains. And there is growing dissatisfaction here on the part of many people.

Religious and civic leaders, including some

who supported Mr. Samudio in the campaign, have launched an effort to get the "popular will" of the electorate recognized—and thus Dr. Arias accepted as the legitimate winner.

"It is not necessary to point out to citizens the tragic consequences that a failure to recognize the popular will would bring about for the community well-being," the group said in a statement.

The group has indicated that, if its appeal goes unheeded, it may well resort to passive resistance in the fashion of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in the United States.

The National Guard apparently wants to avoid the possibility of such resistance which might lead to massive civil unrest in this Isthmian nation. And there is a good deal of feeling here that the National Guard's commander, Brig. Gen. Bolivar Vallarino, is working behind the scene in an effort to get the Robles-Samudio forces to accept the Arias victory.

So far, these forces have refused to do so.

ECONOMIC CRISIS LOOMS

In fact, the National Electoral Tribunal, a three-man board appointed by the government, has given every indication of rejecting the Arias victory.

Meanwhile, Panama is facing something of an economic crisis. Business firms in downtown Panama City continue to operate on a business-as-usual basis, but many firm owners say that sales are off significantly.

One merchant who deals in clothing goods said this past week, "I could close my store three days a week and it would not affect my business."

Not all businessmen, however, see things as drastically. But most will say that there has been a slowdown in the past few weeks. In part, it depends on the type of business.

UNPRECEDENTED GROWTH

The tourist business apparently is off sharply. Employee working hours have been shortened in some cases. And in others, there have been layoffs. Taxi drivers are particularly full of complaints.

"There just isn't any business," one of them at a major hotel here said. "I have had very few fares in the past four weeks."

Interestingly, the economic downturn comes at a time when Panama's economy has been enjoying a period of unprecedented growth. The 1967 growth rate is estimated at 9.5 percent, down only slightly from the record 1966 total of 10.7 percent.

And based on per-capita income, which figures in the population increase and other factors, the 1967 figure was up more than 5 percent—double the Alliance for Progress goal of a 2.5 percent increase per year.

As 1968 began, there were forecasts that the growth rate would equal or better the 1967 estimates.

But the election crisis, which was preceded by the effort of opposition forces to unseat President Robles, has left the economy in an uncertain state. There is clearly a slowdown in business activity—as much as 25 to 30 percent in the past four weeks—but there is little capital flight from the country.

As far as long-range investment is concerned, there seems to be little evidence on any slowdown. But these calculations are only now coming in, and it will be several more weeks before it can be determined if a slowdown is taking place here.

HOPES FOR UPTURN HEARD

There is general feeling here that once the current electoral crisis is solved, an economic upturn can be expected. Almost all banking and business forecasts suggest this to be so.

At the same time, forecasters here think the longer there is uncertainty over the country's political future, the more difficult will be the task of regearing the economy.

The one area of business activity which has not fallen back is the retail food industry. Panamanian residents are stockpiling food in their homes in anticipation of any

disorder which might come out of the present uncertain political scene.

The United States has officially remained aloof in the current political dilemma. But forces loyal to Mr. Samudio say Dr. Arias has the backing of the United States. The charge is firmly denied by both the United States and Dr. Arias.

The Panama Canal, which is registering record transits at the present time, has not been an issue in recent Panamanian politics.

Neither candidate brought the canal or relations with the United States into the campaign, but there is always a concern in Washington that the volatile nature of Panamanian politics may erupt at any moment and embroil the United States. That remains a possibility.

JUDGE KENNETH L. NASH

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Members of this Congress that today marks a milestone for the Massachusetts judicial system and for Judge Kenneth L. Nash of the Quincy District Court.

The story of Kenneth L. Nash, is, in a strong sense, the story of parliamentary effectiveness in a democracy. Judge Nash may be said to stand out as the symbol of leadership achieved by merit. Kenneth L. Nash, presiding justice of the district court of East Norfolk, Quincy, Mass., has served in both the Massachusetts House and Senate. He has served the people of his Nation, State, and local community with distinction.

In June of 1918, he was appointed associate justice by Gov. Samuel W. McCall. In October of 1933, he was appointed presiding justice of the district court by Gov. Joseph B. Ely. In 1965, he attained the high honor of being appointed chief justice of the district courts by Gov. Endicott Peabody.

Judge Nash will be 80 on July 14—32 days after his 50th anniversary on the bench. He continues to put in a full day at the courthouse in Quincy as he has every day for the past 50 years. He has become an inspiration, a symbol of power and achievements in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In addition to his judicial duties, Judge Nash has also been very active in other fields of endeavor: He played ball as a major league baseball player with the Cleveland Indians and the St. Louis Cardinals. In later years, he coached the Tufts University baseball team for 20 years.

Judge Nash is well endowed with outstanding moral and intellectual qualities necessary for the position of chief justice of the district courts. I hope that God will continue to bless him and his work abundantly.

At this point I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article, entitled "50 Years on Bench," which recently appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger:

FIFTY YEARS ON BENCH: JUDGE NASH NEARS MILESTONE

(By Frank Kyper)

QUINCY.—June 12 will be a milestone for the Massachusetts judicial system and for Judge Kenneth L. Nash of the Quincy District Court.

The date will mark the justice's 50th year on the bench—the last four of which have also seen him serve as the first chief justice of the Massachusetts District Courts.

Veterans of the state's judicial system report they cannot remember any other judge who has served on the bench for a full 50 years—especially one who is under 80. Judge Nash was appointed to the Quincy court in 1918, when he was 29.

Just as he has for the past half century, the Weymouth native and resident, who is a bachelor, continues to put in a full day at the courthouse in Quincy. Much of this time is now devoted to continuing the smooth operation of the many district courts scattered throughout the commonwealth.

Judge Nash still remains nearly as trim as he was in his early athletic career. After he was graduated from Brown University, where he was captain of the baseball team, he had a brief session in major league baseball—playing for the Cleveland Indians in 1912 and the St. Louis Cardinals in 1914.

He coached the Milton Academy baseball team in 1918 and the Tufts University team from 1920 to 1941.

Judge Nash also played for the Steel League baseball team at the Fore River shipyard in 1918. Joseph P. Kennedy, father of the late President, was assistant to the general manager at the facility and managed the team.

Baseball remains a passion with the judge, friends say, and he will discuss it for hours on end, at the slightest provocation.

Judge Nash served as the juvenile judge in the court for about the first 10 years following his appointment. The late Judge Kenneth Johnson succeeded him in the juvenile sessions.

The chief justice says the most notable change during his years on the bench has been the increased length of court sessions. He attributes this only partly to the increased number of cases being processed.

He cites Supreme Court decisions and federal requirements that the court must provide a lawyer for every defendant who requests one as contributing factors.

"We never used to know anything about getting an attorney for any man who came into court," he says.

PRISONER'S RIGHTS

In addition to the requirement—and added expense—of providing a lawyer for any defendant requesting one, policemen are now required to inform a prisoner that he does not have to talk unless he wants to, and the requirements for obtaining search warrants are being beefed up.

Both are contributing to the increased work load of court officials, Judge Nash said. Looking ahead, the chief justice said:

"I'm sure we're going to get new (Supreme Court) decisions, but I don't see how we can go much farther in the protection of individuals."

The increased mobility made possible by the automobile during the period of his half century on the bench was attributed by Judge Nash for the increase of violence and destruction, especially by younger persons.

"When they drive 40 or 50 miles from home, they feel a tremendous freedom which was not available before," Judge Nash said.

"Automobiles are responsible for an awful lot of these crimes, especially the ones these kids commit," he said. The chief justice cited his annual reports, which recorded the increasing numbers of stolen motor vehicle charges which are constantly coming before

his courts, especially in their juvenile session. Parental laxity was blamed for their inability to cope with this increased independence of youths.

"Some parents are ruled by their children," he said.

"There is a right of free press, but it can be abused," the chief justice said in commenting on recent bar association charges of prejudicial pretrial publicity.

"There ought to be a line drawn" before a person's rights are placed in jeopardy, he added. One or two cases have reached the point in the past where the press has made a fair trial impossible, Judge Nash said. This should not be allowed to happen.

BRINKS TRIAL

The Brinks Trial was especially cited by the chief justice. He said he felt the defendants never received completely fair trials as a result of the newspaper publicity given the case from the time the accused were arrested.

Judge Nash's two current "pet projects" are increasing the implementation of the recently-established six-member jury system on the district court level, and increasing his "judicial education" program.

Although the six-member juries have been set up in only about nine district courts in the commonwealth, the chief justice feels they have created a tremendous saving in time, money and work which would otherwise have to be performed on the superior courts level.

Monetary and personnel difficulties have prevented establishment of more of these new sessions in other district courts in the state—including Quincy.

The bulk of the education program occurs when the chief justice and the district courts judges get together to "talk shop" every once in awhile.

"We often discuss methods used to handle different situations which have come up in their courts," Judge Nash said. "In this way, we often standardize court procedures."

"I am also impressed with the good caliber of the judicial personnel sitting on our court benches," he added.

Noting that there were district court judges who are as much as 11 years older than he, Judge Nash said he has no immediate plans for the future.

The chief justice will be 80 on July 14—32 days after his 50th anniversary on the bench.

"There is a great deal of more detail in the district courts than there used to be," he observed. Judge Nash plans to continue keeping these details in line, thus insuring the continued smooth operation of his "grass roots" court system.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the vitality, force, and energy of youth has never been so dramatically demonstrated as it is in this Nation today. Never before has the impact of youth been so apparent on the print of our national fabric.

Young America today possesses a fervent desire to participate in the resolution of the vital issues facing this Nation. Yet the large majority of America's young adults are denied one of the basic

rights in the process of determining which course America will follow; that path on which the Nation will embark today setting the course of events for the world that our youth will inherit tomorrow. The right to vote should be extended to these young adults.

During my service in the Congress I have favored and sponsored legislation which would lower the Federal voting age requirement to 18. While a member of the senate in the Tennessee General Assembly, I favored such legislation for my own State.

For nearly three decades there has been a growing public sentiment favoring the vote for young Americans. According to the Gallup poll of June 1939 only 17 percent of the public supported this idea. However, the figure has increased until, in March of 1967 the Gallup poll indicated 63 percent favor lowering the voting age.

The reasons for this change in attitude are apparent. It is undeniable that the youth of today are far better educated and more intellectually sophisticated and mature than their fathers or grandfathers at the same age. Improved educational facilities and opportunity combined with the great strides in communications have made this an undisputed fact.

This superior education and heightened sophistication has spawned an increased awareness of the problems not only of their immediate environment but of concerns of national and international scope. With this awareness has grown a tremendous amount of potentially positive energy to set at the tasks which are before us. The Peace Corps and VISTA are just two very good examples of how this energy can be harnessed for constructive endeavor.

Yet there exists today an alienation of youth in America. Call it the "generation gap" if you like or call it what you may, it exists. It manifests itself most dramatically in the student protest movement which has exhibited itself in unbelievable, sometimes violent, often disgusting and frequently disturbing activities. These incidents, involving a relative minority of young Americans, nonetheless, receive the headlines and television coverage.

A much more laudable manifestation of young energy positively applied has been seen in the political campaigns of the late Senator Robert Kennedy and Senator EUGENE McCARTHY, though such expression is by no means applicable to one political party for I have never seen a more dedicated and conscientious group of young persons than those who worked in behalf of Senator Goldwater in 1964.

The fact of the matter today is that youth wants to participate, it wants to be involved, it wants, as the cliché goes, "a piece of the action." This is certainly understandable in light of what the older generation expects of and requires from each new generation. We demand wisdom and maturity but are not willing to acknowledge it.

The result is frustration and alienation; a dislike for and distrust of "the establishment." Thus a shabby few turn

to antisocial and often anti-American activities to express their frustration. While the responsible majority turns to constructive activities, suffering in relative silence this seeming injustice.

The older generations possess one very powerful instrument for change, the vote. If we grow frustrated with our public servants or their policies we can, and often do, vote them out. But this powerful instrument is denied responsible youth leaving them without an effective democratic instrument of protest.

The Senate is currently holding hearings on a bipartisan joint resolution for a constitutional amendment to lower the Federal voting age to 18. It is my hope these hearings will lead to early and positive consideration by that body and that the House will follow suit this year so that the proposition can be submitted to the States for the necessary two-thirds ratification.

In the United States today the 18-year-old can marry, he pays taxes, he can be required to give his life for his country, and he is subject to adult criminal laws but he can have no say in any of these laws which so affect him.

Finally, it might be suggested that if we do give the 18-year-old the vote the voters of the older generations may well pay more attention to and participate more fully in the political arena.

THE ARNHEITER AFFAIR

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in further pursuit of my announced objective of placing the other side of the Arnheiter story into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I submit herewith portions of an editorial appraisal of the affair which appeared in the June 12 issue of Navy Times.

I am deleting the first portion of the appraisal since it deals with the activities of one of my colleagues and draws a conclusion regarding those actions. However, the portion which shall be included herewith is the full substance of the editorial appraisal of the Navy Times after it had viewed the 413-page transcript of the Subic Bay hearings concerning the Arnheiter matter:

EDITORIAL APPRAISAL: THE ARNHEITER AFFAIR

We've read all that material and related documents. They make Arnheiter's demands of a formal court of inquiry or a court-martial questionable. Questionable because he had his hearing. Questionable because:

What would come out of any future inquiry into his relief from command of Vance? First, the interminable playing of 12 tapes (the 10th of the 13 recorded turned out blank).

And then, examination of those who testified.

And what would that produce?

Would Arnheiter change his story? We doubt it. Would any of the others? We doubt it. Would anybody's recollection of events be improved by the passage of two years' time? Peoples' memories of events don't usually improve with aging. They may change a bit, but they don't improve.

The best evidence, the best testimony is in all probability the evidence and the testimony already taken.

That evidence and testimony supports what the case is all about: An officer talked a grand job of leadership, but in the practical test did not show up too well in many peoples' eyes. He was relieved of command. He blamed it on every one in sight.

It was a fairly close case. It had to be a close case. Only a few people commit heinous offenses or create major disasters. Most peoples' records, good and bad, are made up of relatively little things. Did the Navy have to wait until a man proved beyond all doubt that he was not qualified for a command before it exercised its unquestioned right to replace him? No!

And that is the crux of the whole affair.

Yet, as must be true in a close case, we find that people differ.

Capt. Ward W. Witter, who heard and saw the witnesses in 6½ long days of hearings and who studied Arnheiter both on the witness stand and privately, voted for relief and no punishment.

Rear Adm. Thomas S. King voted to add a letter of reprimand.

Vice Adm. Baumberger, after hearing pleas and promises from Arnheiter, voted for another chance at command and in his own Force, under close supervision. In a much-publicized review and in a still later and little-published informal judgment, the admiral showed himself of two minds about the case.

So, you will recall, did Capt. Richard G. Alexander.

Surely all this disproves any contention that the reviews of the case were perfunctory rubber stamps. People pondered. They were troubled. They judged. At least two modified their judgments.

At length, the then Chief of Naval Personnel judged, as Capt. Witter had judged, that the facts created serious doubts about Arnheiter's fitness to stand alone in command.

Vice Adm. B. J. Semmes Jr. had more to go on than the intervening authorities had. He had the officer's performance records in other jobs—from unsat to outstanding and all points between. There was that first passover for lieutenant. There was that divided major command board decision to give Arnheiter a combatant ship in the first place.

Everything since Adm. Semmes decision has been rehash or afterthought. Everything, that is, except Mr. Arnheiter's demonstration of talent in the conduct of public relations.

In the course of the controversy he alleged conspiracies against himself, both among the officers below him and among the admirals above him. He accused various flag officers of various prejudices, religious and professional, reserving his choicest accusations for Adm. Semmes.

He accused Semmes of telling an untruth. This charge was renewed by Resnick. They say the Chief of Naval Personnel wrongly denied, in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy on June 29, 1967, that he had sent a memo to the selection board that was considering Arnheiter for commander in 1966.

We have seen that letter and it mentions, among other things, that it was Arnheiter who first sent documents challenging his relief to the selection board.

But on the point at issue, Semmes simply did not—repeat, did NOT—"send a memo to the selection board." He rendered a judgment holding that Arnheiter's relief was "for cause" and he had that put in the jacket of Arnheiter, which was then in board custody.

And—get this—Semmes said so, in that June 29 letter to the Secretary.

Semmes spoke absolute truth. And he did what a Chief of Naval Personnel should have done in insuring that the most important piece of paper accumulated in Mr. Arnheiter's career was in his file.

From all this sorry affair, Navy Times agonizedly has come to these conclusions:

That the Navy should have released all those documents when Mr. Arnheiter first made the relief controversy public.

And that is the only Navy mistake. The Navy not only had a legal right to relieve Mr. Arnheiter (even this unquestioned fact has been obscured) but, on the record, it had ample professional grounds to relieve him.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address given by Mr. G. Harold Keatley, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1968, at the cemetery in Fleming, Centre County, Pa.

Mr. Keatley returned to his birthplace, Fleming, Pa., to give the address. He attended the Unionville Borough schools and Bellefonte High School in Centre County. He graduated from Dickinson and George Washington University Law School. He is a member of the District of Columbia bar. After spending a year with the International Committee of the YMCA in China, he served as private secretary to two Governors General of the Philippine Islands, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, and Col. Henry L. Stimson. He returned to the United States to serve 4 years as private secretary to Colonel Stimson when he was Secretary of State, and continued in Government employment with the Departments of State and Commerce in the international commercial field. Mr. Keatley's address follows:

Fellow Americans—Why do we gather here today? In a Memorial Day address delivered at Keene, New Hampshire, eighty-four years ago, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes replied to that question in one brief sentence:

"We pause to become conscious of our national life, . . . to recall what our country has done for each of us, and to ask ourselves what we can do for our country in return."

From time to time we should do just that. To be sure, Memorial Day was kept alive for many decades by those who gathered together to recall the memories and to renew the fellowships of war days. But the purpose stated by Justice Holmes suggests the desirability of continuing Memorial Day into the years when the majority of those who gather no longer share the memories of fellowships formed while bearing arms. So I for one was glad to hear that this community had decided to meet again on this day, not only to honor the memories of those veterans who are no longer with us, to express our appreciation to those who are still among us, but also to give voice to the objectives mentioned by Justice Holmes.

I might ask myself "what am I doing here?" I never have been privileged to serve in the armed forces, have never experienced battle, and have never shared directly in the close bonds of fellowship, of high resolve and of common purpose enjoyed by those who bear arms together. So, I felt particularly honored to have been asked to speak to you today.

I well recall the memories, and I might add, even the thrill, of past Memorial Days of half a century ago when the thinning ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic met in this cemetery to do honor to those of their group who had passed on. I remember vividly

some of those veterans, Barney Shipley, George Rumberger, Jack Sinclair, Dr. Russell, and my own grandfather, George P. Hall, who carried in his lung until his eightieth year the bullet he had received at Gettysburg; also John Biddle, who lived by the side of this cemetery, whose account of his imprisonment at Andersonville was published in the History of the 148th Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers.

Then too I recall the return of our First World War veterans; the one who did not return—Paul Clancy; and our non-combatant soldier, Harry McElwain, who came back laden with honors for the risks he had taken as a hospital corpsman on fields of battle—wearer of the Distinguished Service Medal, the Croix de Guerre, and a member of the Legion of Valor. We all remember his modesty and the place he made for himself in this community. Sometimes I wonder if our younger generation were even aware of the distinguished service he had rendered.

Before we pause to consider what our national life has been and what it now is, let us survey our principal wars in the past, the objectives for which they were fought, and what the brave men who fought those wars have done for us. We won our liberty in the Revolutionary War; our unity in the Civil War; and World Wars I and II, though fought primarily in the name of freedom and democracy, gave us security from enemies from without, which enabled us to continue to live in freedom and under a democratic form of government.

Subsequent conflicts, such as those which have engaged us in Korea and Viet Nam, are being fought in the interests of our national security. I know that there are those who would say that some of these involvements are not necessary to that security, and that they are but attempts on our part to extend our principles of freedom and democracy to other peoples of the world, some of whom are not ready to receive them, and others of whom may not desire them.

In the larger context we should ask ourselves if we can maintain these principles in our own country alone and assure our security if at the same time rival philosophies and ideologies adverse to religion, individualism and human dignity are permitted to extend themselves throughout the world. We might query whether than to stand alone, might it not be better to become a part of a cohesive free world which stands for the worth of the individual, for religion, for law and order, and for those sterling qualities which melded together have produced the great country which we have become.

But perhaps today the greatest danger is not from beyond our shores. I am impressed in recent years by queries from those who have emigrated to this country who ask, "Do you Americans really appreciate the great country you have? We who have suffered under the bondage of other countries, who have experienced the fear that a knock at the door brings, who were afraid to give expression to honest thought, perhaps know better than you how much you already have." We should ask ourselves whether we are not in danger of losing from within those principles, virtues and strengths for which we have fought.

Let us look at some of the factors which have preceded and have resulted in the decline of other great civilizations:

- 1 Excessive spending by the civil government;
- 2 Unwillingness of young men to bear arms in defense of their country;
- 3 Overindulgence in luxury;
- 4 Wide-spread sexual immorality and easy divorce which destroy the integrity of family life;
- 5 The spread of effeminacy—girls looking and acting like men, men looking and acting like girls;
- 6 Disregard for religion.

Do some of you think I have described our situation today? Perhaps so, but the

great English historian, Edward Gibbon, listed those factors as the principal reasons for the decline and fall of the great political force which 1500 years ago was the Roman Empire; a force which had held the civilized world together for 500 years!

But you say it cannot happen here? It has been my lot to live among and to know two highly individualistic peoples, both possessing a wonderful sense of humor—the Chinese and the Cubans. Who would have dreamed them susceptible to the blandishments of the Communistic world? And perhaps they were not, but became the victims of subtle propaganda and ruthless organized force. Today both are controlled by dictatorships which forbid freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the ordering of one's individual economic and even family life.

You say it couldn't happen here? From the window of our apartment house less than two months ago I watched smoke and flames arise from a corridor which for a distance of almost two miles paralleled within two blocks one of the principal streets of our Nation's Capital. For some hours there was no law and order in the area; fires were set freely; looting took place on every hand; and young people defiantly and arrogantly carried through the streets their stolen gains. From this beautiful hillside it is difficult to envision the 14th Street corridor of Washington looking as a bombed-out city in Europe must have looked during the World War.

While the debt we owe to those who have fought in our wars is monumental and eternal and we give expression to that debt here today, in years to come our growing debt may be to the policemen and firemen who are on the firing line to protect our persons and our property from riot and violence.

You may ask yourselves what you as residents of the Bald Eagle Valley and its rugged countryside can do. Sheltered from the cynicism, pessimism and permissiveness of so much that today prevails in urban life, it may be that it is these country communities, spread across the nation, which will best preserve the standards, traditions, and virtues which have made our country great and whose youth imbued with those ideals will go forth into the great urban centers and into halls of government to act as a leaven of unselfishness and sacrifice in our national life. I know it is heartening for some of us to come back and see the American flag still proudly displayed and to experience the patriotism which is so associated with our country life; and to note the respect and admiration taught in our schools for the courage and wisdom of our forefathers who both on the field of battle and in our communities and legislative halls have fought to preserve and perpetuate those high ideals for which America stands.

"But," you ask, "what can we do? What should we do as individuals?" I began my talk with a quotation from Justice Holmes, a gallant warrior and a gallant gentleman, who throughout his lifetime asked himself those same questions. Thrice wounded in the Civil War, his thought and speech remained colored until the end by the experiences he had had in the war, and what is more important, his principles of self-sacrifice and devotion to country were expressed in action. I know many of you will recall his famous paragraph on the privilege of paying taxes, the price of our civilization; perhaps, not so many of you, the fact that upon his death, after making a bequest to his nephew, his next of kin, and bequests to a few friends, the remainder of his estate, amounting to over \$300,000 was left to "the government which gave me the opportunity for service, the United States government."

It is good for us to recall from time to time, as we have done here today, examples of self-sacrifice and patriotism. It is not with the idea that we individually and collectively can literally follow those examples, but there

are so many ways, available to all of us, in which we can do our part.

I have thought that one of our greatest individual weaknesses has been our reluctance to become involved. In the situation in which we find ourselves today, I believe that we are in great danger of losing our heritage, or a part of it, unless we become more willing to become involved. How do we become involved? One of the simplest ways, and one which so many neglect, is the exercise of our voting privilege. Another is to inform our representatives in the legislative halls of our state and nation about our thinking on current problems, and still another is to take an active part in the government of our own borough, township and county.

We must not forget our past, yet it doesn't suffice to look only to the past. Change in itself is not necessarily progress, yet we cannot progress without change. And so we must be prepared to show some flexibility and adaptability to ever accelerated change. We should not walk so fast, however, that we leave our souls behind. We must put on the brakes not only to bring to a halt those factors, which, if permitted to continue in operation must inevitably bring about our downfall, but we must actually reverse some of the trends which we have noted.

To reverse some of these trends we must reaffirm our enthusiasm and faith in the principles for which the veterans whom we honor here today have fought. In fighting for our country they learned that life is a profound and passionate thing; they shared the experience which set them apart; they experienced high motives above and beyond themselves.

We, at times, become discouraged as we read current literature, attend the present day cinema and theater and indulge ourselves in the comforts and affluence resulting from our technological development. We ask ourselves whether these unfavorable trends can be reversed. George Santayana, the great Harvard philosopher, has reminded us that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." If we continue to disregard the lessons which the past should have taught us, we may look forward to being required to learn those lessons afresh from new perils and new necessities which will again demand our self-sacrifice and self-denial.

In arranging this ceremony here today, you have taken one step in acknowledging our debt to the past. In our daily lives, in our speech and actions, we should continue to demonstrate that honor, duty and love of country are essential if we are to continue as free men and women. We must point out to the youth of this country that true freedom carries with it duties, obligations and responsibilities, and that the maintenance of a personal code of virtues and a sense of personal responsibility must be perpetuated on an individual basis. Edward Hale, a former Chaplain of the United States Senate, expressed his responsibility in these words, "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot 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."

RESIDENTS OF PENNSYLVANIA'S FOURTH DISTRICT QUERIED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have begun to circularize the residents of my constituency, the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, on some vital questions of our times.

I have unanimous consent to reprint the questions and my letter to my constituents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When I receive the answers and they are tabulated, I shall then ask leave to share the opinions of my constituents with my colleagues.

The letter and questions follow:

MAY I HAVE YOUR OPINIONS ON THESE VITAL ISSUES?

DEAR FRIEND: Once again, I am asking your help to do my job better.

Back in the old days, a Congressman represented at tops some 50,000 people and spent perhaps three months a year in Washington. It was a lot easier to visit constituents (perhaps on horseback) and get their opinions.

Today, Congressional Districts have grown to close to the half-million mark and Congressional sessions last a lot longer. (The First Session of the present 90th Congress was in session 340 days.)

Of course, I try to spend as much time as I can in my District Office at the First Federal Building, at Castor and Cottman Aves. There (as in Washington) my door is always open to constituents who need help, have a complaint, wish to express an opinion, or who just want to say "hello."

And then there's the mail, which I prize highly and look forward to. The mail is the Congressmen's lifeline to his district. But only a small percentage writes (I wish more would) and most letters deal with one specific subject.

Therefore, it is only through the means of this questionnaire that I can get the feelings of the folks in the Fourth Congressional District; get to know how you are feeling about the various important issues that govern our lives and fortunes, and even alter them.

Therefore, I am asking you to take a few minutes out of your busy life to complete this questionnaire and share your thoughts with me.

While all years are important, this year is more so because it is a Presidential year. I am more than interested in your views on the candidates. List your preference, and, please, don't forget to give the reason for your choice.

If you need more space, please attach a sheet of paper.

I am looking forward to hearing from you. Sincerely,

JOSHUA EILBERG.

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? JUNE 1968

(Please circle the answer (or answers) below which most closely approximate your feelings on the issues or fill in the spaces where that is appropriated.)

1. My choice for President of the United States (in order of preference) is:

- A. -----
B. -----
C. -----
D. -----

2. My reason(s) for my first choice:-----

3. Regardless of my choice above, I think that you, as my Congressman, would be able to work best with the following (in order of preference) to serve the interests of the people of the Fourth Congressional District:

- A. -----
B. -----
C. -----
D. -----

4. Realizing the importance of the Vietnam war both nationally and internationally, I think the United States should:-----

- A. Continue its present policy toward a negotiated peace while continuing military operations.
B. Continue its present policy toward a negotiated peace but halt all military operations in the interim.
C. Withdraw unconditionally from South Vietnam.

D. Intensify military operations, utilizing all weapons available, including nuclear.

E. (other)-----

(NOTE.—If a dramatic change has occurred in the Vietnam situation between the time of the preparation of this questionnaire and your receiving it, please express your feelings about U.S. commitments in Southeast Asia (and elsewhere in the world) in space "E".)

5. Recognizing the serious threat of inflation, I would prefer my Government to:

- A. Impose the 10 percent surcharge asked by the Administration accompanied by a substantial cut in spending demanded by the Congress.
B. Impose new taxes instead.
C. Do nothing.
D. (other)-----

(NOTE.—If the Congress has acted on the surcharge matter before you received this questionnaire, will you indicate your preference for future action in this field?)

6. I think the present Selective Service System is:

- A. Doing a good job and should be continued as it presently operates.
B. Antiquated and in need of a major reevaluation and revision.
C. (other)-----

7. Concerning gun control legislation, I think:

- A. Strict regulations are needed on registration of all arms and mail order sales of weapons.
B. Handguns should be regulated but not rifles and shotguns.
C. Nothing should be done because it would be an infringement on constitutional rights.
D. (other)-----

8. I think veterans' benefits are:

- A. All right the way they are now and nothing should be changed.
B. Too low to be realistic and increases are needed.

C. (other)-----

9. I think Social Security benefits are:

- A. Too low when one considers the high cost of living and the high cost of dying. Increases should be made in pensions, survivors' benefits and death benefits.
B. Satisfactory in their present form.

C. (other)-----

10. I recognize the importance of the space program:

- A. And I think it should continue without interruption.
B. But I think that it should be curtailed until the fiscal picture brightens.
C. But I think the money could be used for a better purpose at this time for programs for people.

D. (other)-----

11. Mental health is an important problem:

- A. But I think it is a province of the states and the Federal Government should not be involved.
B. And requires more and intensive participation by the Federal Government.

C. (other)-----

12. As an honest and law-abiding citizen, I am concerned with the rapidly growing crime rate in the Nation:

- A. But while law enforcement must be encouraged and aided, personal liberties must not be tampered with through the use of "bugging" and "tapping" devices.

B. And every available weapon must be given to law enforcement agencies, regardless of possible infringement upon personal liberties.

C. But "bugging" and "tapping" devices should be used only in the investigation of matters concerning national security and then only with judicial supervision.

D. (other)-----

13. I am concerned with the upheavals in our cities and I would favor combating the situation:

A. By strict, impartial and immediate police action to quell any disturbance, including the shooting of looters and arsonists.

B. By attacking the causes of the disturbances through the creation of new homes, jobs and educational opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed.

C. (other) _____

(NOTE.—As soon as the answers are compiled, I'll let you know the collective thinking of the folks in the Fourth Congressional District.)

Additional comments:

TREE SLAUGHTER ALONG THE HIGHWAYS

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Louis Hofferbert writes a perceptive column which appears in the Houston Chronicle. He is especially concerned about our environment and the importance of conserving it. On June 4, 1968, he wrote about a new policy adopted by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, which will cause the needless destruction of millions of trees along our highways. I agree that this policy is unnecessary, and I am glad that Mr. Hofferbert has stated the case against it so clearly and so well. The column follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 4, 1968]

TREE SLAUGHTER ALONG THE HIGHWAYS
(By Louis Hofferbert)

Nothing I can remember offhand ever made me quite so mad as a recent order by the U.S. Bureau of Roads now being carried out in Texas and other states to cut down millions of trees along America's highways. It is the most stupid and needless sacrifice of natural beauty our country has seen in many a day.

This order, was given no advance publicity. It was sort of slipped over on the people, perhaps because some bureaucrat figured it might stir up a real stink. I sure hope it does, and I will do my best to help.

The order is for all trees four inches in diameter or larger to be cut if they are within 30 feet of the pavement. It applies to all federal aid roads where the speed limit is 50 miles an hour or higher. The reason is said to be highway safety. That is, to keep some idiot from killing himself by ramming into a tree when he drives so fast he can't stay on the road.

To support this absurdity, a study of 507 fatal single-car accidents is cited. The figures show 13 of the 507 were killed when their cars hit trees. To put this in perspective, remember the 507 is only a tiny fraction of the drivers who have accidents, and an almost invisible fraction of the number who drive. So it is this 13, or about 2.5 percent of an almost invisible fraction of this country's drivers, that is supposed to justify destruction of millions of trees.

Now, I don't want anybody to be killed if it can be helped. But this would not make sense if it guaranteed the 13 drunks or speeders would be saved. And it does not do that, of course. It only makes them find another way to kill themselves.

And they will manage that some way, with or without trees, like the other 494 covered by the study.

The study did not set out the reasons for the 507 accidents. But any safety expert can tell you nearly all single-car accidents are brought on by speed, drinking, illegal passing and other things that are the direct fault of the driver. Very, very few are caused by mechanical failures or things the driver couldn't help.

So it boils down simply to a matter of sacrificing these millions of trees to maybe (remember, it's all maybe) save the lives of a few people who are a constant menace to every moderate, sensible driver on the road.

I hope this idiotic tree-slashing program makes everybody as mad as it makes me, which is plenty. I hope you all write or wire or phone our congressman and senator and ask him to get this senseless destruction stopped in a hurry.

And I hope somebody in Congress gets mad enough not only to demand and end to the tree slaughter, but demand that we be told the name of the bureaucrat who put out such an order in the first place. I think the people of this country have a right to know who is responsible.

What's more, even without knowing who he is, I hope he gets fired so far out of his bureaucratic swivel chair he never finds the way back.

A GOLD MEDAL TO HONOR REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1968, I introduced a bill, H.R. 16532, to authorize the President of the United States to present a gold medal to the widow of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

That bill provided for the coining of duplicates in bronze to be sold by the Treasury Department at a price to cover the cost of manufacture.

I have now redrafted my bill and today I am introducing a new version on behalf of myself and our colleagues DANIEL E. BUTTON, JAMES C. CORMAN, JOHN G. DOW, BOB ECKHARDT, DON EDWARDS, DONALD M. FRASER, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, BERTRAM L. PODELL, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, JAMES H. SCHEUER, and LIONEL VAN DEERLIN. This new version provides for the coining of duplicates in bronze of the same size as the gold medal to be presented to Mrs. King and duplicates in bronze of the one and five-sixteenths size. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish these duplicates to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Fund at Morehouse College at cost so that they can provide them to the public to raise money.

While the Government will pay for the cost of the gold medal to be presented to Mrs. King, no cost to the Government will be involved in the production of the bronze duplicates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that choosing the traditional manner of honoring Dr. King—that is, with a national medal—would be a fine tribute to one of the truly

great leaders of our Nation. Martin Luther King was a man who insisted that the way to change our society was through peaceful, nonviolent means. We owe him the respect due those who preach peace when peace is not popular, when violence begins to be the more attractive alternative to silence.

I am pleased to note that Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Wallace endorsed this approach to honoring Dr. King in his May 4, 1968 address to the Metropolitan New York Numismatic Convention. I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will schedule early hearings on this bill.

A LOADED CENSUS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about there being a loaded census for 1970 unless the Congress moves speedily to bring the degree of questions into a sensible range.

It is absolutely ridiculous that 120 questions are being proposed for the people of this country to answer. This is just another bureaucratic invasion of privacy that should not be tolerated.

To me, it would appear that the bureaucrats thinking up these questions would be better off by devoting their time to the problem of less spending and to the enforcement of law and order.

I am introducing a bill to remove the penalty provision and bring the questions into proper focus.

The Johnson City Press-Chronicle, on Monday evening, June 3, 1968, speaks out in an editorial on the question of a loaded census which I would like to share with the readers of the RECORD:

A LOADED CENSUS

Unless Congress puts up a roadblock, the 1970 census will contain more than 120 questions, all of which the individual must answer or else face a fine or jail sentence.

Rep. Jackson E. Betts of Ohio is continuing his campaign to knock out all but a few of these questions. We hope he will be successful.

Like Mr. Betts, we do not see why the people should be required to furnish their government information such as:

- (1) income dollar by dollar, from all sources including public assistance, alimony, unemployment and disability insurance, pensions and investments.
- (2) the value of property or the amount of rent paid;
- (3) educational, marital, employment and military history;
- (4) with whom bathroom and kitchen facilities are shared;
- (5) a long list of household items possessed, including dishwasher, television, radios, automobiles, and second home;

Mr. Betts emphasizes that the constitutional purpose of the census is to count people and that the gathering of more than 100 other facts about them is a secondary and unnecessary objective. He notes that in 1960 the Census Bureau failed to count 5.7 million Americans and predicts a greater undercount in 1970 unless the forms are simplified and most questions put on a voluntary basis.

To give you an idea of what is coming, consider these specific questions:

Have you been married more than once?
Did your first marriage end because of death of wife or husband?

Where did you live in April, 1962?

What was your major activity in April, 1962?

Place of birth of parents?

What is the value of this (your) property?

What is your rent?

Last year, 1966, did sales of crops, livestock and farm products amount to?

Did you work any time last week?

One hour was set aside in the House of Representatives recently to hear many congressmen concerned with reform not only in the 1970 census, but also in the census of agriculture set for 1969 and the census of business now in progress. Twenty-eight members of the House and Senate are sponsoring bills to remove the penalty provision from all but seven essential population questions. These are: name, address, age, sex, race, head of household, and visitors in home at time of census.

It appears to us that these seven categories cover all information to which the government is entitled. If you agree, tell your congressman.

NEW PROCEDURE WOULD REDUCE HOSPITAL COSTS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since medical-care costs cut across the whole spectrum of our society, I think my colleagues will be particularly interested in reading about one of the successful steps that has been taken to minimize the impact of this expense, recently announced by the Melrose-Wakefield Hospital, Melrose, Mass.

This new procedure would reduce hospital costs and lighten the serious burden of overcrowding, and its implications for adoption on a national scale are indeed worthy of careful attention.

A new procedure designed to shorten the hospitalization of patients admitted for minor surgery which could free as many as 645,000 beds annually on a national basis has been announced by the Melrose-Wakefield Hospital.

The plan, introduced at the hospital in December of 1967, and tried on over 200 surgical patients could save patients, if adopted nationally, as much as \$133 million annually in hospital and associated costs.

According to Mr. Nellis, general director of the Melrose-Wakefield Hospital Association, the new plan, called surgical day care, will reduce hospital costs for patients, while freeing beds and other hospital facilities for those more seriously ill.

In addition, Mr. Nellis said, nursing workloads will be lightened, meaning those hospitalized for serious ailments will be given more time, as needed, by the nursing staffs.

The new Melrose-Wakefield Hospital procedure calls for patients undergoing minor surgery to report to the hospital for laboratory and other tests on the day of their operation.

Upon completion of the testing, they will be brought to the operating theater,

where they will be prepared for surgery.

When surgery has been completed, the patient's condition will be evaluated by his physician. If recovery time beyond a nominal period in the recovery room is required, the patient will be admitted to the hospital. If not, the patient is sent home under the care of his physician with postoperative instructions.

During the first 6 months of the program at the Melrose-Wakefield hospital, a total of \$15,000 of projected hospital costs would have been assessed under standard surgical-hospitalization procedures. The combination of presurgical and postoperative procedures saved each patient approximately \$66.

Mr. Nellis stated that if the plan were adopted nationally patients and their insurance companies could save over \$133 million annually, and free 18,000 hospital beds currently used by patients undergoing minor surgery.

Mr. Nellis said:

This system is very much in line with modern medical surgical techniques. Surgical patients are now on their feet within hours of surgery. This swift ambulation has been found to aid patient morale and speed healing. We further feel that given the opportunity to recover at home, patients will add another dimension to their state of mind which will further increase recovery speed.

The Melrose-Wakefield Hospital general director stressed the obvious economic gains possible in the freeing of more than a half-million hospital beds annually.

He said:

This Surgical Day Care, as we call it, could save communities in every part of the nation millions of dollars in hospital building programs. As the national life-expectancy figures rise, and Medicaid and Medicare are used increasingly by our senior citizens, hospital beds will be at a premium.

He pointed out that the freeing of beds by patients undergoing simple surgical procedures would reduce costs to the hospital, to the individual, and to the insurance organization involved which could, he noted, reduce insurance premiums.

He said:

In population centers, the need for new hospitals or additions to existing buildings could become less pressing, or possibly, unnecessary. At the least, it would free scarce hospital beds for those seriously ill and for those undergoing surgery.

Mr. Nellis emphasized the need for medical approval before the discharge of any patient who had been anesthetized for a surgical procedure.

JIM BATTIN REPORTS

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, enclosed is my report from Washington for June 14, 1968, which I include in today's Extensions of Remarks:

JIM BATTIN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

DEAR FRIENDS: During hearings of the Ways and Means Committee this past week, world trade in farm products had the spot-

light. We discussed wheat and meat extensively after hearing testimony from the Department of Agriculture which supported a more liberal trade policy in all goods. Secretary Freeman led the USDA officials and threatened that our agricultural export trade will suffer unless we maintain liberal import quotas on foreign products. As usual when foreign trade is being discussed between Freeman and Congress, meat imports into the United States came up.

Mr. Freeman and members of his Department defended the current meat import law—which incidentally hasn't been used since it was enacted in 1964—and discounted the impact that more than a billion pounds of foreign beef has had on our cattle market. They also supported the new International Grains Agreement, even though other testimony showed that the Agreement will mean reduced wheat acreage in the United States next year. Overall, I would say Freeman and his men did the job they were sent to do, namely to protect the Johnson Administration's trade policies that have contributed heavily to our gold drain.

Agricultural trade between the U.S. and foreign countries has done nothing to contribute to the gold drain. In fact, our agricultural trade is the only area that has consistently brought cash back to our shores. But, as in all past years of the Freeman Administration, agricultural exports are being placed on the block to gain advantages for other trade items. Since Montana depends greatly on wheat exports to the Orient and since the domestic cattle market means so much to our economy, I am worried—after hearing from Secretary Freeman—that the state is in for trouble this coming year. In what is sure to be Freeman's last year in office, we may have the worst year yet for farmers. The Secretary has already completed plans to reduce wheat acreages without any assurance that higher prices will make up the lack of volume. He also is firmly committed to doing nothing about controlling imports of meat. From the testimony submitted by Agriculture officials, it even appears that our Department will defend the import of substandard meats into this country. Consider this in the light of the recent pressure that the Department put on Congress for a strict meat inspection law for American producers.

On wheat exports.—Our farmers are being forced to cut back acreage 10 to 15% from last year's crop. We had a wheat surplus last year and kept prices low. This year when less wheat will be grown, however, we cannot in turn expect prices to rise because the Department of Agriculture also figures that wheat exports will decrease. During the current year when we had a sizable surplus in wheat, U.S. farmers exported 750 million bushels. Next year wheat export could go as low as 650 million bushels. Mr. Freeman admitted that exports will be lower in the coming year, but he refused to be pinned down on the exact amount. This means that wheat producers will experience the same thing as a surplus next year because the domestic market will again be overloaded.

On meat imports.—Although more than a billion pounds of frozen meat was brought into our country last year, the Secretary took pride in the fact that the United States had never imposed quotas under the Meat Import Law of 1964. The wide open policies of meat imports causes several problems, not the least of which is the depression on the U.S. cattle market. Besides this, we have meat that is slaughtered and processed under standards that are not as strict as those we require of local producers. Although there is no direct evidence of contaminated meats in the imports, we still have the fact that our producers must put more money into processing meat than their foreign competitors. If rigid standards are required of our producers, how can we justify allowing meat of any lower standards to be brought into our country. Regardless of requirements, agricul-

ture officials have opposed any attempt to require foreign meat processors to label their products. The undisputed fact remains that vast amounts of meat are being brought into our country and are being sold on the meat counters without any identification of where it came from or what standards of cleanliness were used in processing.

Sincerely,

JIM BATTIN.

INDOCTRINATION RATHER THAN EDUCATION?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as early as 1962 I introduced legislation designed to curb abuses in some of the testing programs conducted in our schools. At that time and on occasion since then I have pointed out excesses in testing programs, excesses which amounted to "brainpicking."

The information gained can be and is valuable to the person intent on directing the student rather than helping the student find his own way. This direction can influence the vocation, occupation, beliefs, moral standards, and mores of the individual. The danger is in the control of many by a few working subtly.

In a free society the child and the student should be taught to think for himself and not as others would have him think.

As an example of the probing nature of these tests, I submit a recent one which was given junior and senior high school students in Utah. It was titled, Student Attitude Inventory, Utah State University, Department of Sociology:

STUDENT ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Begin by answering the first 10 questions in the Identification Number section of score sheet.

1. Last grade in school completed (Including this year): (1) 8 grades or less, (2) 9th, (3) 10th, (4) 11th, (5) 12th.

2. Your age group: (1) 13 years or less; (2) 14-15; (3) 16-17; (4) 18-19; (5) 20-21; (6) 22-25; (7) 26-30; (8) 30 or over.

3. Sex: (1) Male; (2) Female.

4. Race: (1) Oriental-American; (2) Negro-American; (3) Anglo-American; (4) Spanish-American; (5) Other.

5. At the present time I am living with:

- (1) Both my mother and father.
- (2) My mother and stepfather.
- (3) My father and stepmother.
- (4) Mother alone.
- (5) Father alone.
- (6) Other adult guardian.
- (7) Alone.
- (8) With friends
- (9) Away from home.

6. How many children are in your family:

- (1) I am the only child.
- (2) 2-3.
- (3) 4.
- (4) 5.
- (5) 6 or more.

7. What category comes closest to the occupation of your father (or whoever earns the living in your family other than your mother).

(1) Clerical, sales or related workers (bookkeeper, secretary, clerks, salesmen, insurance agents, etc.).

(2) Craftsman or foreman (electrician, carpenter, etc.)

(3) Laborer (janitor, unskilled worker, helpers, farm laborer, etc.)

(4) Semi-skilled worker (bus driver, assembly-line worker, etc.)

(5) Farmer (owner, farm operator).

(6) Professional (teacher, doctor, lawyer, engineer, etc.)

(7) Proprietor or manager (public official, merchant, executive, etc.)

(8) Service (policemen, barber, cook, beauty operator).

(9) Other

8. What category comes closest to the occupation of your mother?

(1) Clerical, sales or related workers (bookkeeper, secretary, clerks, salesmen, insurance agents, etc.)

(2) Laborer (janitor, unskilled worker, helpers, farm laborer, etc.)

(3) Craftsman, or foreman (electrician, carpenter, etc.)

(4) Semi-skilled worker (bus driver, assembly-line worker, etc.)

(5) Farmer (owner, farm operator).

(6) Proprietor or manager (public official, merchant, executive, etc.)

(7) Professional (teacher, doctor, lawyer, engineer, etc.)

(8) Service (policemen, barber, cook, beauty operator).

(9) Other

(10) She doesn't work outside the house.

9. Do you work at a job:

- (1) no.
- (2) 1 to 5 hours a week.
- (3) 6 to 10 hours a week.
- (4) 11 to 15 hours a week.
- (5) 16 to 20 hours a week.
- (6) 21 or over hours a week.

10. What is your religious preference?

- (0) None.
- (1) Baptist.
- (2) Greek Orthodox.
- (3) Jewish.
- (4) LDS (Mormon).
- (5) Lutheran.
- (6) Presbyterian.
- (7) Roman Catholic.
- (8) Other Protestant.
- (9) Other.

Go to No. 1 in the General Section on answer sheet. Notice you use Only Odd numbers.

1. Are you enrolled in a regular week day religious training program? (a) Yes, (b) No.

3. Do you participate in your church young people's organizations (such as MYF, MIA, Walther League, Westminster Fellowship, etc.) (a) No, (b) Occasionally, (c) Regularly.

5. Do you attend church? (a) Hardly ever or never, (b) Less than once a month, (c)

Once or twice a month, (d) Generally every week.

7. On your last report card what grades did you receive? (a) Mostly A's, (b) Mostly B's, (c) Mostly C's, (d) Mostly below C.

9. How long have you lived in this community? (a) All my life, (b) Last five or more years but not all my life, (c) One to two years, (d) Three to four years.

11. Would you like to live in this community the rest of your life? (a) Definitely not, (b) I don't think so, (c) Wouldn't care much one way or the other, (d) I think so, (e) Definitely yes.

13. Do you feel that you are really a part of this community? (a) Don't feel I really belong, (b) Feel included in some ways but not in others, (c) I feel included in most ways, (d) I feel I'm really a part of the community.

15. In many communities service clubs have programs aimed at worthwhile leisure time activities for young people. Which of the following clubs' activities have you participated in most? (a) Lions Club, (b) Kiwanis Club, (c) Elks Club, (d) Rotary Club, (e) None that I know of.

17. Have you ever been picked up by the police for anything other than a traffic violation? (a) Yes, (b) No.

TRUE-FALSE SECTION

This section deals with differences in feeling about religion. If a statement is True or Mostly True, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed T(a). If a statement is False or not Usually True, as Applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column F(b).

- T F 19. I sometimes feel disloyal to my parents because I cannot entirely accept their religious beliefs.
- T F 21. My church is too strict.
- T F 23. Education has led me to question some teachings of my church.
- T F 25. It is hard to reconcile science with religion.
- T F 27. Although basically I believe in my religion, my faith often wavers.
- T F 29. I believe in the basic teachings of my church and attend regularly.
- T F 31. I believe firmly in the teachings of my church.
- T F 33. I never doubted the teachings of the church.
- T F 35. I believe that religious faith is better than logic for solving life's important problems.
- T F 37. I believe that our fate in the hereafter depends on how we behave on earth.
- T F 39. I believe God knows our every thought and movement.
- T F 41. I believe God controls everything that happens everywhere.
- T F 43. I think my prayers are answered.
- T F 45. I believe that religion is of little use in present-day society.
- T F 47. I am indifferent to the subject of religion.
- T F 49. I have little use for religion.
- T F 51. Religion has not kept pace with the times.
- T F 53. Religion has too often been used to promote prejudice.
- T F 55. If you are a strong person, you do not need religion.
- T F 57. Promoting a better world is more important to me than religion is.

Read each item carefully and mark on your answer sheet quickly the spaces representing the phrase which best expresses your feeling about the statement. Whenever possible, let your own personal experience determine your answer. Do not spend much time on any item. If in doubt, mark the phrase which seems most nearly to express your present feeling about the statement. Work rapidly. Be sure to answer every item.

[SA stands for strongly agree; A stands for agree; ? stands for undecided; D stands for disagree; SD stands for strongly disagree]

a	b	c	d	e		SA	A	?	D	SD	85. So far as ideas are concerned, parents and children live in different worlds.
SA	A	?	D	SD	59. Home is the most pleasant place in the world.						
SA	A	?	D	SD	61. Parents expect too much from their children.						
SA	A	?	D	SD	63. One ought to discuss important plans with the members of his family.						In Thinking About Your Home Community and Law Enforcement
SA	A	?	D	SD	65. One cannot find as much understanding at home as elsewhere.	SA	A	?	D	SD	87. No one in this community is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.
SA	A	?	D	SD	67. One owes his greatest obligation to his family.	SA	A	?	D	SD	89. Most so-called community issues are really not of much interest to the young people of the community.
SA	A	?	D	SD	69. It is hard to keep a pleasant disposition at home.	SA	A	?	D	SD	91. Police could do more to help people.
SA	A	?	D	SD	71. The joys of family life are much over-rated.	SA	A	?	D	SD	93. The police have it in for young people.
SA	A	?	D	SD	73. One's parents usually treat him fairly and sensibly.	SA	A	?	D	SD	95. You must always be on the lookout for policemen who want to do you dirt.
SA	A	?	D	SD	75. One feels most contented at home.	SA	A	?	D	SD	97. Policemen try to trick young people.
SA	A	?	D	SD	77. Parents are inclined to be too old-fashioned in their ideas.	SA	A	?	D	SD	99. Policemen are pretty nice guys.
SA	A	?	D	SD	79. I just can't talk to my parents about personal problems.	SA	A	?	D	SD	101. Boys like most policemen.
SA	A	?	D	SD	81. Members of the family are too curious about one's personal affairs.	SA	A	?	D	SD	103. Girls like most policemen.
SA	A	?	D	SD	83. Parents are too particular about the kind of company one keeps.	SA	A	?	D	SD	

Thinking of Schools Now

Table with 2 columns of remarks. Left column items 105-139, right column items 141-181. Each item includes a code (SA, A, ?) and a description.

183. In terms of occupation categories I expect to be:

- (a) Clerical, sales or related worker (book-keeper, secretary, clerk, salesmen, insurance agent, etc.).
(b) Craftsman or foreman (electrician, carpenter, etc.).

- (c) Laborer (janitor, unskilled worker, helpers, farm laborer, etc.).
(d) Semi-skilled worker (bus driver, assembly-line worker, etc.).
(e) Farmer (owner, farm operator).
(2a) Professional (teacher, doctor, lawyer, engineer, etc.).

- (2b) Proprietor or manager (public official, merchant, executive, etc.).
(2c) Service (policeman, barber, cook, beauty operator).
(2d) Other.

[Choose one of the following]

Table with 7 columns of survey questions and 7 columns of response options (a-g). Questions include 'I like or dislike Americans (U.S. white) enough that I—', 'I like or dislike Japanese enough that I—', etc.

Now that you have done some thinking about several aspects of your life please briefly answer the following:

- 1. The best thing about my home community is:
2. What my home community needs most is:
3. The best thing about the police is:
4. The worst thing about the police is:
5. The best thing about religion is:
6. The worst thing about religion is:
7. The best thing about our school is:
8. The worst thing about our school is:
9. The best thing about my parents is:
10. The worst thing about my parents is:

But since its modest beginning, the Tribune has grown to one of the great newspapers of the country. It is not uncommon for the Tribune to run 120 full size news pages including color advertisements and color photos.

From its beginning, the Tribune has always been a hard-hitting paper. One of its earliest editors, Joseph Medill, who took over as editor and publisher in the summer of 1855, set the guideline and tone for the character of the Tribune. He wrote in his editorials and preached to his staff:

... tell the truth fearlessly, criticize whatever is wrong, and denounce whatever is rotten in the administration of State and local affairs.

Medill's philosophy set down more than 100 years ago has been the guideline for the paper ever since.

The Tribune has been the leader in many journalistic areas. It was the only paper to publish in full the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates and many credit the attention that the front-page treatments of the debates received throughout the country with vaulting Lincoln into the national limelight.

During the Civil War the Sunday Tribune began publishing and was one of the few papers to publish on Sunday because, at that time, many clergy

thought it was irreligious for a newspaper to be published on Sunday. But because the Tribune was the only major newspaper publishing on Sunday, its accounts of the Civil War became cherished and were highly sought after throughout the country. When the great fire of 1871 swept Chicago, it destroyed the Tribune's printing plant and virtually every piece of equipment and all of the records kept by the paper. But although the fire destroyed the physical plant, it did not destroy the Tribune's dream and the paper rebuilt virtually from scratch.

Mr. Speaker, as a native of Chicago, I salute the Tribune as it begins its 123d year of publication and services to the people of Chicago.

CHICAGO TRIBUNE CELEBRATES 122D BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1847, the Chicago Tribune was first published. The baby publication bore little resemblance to what it has become today. The Tribune's first edition was only four pages of news and advertisements printed on a hand press. At the time of its publication, Chicago had only 16,854 residents.

STATEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi Cattlemen's Association has prepared a most convincing statement outlining the crucial need for legislation to

insure the stability of our domestic beef industry.

The statement, provided me by J. Q. DeMerville, president of the association, and David R. Pingrey, executive vice-president, contains a cogent summary of the plight of our Mississippi producers and a just solution to the dilemma confronting our beef industry.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to the statement, which follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO CORRECT INADEQUACIES IN THE MEAT IMPORT LAW OF 1964

This statement detailing inadequacies in the present meat import control law and recommending needed corrections in same is submitted by the Mississippi Cattlemen's Association, a 4,376 paid-member organization headquartered at Macon, Mississippi.

Mississippi's beef cattle industry is cow-calf oriented, and with 1,204,000 breeding age females, we rank ninth nationally in this category. Our primary product is a feeder calf which until recently moved out of our producers' hands into the nation's beef production system through two main avenues of sales. The calves, depending on weight and grade, were sought in approximate equal numbers by grain farmers for feedlot finishing and by grassland cattlemen for additional grazing. At the completion of the latter group's grazing period, many of these grassers went directly to slaughter, filling the need of a major segment of this nation's meat demand, i.e., the essential lean beef ingredient of our vast variety of process meats. Whether these grass cattle went directly to the packer or were purchased for feedlot grain finishing, they were favorably considered by two types of potential purchasers and were known as "two-way cattle." It is an established business rule; the more potential buyers for a product, the stronger price structure that product enjoys, but, unfortunately, today's international meat trade has virtually removed the two-way play previously enjoyed by lean American cattle.

The reason is obvious. These grass cattle going into processed forms of meat require boning of virtually the entire carcass. This process utilizes skilled American laborers who justly demand and receive a fair wage. Unfortunately, there is a segment of American business that cares little for the welfare of American labor or for the investments of independent, tax-paying American cattlemen. They have, therefore, to their advantage incorporated into our processed meat manufacturing system frozen, boneless beef, a product prepared by foreign labor working at a fractional wage scale of its American counterpart, and so deliverable at American ports at a lower price than our domestic, higher quality, more wholesome product.

What this influx of frozen, boneless beef has done to the American "two-way" beef animal is record. What the removal of one entire purchasing segment of Mississippi's feeder calf customers has done to the cattle industry in this state is well known to Production Credit office managers and to bankers with cattle money out.

Mississippi has suffered in another way. Any cattle system centered around production of calves must certainly have as a major byproduct the sale of cows and bulls whose breeding efficiency is sub-standard. These animals are also primarily utilized as some form of process meat, and so obviously the price structure on this class of cattle has also been damaged.

Mississippi cattlemen are aware we cannot embrace isolationist policies and do not suggest the removal of the American market from foreign beef producers. We do, however, suggest a reappraisal of the law under which

these beef imports are admitted and the enactment of corrective legislation necessary to insure this nation's future supply of high quality, wholesome meat.

Beef cattle production over the past several years has been a marginal business at best with several severe depressions a matter of record. While the beef import situation cannot be solely blamed for the dreary, current, economic level of the beef cattle business, certainly it has been an over all depressant with disastrous immediate effects when periods of peak imports coincided with weakening domestic markets. This Association, therefore, respectfully requests and recommends a five-point modification of the 1964 law:

1. We believe using 1959-63 as a base period projects an unreal image for average imports, for 1963 was one of the all time peak beef import years. We, therefore, recommend as more realistic a base period composed of the years 1958-62.

2. We further believe the records show the inclusion of the 10% allowable import margin has in fact simply given foreign producers a 10% larger share of our market than was intended. We believe they programme their exports, brazenly using this allowance originally designed solely as an over-ride, for their convenience.

3. We have observed further, importers make no attempt to regulate their annual flow of beef to coincide with our domestic production peaks and valleys, but rather, jam our ports as it fits their benefit with resulting periodic chaos to the American cattle market. We, therefore, believe an annual allowable import quota embraces too long a time unit and recommend the quota be broken into quarterly periods.

4. The current law includes only fresh, chilled or frozen meat, but our Congressional leaders need only refer to the devious "Colby Cheese" incident of dairy import history to realize we have naively left a vulnerable opening in our meat import quota law. To correct this inadequacy, we urge the inclusion of canned, cooked, and cured meat in our modified meat import quota law.

5. Every American is anxious for the day when our young men in uniform are not only out of combat areas but returned to these United States. Until that time, we urge the very best food possible for these heroic troops and believe any foreign-purchased meat fed to our American boys must logically be charged against the allowable quota.

We believe the time has come when our Congressional leaders must take a stand on this matter. Either our import quota law will be allowed to continue furnishing only token protection for American skilled labor, American beef cattle farmers, and American consumers, or a realistic statute will be placed on the books more favorable to our international balance of payments and our tax payers.

Allow the present meat import situation to continue to the benefit of meat importers, or enact reform legislation to insure continuation in the strengthening of an American beef industry based on hope of reasonable return to investment. On this decision rests the meat selection in the American consumer's future.

A MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the week that followed our celebration of Memorial Day 1968, we found ourselves

once again experiencing a catastrophe of such impact that we must perforce pause to dwell on how we as a nation can rid ourselves of those forces of hate, distrust and fear which pervade our society.

I am drawn to the thoughts of Allen J. Martin, a veteran of World War II, in a speech which he gave in my district commemorating this Memorial Day, and in which he spoke of the urgent need "to create stronger confidence and unity among our own people."

Allen Martin and I both served with the 3d Marine Division during World War II. We landed on Guam and Iwo Jima together. Mr. Martin now resides in La Puente, Calif., and is a charter member of Puente Post No. 1944, having served as its commander during 1954-55. He is also a former commander of the 6th District Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I know Allen Martin and believe that his tribute to those American servicemen who have been killed in our wars has real meaning for each of us today. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit Mr. Martin's speech for inclusion in the RECORD, as follow:

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE

We are assembled here today to commemorate our honored dead. This brief moment of retreat from the busy work-day world is symbolic of our respect and the spirit of comradeship we have for all the departed brothers and sons and friends who were our nation's defenders.

These honored dead fought the enemies who sought to destroy our freedoms. They helped win the victories. And today we, the living, are everlastingly indebted to them, for we are the inheritors of the high ideals which they defended—and for which many died.

Who were these men? Each of us can identify some of them as personal acquaintances. But here we are not so concerned with the names of individuals, nor of their status in life.

As the author—John Ingalls—declared: "In the democracy of the dead all men at last are equal. There is neither rank or station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave." That is so true. The only thing important to us is that all our honored dead were loyal and brave. They were our flesh and blood. They left their homes and their loved ones to answer our nation's need. They were the Protestants and the Catholics of our land. They were the gentiles and Jews, the white man and the black, the native sons and the foreign born. They were rich, the poor, the educated and the untutored. But all those differences mattered not one whit because, foremost, they were Americans and they fought shoulder to shoulder with us against the common foe.

If names are to clarify anything in the final analysis—these men were the Kellys and the Cohns, the Olsens and the Smiths, the Orgetas and the Betheljowskies. They were our men. They loved life—just as you and I. And so, to the departed heroes we can repeat the words spoken by a Marine Corps chaplain as he stood before a row of flag-draped bodies on an island in the Pacific during World War II. The chaplain said simply: "You men who gave your lives were of all races and religions—but you were our comrades. You served your country well. You shall always be with us. God bless you. Amen."

Our tribute to the honored dead must not be limited to mere words. Deeds will be better payment of the great debt we owe them. These brave men believed in our way of life. They fought and died for their convictions. We must not sell them short. We must carry

on their struggle with the unconquerable determination, intelligence and readiness to defend our glorious freedom heritage.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, "It is for us, the living, to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought so nobly advanced . . . it is for us to resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." And, in the words of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States: "We honor the dead by helping the living."

Each of us can pledge himself to a sincere, wholehearted crusade to help make more abundantly real for everyone the fundamental ideals of our American way of life. How can we do that?

We the peoples of all nations want peace. So each of us can help make world peace a reality. But we must start right here at home.

First, we must create stronger confidence and unity among our own people. To do that we should create better understanding with our neighbors—especially those who may be different from ourselves. To do that we should rid our minds of petty jealousies, suspicions, fears and hatred. Then we should extend our influence—to counteract those who, for selfish reasons, work against universal harmony.

All that is possible because each of us has a mind and a tongue. With those instruments of decision and expression we can become leaders for a coordinated national and worldwide educational buildup. That educational process can create more perfect justice between men. It can strengthen and extend mutual trust and friendship among all peoples who want to believe in the mighty power of freedom. Only through taking those steps can we prove to ourselves and others that the American way of thinking and living is sincere and best.

Yes, my friends, that campaign can complete the monument honoring our brave departed comrades. But it must be a monument of deeds and achievements. The very foundation stones or our monument must be unity of effort and loyalty to the fundamental American proclamations of human worth and dignity. And inscribed upon the monument we are to make complete through greater service should be our pledge to perpetuate the high ideals for which so many have fought and died—the ideals so important to all freedom loving peoples.

That, my friends, can be the truly noble and positive fulfillment and promise to honor the dead by helping the living. And, now, with that task before us, let us seal our pledge with these few final words of assurance. Let us declare to our departed comrades:

"Fear not that you have died in vain,

The torch you gave us, we hold high.

The task is ours—the goal unchanged:

And freedom's light shall never die."

**A FORTHRIGHT STATEMENT BY
SECRETARY FREEMAN BEFORE
HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
IN SUPPORT OF BILL SPONSORED
BY 122 MEMBERS OF
HOUSE TO EXPAND THE FOOD
STAMP PROGRAM**

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the Members of the House of Representatives, and particularly the 121 Members from 30 States other than mine who have joined me in sponsoring legislation to expand the food stamp pro-

gram, will want to read the forthright statement made this morning before the House Committee on Agriculture in support of this legislation by the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Secretary Freeman initiated this program 7 years ago in an imaginative and courageous use of section 32 funds. His predecessor could have used the same funds in the same manner to institute such a program 14 years ago, when I first proposed a food stamp program.

Under an amendment written by the Senate last year, it is no longer possible to use any section 32 funds for the food stamp program. Only direct appropriations can be used. But the top amount Congress can appropriate for the food stamp program for the coming fiscal year is only \$225,000,000, and that is probably not enough even to cover the projects now in operation, because participation in those areas is increasing. So we must amend the basic Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit higher appropriations, and that is what 122 of us in the House have now proposed in the legislation we have introduced.

I hope many more Members of the House will let me add their names to the cosponsorship list so that we can demonstrate to the Committee on Agriculture the extent of support in the House for expanding this program into all of the 400 additional counties now seeking it, and eventually into every county in the country. At present, 1,027 counties have this program—about one-third of the counties in the United States.

TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY FREEMAN

Mr. Speaker, following is the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman to the Committee on Agriculture this morning, endorsing the bills I introduced for myself and 121 cosponsors:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, JUNE 12, 1968

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I welcome the opportunity to meet with the Committee.

Today, I want, once again, to report to the Committee on the status of the Department's consumer food programs. I want to make some general long-range recommendations for consideration by the Committee.

And, I want to specifically discuss the funding of the Food Stamp Program.

This matter cannot be discussed in isolation from the larger issue of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that Committee members are aware that I have publicly deplored the emotionalism surrounding the recent public debate on this matter. It is an emotionalism that is obscuring both the complexity of the problem and the progress that has been made to provide food assistance to the poor.

But, while I deplore that emotionalism, I want also to say: More needs to be done; the problem of hunger—at times, for some poor families—and of malnutrition—for larger numbers of poor families for longer periods of time—are a present-day fact.

The ultimate goal, the positive commitment, must be: No American—regardless of race, creed, color, or material possessions—should go hungry or suffer from severe malnourishment.

Therefore, before presenting recommendations on food stamp funding, I want to:

Summarize the change in scope, emphasis, and accomplishments in the Department's consumer food programs in the decade of the 1960's—the USDA programs directly concerned with hunger and malnutrition;

Project for the Committee what can be, and should be, done with the Good Stamp Program—if it is to make its maximum contribution to banishing hunger and malnutrition in the years ahead.

I shall conclude by recommending what we can and should do about food stamp funding now.

During the decade of the sixties:

The concept of family food assistance programs has shifted from distributing a few surplus food items to increasing food purchasing power through the use of food stamps; and from supplementing the families' food supply to providing a more nearly adequate diet.

The administration of these food assistance efforts has changed from a passive offering to State and local government—"food is available if you are willing to distribute it"—to active encouragement, and the promise that Federal authority will intervene if necessary to make food available to families.

The concept of child feeding programs has been enlarged from the narrow view of providing a noonday meal service to one that includes school breakfasts and feeding programs outside the school system—with greater emphasis on reaching the poor school and the poor child.

These broader, more positive, concepts—and the more positive Federal direction and leadership and financial support—have resulted in substantive and significant progress.

But, they also demonstrate the scope and depth of the further commitment that must be made if—someday and in the not too distant future—it can be truly said that there is no hunger in America.

In child feeding: In 1960:

12.8 million children were eating balanced lunches under the National School Lunch Program. About 1.2 million children were receiving their lunches free or at a special token price;

There was no legislative authority directing that special assistance be provided poor schools that had a large number of poor children in attendance;

There was no way—other than with surplus foods—to help poor schools with a breakfast program or to help them buy some essential lunchroom equipment;

There was no way—except for the Special Milk Program—to extend assistance to feeding operations in non-school situations.

But in the 1968 school year now ending: 19.5 million children ate the Type A school lunch and 2.5 million were poor children who got a free lunch or paid a token price;

A total of \$5.0 million was available to help poor schools serve more poor children—under the 1962 amendment to the National School Lunch Act;

Under the Child Nutrition Act, we are building the base for further food services for poor schools and poor children with the \$4,250,000 in appropriated funds.

And, this year, new authority has been provided by the Congress to move into non-school feeding programs.

In needy family feeding: In 1960:

Our only tool for family feeding was the Commodity Distribution Program;

Under it, we were offering five low-value foods—worth, at retail, \$2.20 per person per month;

We were reaching 3.5 million needy people in family units—with about a 6 percent national unemployment rate;

About 1,200 counties and areas were distributing food to their needy families;

Of the 1,000 poorest counties, there were commodities distributed in 370.

In contrast, in 1968:

The Food Stamp Program has been added to our kit of tools and Commodity Distribution has been improved and strengthened;

Needy families now being assisted under the Commodity Distribution Program have 16 foods now available, and we have announced the addition of 6 more;

We are now reaching—or shortly will be—6.1 million people in 2,400 counties with commodities or food stamps—with the national unemployment rate now below 4 percent;

All of the 1,000 poorest counties are being, or soon will be included.

Progress was accelerated this past year through the major modifications in these family feeding programs that I announced last July. They were:

For the first time, the Department would offer to pay up to the full local operating costs of the Commodity Distribution Program in any of the 1,000 poorest counties then without a program;

There were 331 counties in this priority or target group.

In food stamp areas—

(a) the minimum purchase requirement was being reduced from \$2 per person per month to 50 cents;

(b) the purchase requirement for all new participants was to be cut in half for the first month—allowing the family to make the transition from a credit to a cash basis; and

(c) low-income people were to be hired, in a number of sensitive areas, as program aides—to help reach eligible nonparticipating families and bring them into the program.

And, finally, Department field personnel—spearheaded by Technical Action Panels—community action agencies and other groups, were joining in an intensive outreach effort on USDA food assistance programs.

The results have been dramatic when one considers that we are now down to dealing with the hardest-to-reach people and counties.

We increased food stamp participation by a monthly average of 300,000 people in the same 830 areas that were in operation in June of 1967. And, of course, we reached more people in the new areas that came into the program this fiscal year.

On the commodity side, our offer of financial aid to the poorest counties—together with vigorous leadership—has resulted in the local officials of 277 of our original 331 target counties taking action to accept and agree to operate a commodity or food stamp program for their poor families. An additional 14 counties are in process of making a decision.

In the remaining 40 of the 331 counties, USDA personnel are now undertaking the work to set up local facilities for certifying needy families and handling and distributing the food—preparatory to direct Federal operation. This step was taken reluctantly and only when I was convinced it was the only way to bring food assistance to poor families in these remaining poorest counties.

Even where we do directly inaugurate a program, it is our hope that arrangements can subsequently be worked out for a return to the traditional State-local operating base.

Thus, our commodity operations are helping to fill the gap until these family feeding operations can be replaced with a stamp program.

I want to restate and reinforce my several earlier statements to the Committee that food stamps do provide the most practical and efficient way to meet the food problems of poor families. Stamps provide the low-income family with the means for a wider, more varied diet—a way to adjust food purchases to the varying needs of the family. It incorporates the desirable self-help principle. It utilizes—rather than competes with—the best food distribution system in the world, our commercial marketing complex.

The food stamp approach has strong support and appeal among the State and local

officials to whom USDA looks to get the food assistance job done.

Of the 331 target counties, 128 elected to go the food stamp route and 11 more have notified us that they intend to request a program. This election was made even though there was no way to relieve the States or communities of responsibility for local operating costs. This appeal and support can be a real strength as we move to make our food assistance reach all those in need.

It is, then, becoming increasingly clear that the events of the past year have placed new demands upon the Food Stamp Program—demands that must be taken into account when future program funding is discussed and planned.

More poor people are coming in to be certified in counties that have the stamp program, as we refine and improve program provisions.

More counties want the program and they should have it.

And, there are more “demands” that *even more* be done to see that *even more* people are reached and that *even more* assistance is provided to those already being reached.

There is room for further improvements in the Food Stamp Program. Some can only be accomplished as experience shows us the way to remove barriers to participation. And, all of them will have an impact on program funding.

But, if we are to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country, our tools must be equal to the task. To effectively reach poor families in their homes we need a Food Stamp Program that:

Is operating in every county and independent city in the country;

Has eligibility standards that encompass all financially needy families;

Is readily accessible to all eligible families—with the States and localities providing prudent but prompt certification services and accessible locations at which to purchase coupons;

Makes available to each participating family sufficient total food stamps to enable the family to purchase an adequate diet—with the family's monetary investment related to its basic ability to buy food;

Includes homemaker training and educational services on what makes for a good diet and how to buy and prepare food to meet the nutritional needs of their families.

This is the kind of family food assistance program we need to operate and fund if we are to ever eliminate hunger and severe malnutrition in this country.

It is also clear that we cannot develop, fund or place into nation-wide operation that food stamp goal this fiscal year. But, we must see that the momentum we have built up continues and, in fact, that we accelerate the pace during the next fiscal year. The times and the national need require it.

Substantial additional funding is necessary in fiscal 1969.

We increased the number of operating areas from 838 in June 1967 to 1,027 areas this fiscal year. We need to provide “full-year” financing for these nearly 200 new areas. As well, we want to reach even more of the eligible families by program refinements or better State or local services.

There are 239 project areas—already approved—waiting to begin operations (166 of these areas wanted to open this May or June. But, we had to ask them to postpone their openings because of a shortage of 1968 funds.)

We had 145 areas, as of the close of business, Monday, June 10, that had officially requested the program and are anxious to start the program in 1969.

The designated and waiting-to-be-designated areas now on the books involve 35 States. For example, there are 36 counties in Georgia; 30 counties in South Carolina—to make a State-wide program there; 16 in

Louisiana; 18 counties in Arkansas; 2 in Washington—to complete the State-wide program.

In the Midwest, there are 16 counties in Nebraska included; 11 in Minnesota; 11 in Iowa; North Dakota has 13 counties, and Ohio has 12. Massachusetts, which entered the program for the first time, has 7 designated areas waiting to enter. Alaska is on the list with 9 areas for a State-wide program.

And, more requests are being received every day. We would expect to receive at least 100 more requests in the next few months from areas that want to start programs in fiscal 1969.

I can clearly define the kind of nationwide Food Stamp Program to which we need to progressively move. But, it is not possible to precisely forecast the maximum possible pace at which we can proceed to move toward that goal. Nor, can its ultimate cost be predicted.

It is difficult to judge exactly when we can complete the shift to food stamps for the rest of the country.

The level of participation is equally difficult to forecast. We would expect more families to continue to move out of poverty—but there may be temporary periods of increased unemployment in some areas. We do not know when experience will show us improved ways to reach more of the remaining eligible people—through outreach, education and motivation, improved program services, etc.

But, the need to eliminate hunger is clear and consistent with the national interest and our standard of values. This certainty should outweigh the uncertainty over the pace at which this national need can move forward both from a practical and financial standpoint. No artificial barriers should prevent progress toward that goal. Rather, the urgency of the need dictates development, now, of the best legislative basis under which this country can move toward the kind of stamp program that will meet national need.

I strongly urge this Committee to accept the identical bills H.R. 17721 through 17725 introduced by Congresswoman Sullivan and 107 other Members of the House.

These bills provide for a four-year authorization with no specific monetary limitations specified in advance. But, to assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decisions, the bills require specific rules for an in-depth Congressional review prior to each annual appropriation.

Mrs. Sullivan's bill provides for effective Congressional direction, leadership and program review. But, it will permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. The national need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for such action.

THE SUPREME COURT VERSUS NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much discussion has taken place recently concerning the part that the Supreme Court has played in weakening our law-enforcement machinery by virtue of some of its dangerously misdirected decisions. Those concerned with the area of internal security are also fully aware that the Courts judgments in the past have been a severe handicap in the administration of this program. The recent *Robel* decision, for instance, permits the

employment of a member of the Communist Party to be engaged in defense work although a basic aim of the CPUSA has been the subversion of our national defenses. Although this decision is almost unbelievable, it is but one of a number of decisions in which the Court has bent over backward to give favoritism to individual rights at the expense of the national security of the country.

On the bright side of the ledger, there is an awakening to the dangerous effect that unbalanced decisions by the Court are playing in our security machinery. Various pieces of legislation have been advanced to both limit the jurisdiction of the Court and to correct some of the decisions now in force. I am hopeful that worthwhile changes will be effected in the near future.

In the area of travel to Communist countries, the Court has also made its presence felt. Here again national security interests have been made subsidiary to other considerations. In the following letter of the State Department concerning the travel of M. Cyrus Eaton to Cuba, it is stated that:

In light of the Lynd decision and other recent decisions in the courts, however, the Department is essentially without effective means to prevent the unauthorized travel of a citizen to restricted areas so long as he does not use his otherwise valid passport in traveling to or through the restricted area.

Here again is another example of the dangerous effect of a Court decision in the area of national security. Again, legislation has been introduced to correct this impasse, but there remains the basic problem of returning some degree of realism to future Court decisions.

I include the above-mentioned letter from the State Department in the RECORD at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 28, 1968.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: The Secretary of State has asked that I reply to your letter of May 22 in which you inquire about the travel of Mr. Cyrus Eaton to Cuba.

The restrictions on the travel of American citizens to Cuba remain in effect in that Cuba continues to be included among the countries for which a United States passport is not valid unless specifically validated for such travel. The Department has announced, however, that henceforth, pursuant to the United States Court of Appeals decision in *Lynd v. Rusk*, the Department would not revoke passports for violation of area restrictions. The Court, in that case, held in effect that the Government could not prevent the travel of U.S. citizens to the "restricted areas" although it could prevent U.S. passports from being used for such unauthorized travel.

Passports are specially validated by the Department for travel to a restricted area upon application if the applicant shows that the purpose of his trip justifies an exception to the general restriction. (A copy or relevant portions of the Departmental regulations concerning the restrictions is enclosed.)

You will note that persons in certain professional and occupational categories are given special validations when their travel is directly related to their professional responsibilities. Included are newsmen, doctors and scientists in public health, scholars with post-graduate degrees, and American Red Cross representatives.

Mr. Eaton applied for special passport vali-

dation in order to travel to Cuba. Inasmuch as Mr. Eaton did not meet the criteria for special passport validation, his application was denied.

In light of the *Lynd* decision and other recent decisions in the courts, however, the Department is essentially without effective means to prevent the unauthorized travel of a citizen to restricted areas so long as he does not use his otherwise valid passport in traveling to or through the restricted area. The actual use of a passport to go to a restricted area without special validation for that area might constitute misuse of a passport, proscribed by 18 U.S.C. Section 1544, and might subject the traveler to application of the criminal sanction in that statute.

I hope you will find this information helpful.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, regularly I report to my constituents on activities here in Congress and the conditions throughout the country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD my June report:

JUNE 1968.

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: Once again, as if it were to become a regular if awful way of life, the attention of the entire country, indeed of the world, has been fixed on assassination and its aftermath in the United States.

The tragic and untimely death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy is certainly a source of great sorrow for all Americans. In this regular edition of my Washington Report I would like to discuss with you the circumstances surrounding Senator Kennedy's death, its implications for American society and the broader social problems related to the assassination.

I do not accept the current charge that the United States is a "sick society." However I do believe we are confronted with a "moral pollution" of which Senator Kennedy's death is the most recent example.

Other examples of the problem include the assassination of our beloved late President John F. Kennedy, the assassination earlier this year of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, the civil disorders that have erupted in all parts of the nation in recent years, the violence on scores of American campuses and the increasing incidence of crime in the streets.

I believe that a principle cause of this "moral pollution" gripping our nation is the growing attention garnered by the extremes in our society. The great middle has been too silent and thus opened the door to extremists who sell hate like a product and view violence with satisfaction. The problem is compounded by various polarizations within our society. The rich and poor, the left and right, the young and old constantly find themselves at odds with one another thus causing deep divisions in our society.

Further complicating this situation has been an unfortunate and regrettable loss of faith in the Nation's leadership and an unprecedented loss of faith in the future of our nation. There results a malaise that must be driven from the American psyche if we are to right ourselves and continue to move forward with unity and confidence.

It is important to note in the consideration of unity and in the effort to heal rifts

that there is no suggestion that we must have unanimity. On the contrary, as a dissenter myself, I recognize that our society invites, even needs, disagreement. The point is that in a democratic society there is ample room for responsible dissension and protest.

In attacking the problems that have created our domestic malady there are certain specific steps available to us. Certain of these steps are only temporary solutions, but they are needed now to strengthen the effectiveness of our law enforcement officials and to preserve the rights of all. Other steps are more lasting and it would be destructive, in the long run, to ignore these steps.

One immediate step is the recently passed Anti-Crime Bill that provides for direct aid to local police forces to aid them in increasing their effectiveness in the fight against crime. This Bill also contains restrictions on the interstate sale of hand guns.

To this we must add stronger and more effective gun control legislation. It has long been my feeling that the sale, distribution and licensing of hand weapons and long guns would be an important step in reducing crime in this country while lessening violence. I believe we should prohibit all mail order sales of arms and ammunition and require that all guns be licensed. I have worked with Rep. Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who is responsible for this legislation, to prepare and secure passage of a strong and workable gun control law.

Such controls would minimize the possibility of irrational, irresponsible individuals possessing weapons without endangering the rights of legitimate sportsmen.

In addition I shall propose separate legislation to prohibit the possession and distribution of switchblades and other deadly knives. The proliferation and easy access to such knives is another extension of violence in our society and it must be stopped.

Also, to minimize the problem created by civil disorders, I have introduced legislation calling for a "National Conference on Law and Order—Now." Such a conference would enable law enforcement officials to learn modern means of effectively controlling disturbances without endangering lives. However, this must be viewed as a temporary step while we look to the day when civil disturbances can be wiped from the American scene.

My proposal for a bi-partisan "Metropolitan Coalition" in Congress, which I discussed in my May newsletter, is designed for just such a long-range attack on our domestic problems. We all must recognize, as Robert Kennedy clearly saw, that it is in the best interests of our nation, and every individual American, for all Americans to enjoy the privileges and opportunities of our society.

To date we have received a good response to the "Metropolitan Coalition" both from Members of Congress and interested private groups. It is my hope that through a concerted attack on metropolitan problems, city and suburban, that we can give all Americans a stake in our society and thus destroy the root causes of unrest. In addition the Coalition assures that areas like our own Nassau County can maintain their autonomy while receiving federal assistance for steady and planned growth.

Another specific, non-legislative step that we should take is for more and more Americans, from the great and powerful middle, to actively and constructively participate in the political process. This would mitigate against the possibility of violent extremists gaining control of public affairs.

It should be made clear that such participation certainly need not be designed to reinforce existing policies nor to reaffirm specific aspects of our society. Actually such participation should include a constant re-examination of policy and reassessment of existing situations. In the long-run this is necessary to the progressive change and growth that is so much a part of our history.

This point relates especially to college students who have many fine ideas for change

and substantial reason for questioning the old order. Yet the tactics they have recently resorted to in an effort to bring about change at certain universities is self-defeating. We do need reformers; we do not need revolutionaries.

In the final analysis and ultimately more important than any tangible action we might take, there must be a concerted and deliberate effort by all Americans to live by, and teach to young people, the ideals of liberty, freedom and democracy that are our heritage. Inseparable from this is the belief that we conduct government by the ballot box and not by violence; that our society offers us every opportunity for peaceful change and precludes any resort to violence.

If, in the practice of citizen participation in public affairs, and in the consideration of American government, you would like a copy of the publication, "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?" please write to me at 1525 L.H.O.B., Washington, D.C., 20515 and I will be happy to send a copy of this booklet to you.

Any consideration of the ideal American society and the standards we should try to live by, I submit, will prove the validity of a statement by Professor John Kennedy Galbraith. He said: "You cannot have liberty without law and order." To this I would add that you cannot have freedom without authority—the very authority that protects that freedom. Nor can you maintain democracy without responsibility.

We can, and I believe we will, drive "moral pollution" from this nation and return ourselves to the progressive optimism of our history. But this can only be done by a recognition of the need for law and order, for respect for the lives and property of others, and the need for moral commitment. Certainly it was to these goals that Senator Kennedy devoted his entire adult life.

The American dream need not, nor need we permit it to, become a nightmare. However if the powerful middle in our society persists in remaining too passive and evidencing an apathy bordering on complete disinterest, our future may just slip from our grasp. The antidote is action.

Motivation is needed and by doing your share you can constructively act to right the wrongs that trouble us all.

The second part of action is, of course, the development of the proper attitude. There is a frame of mind in which violence becomes the norm; either anarchy or totalitarianism ensues from this. The norm, instead, must include an absolute and enduring commitment to responsibility coupled with mutual respect and a recognition of the importance of flexibility.

Abraham Lincoln, if I may paraphrase him in closing, said it all very well: Without public support nothing will succeed; with it nothing will fail.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

RHODESIAN SANCTIONS ON STRATEGIC CHROME ORE AVAILABILITY AND U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to this body in the RECORD of June 4, 1968, on "Crisis in World Strategy," I stressed how the executive branch of our "General" Government—George Washington's term—was ignoring the

Constitution and the Congress in supporting a U.N. resolution escalating warfare against Rhodesia, and quoted two broadcasts by Fulton Lewis III and an address by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson relative thereto.

In the RECORD of June 5, in order that all Members of the Congress could read the indicated U.N. resolution on Rhodesia, I quoted its full text.

In a sequel broadcast on June 3, 1968, Mr. Lewis discussed some new angles in the Rhodesian situation; namely, how the U.N. economic sanctions against Rhodesia affect our balance of trade, how such sanctions have forced the United States to purchase strategic chrome ore at greatly increased prices from the Soviet Union, and how it has forced Rhodesia to sell this vital ore in other than U.S. markets, including Red China.

It must be stressed that chrome is absolutely indispensable to our country, both industrially and militarily. Yet, without the approval of Congress, the executive branch of our Government joins in sanctions against little, independent, and strategic Rhodesia by coercive means to satisfy the demands of Great Britain and the African bloc in the U.N. organization to destroy Rhodesian independence.

Since the Constitution of the United States vests the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations in Congress, as well as the power to declare war, these are important constitutional questions involved in the Rhodesian situation, which Congress cannot evade, although our State Department ignores them.

The indicated broadcasts by Mr. Lewis, a news release on Nigeria showing British-Soviet involvement, and an address sent to conservatives by Mr. J. Gwynne Evans follow as part of my remarks; and I may say that the people of our country are indebted to Mr. Lewis for his clear, able, and courageous exposure of this perilous situation.

The material follows:

[From the Top of the News, June 3-7, 1968]
REMARKS BY FULTON LEWIS III BROADCAST,
MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1968, WASHINGTON,
D.C.

RHODESIAN CHROME, U.N. FOAM, AND U.S.
METTLE

Last week, I discussed in some detail the latest action by the United Nations Security Council regarding the rebellious African nation of Rhodesia. Although there has still been no official comment by Prime Minister Ian Smith, it is generally expected that his government will continue to defy the new and stiffer UN sanctions just as it successfully defied those that were imposed on December 16, 1966. Spokesmen for the Smith regime concede that the UN's action last Wednesday night will make it considerably more difficult for Rhodesia to survive. The key to survival will lie in the fact that many nations will continue to ignore the world organization's mandate. Rhodesia's rich neighbor, South Africa, for instance, has already indicated that it will not cooperate in the new sanctions. It is also anticipated that Portugal will follow suit, in which case Rhodesia will still enjoy trade with and through the Portuguese colony of Mozambique on Africa's eastern coast.

These economic sanctions will have their repercussions elsewhere, however, and some of these will have a significant effect on our own country. By abandoning trade with

Rhodesia in accordance with the UN directive, the United States is adding directly to its balance of trade miseries in the world. Before any sanctions went into effect, and trade between the U.S. and Rhodesia was normal, the transactions were running 3 to 1 in our favor. In short, we were selling Rhodesians roughly \$30 million a year in goods, whereas we were buying only \$10 million annually from them. The immediate effect of the sanctions, then, was to deny American businessmen \$30 million a year in foreign sales, while the lack of a Rhodesian market has contributed \$20 million annually to our balance of payments deficit.

In addition, though, there is an issue of national security involved in all of this. The story is somewhat complicated, but it goes like this. Red China has had her chromium supply of some 300,000 tons per year cut off by the Soviet Union as the result of the growing feud between those two Communist powers. Rhodesia prides itself in being the owner of the world's largest deposits of top-quality metallurgical-grade chrome ore. The United States, indeed, used to be one of her biggest customers. That trade, of course, came to an abrupt halt on January 5th, 1967, when President Johnson issued his Executive Order banning further U.S.-Rhodesian trade in such important items as this. The net result is that we have now had to turn to the only other major supplier of chrome ore in the world, which happens to be the Soviet Union. Moscow, realizing our dilemma, hastened to exploit the situation by immediately putting American companies on notice that, beginning in January, 1968, the price they would be charged for Soviet chrome ore would be jacked up considerably, by \$7 a ton, or an increase of more than 15 percent. We have had no choice but to accede to this blackmail.

Rhodesia, on the other hand (her U.S. chrome markets cut off), has been forced to turn to a bitter enemy, Red China, for a customer. Last year, Peking purchased 60,000 tons of Rhodesian chrome ore—20 percent of the African nation's total output last year.

If the Johnson Administration thinks that our cooperation in the UN's mandatory economic sanctions have hurt Rhodesian industries, it should take another look. The two companies which have been hit the hardest by the Administration's ban on trade are two American companies—Union Carbide and Vanadium Chrome—both of which have wholly-owned subsidiaries in Rhodesia which used to provide them with all the chrome they could use. Now both companies here in the United States have been forced to purchase chrome on the open market, principally from the Soviet Union. Their respective subsidiaries inside Rhodesia have been forced to sell to the other major world Communist power, Red China—all of this because the President is convinced that little Rhodesia is a threat to world peace while the truth of the matter is that the two nations that are benefiting directly from the sanctions—the Soviet Union and Red China—are indeed threats to world peace. Both Communist nations are contributing directly to the war of aggression in Vietnam, and to the American casualty lists which continue to grow as a result of that conflict. And yet, because of the Administration's unbending loyalty to the dictates of the United Nations, we find ourselves again in the wholly inconsistent and illogical position of helping our enemies while we are trying to destroy our friends. Rhodesia, I remind you, is one of the few nations in the world which has offered to send forces to help us out in Vietnam.

Legal experts here in Washington inform me that the latest Security Council mandate will not be binding on this country until some action is taken at the federal level to make it binding. This, in turn, raises still another question. Under our Constitution,

should it be the Legislative or Executive Branch that has the power to comply with decrees such as this from the United Nations? As I mentioned before, the President single-handedly ordered compliance with the earlier UN mandate for economic sanctions against Rhodesia in January of 1967, by issuing an executive order, claiming that such a power was warranted under the United Nations Participation Act which was passed by Congress in 1945. The newest Security Council action, however, goes far beyond mere limited economic sanctions. Under the definitions of international law, the new action actually constitutes an act of war against Rhodesia. It is an across-the-board embargo and, as I have mentioned on previous broadcasts, it could ultimately lead to the use of military force. Although the Johnson Administration has not yet indicated just what action the President intends to take regarding this new Security Council ruling, it is generally anticipated that he will again try to command obedience to the UN mandate by issuing an Executive Order, in which case, of course, it would raise some serious Constitutional questions. The Constitution provides very clearly that the Congress, and NOT the President, shall have the power to regulate American trade abroad. More importantly, it states clearly that the Congress shall have the power to declare war.

I have never advocated or supported acts of civil disobedience. Listeners to this broadcast, I am sure, are well aware of this fact. In this instance, however, there are some severe Constitutional questions which are at stake, questions which indeed involve the basic question of whether this country is a sovereign nation or whether it is simply now a pawn of the United Nations. It would seem very proper, in this case, for the Congress to raise this question promptly so that it could be resolved, and if this is not done, the issue could then be brought to the attention of the courts by some dissenting business interests.

DEAN ACHESON ON THE U.N.

On Friday, I read you portions of a statement by former Secretary of State *Dean Acheson* regarding the Rhodesian issue. Unfortunately, because of lack of time, I had to omit some important comments. Since they are significant (they come from a man who is well respected in the liberal community), I want to read them now. The remarks were made by *Dean Acheson* a week ago at a meeting of the American Bar Association's International Law Division:

"Those of whom I complain are not the peddlers of spurious panaceas of peace, not those who are overimpressed with the role of international law, but those who would impose upon states, in the name of law, their own subjective conceptions of justice. As is so often the case with the righteous, deeply convinced of the righteousness of their cause, their impulse is to snatch the knotted cord from the hand of God and deal out murderous blows. These blows are usually directed against the weak by the strong. This process also furnishes the figleaf of legal responsibility to cover otherwise naked aggression. Such support was given to the actions of the United Nations Security Council in calling for economic sanctions against Rhodesia and to the attacks on the World Court's decision dismissing the complaint in the Southwest Africa case. . . .

"It will surprise some of my fellow citizens . . . to be told that the United States is today engaged in an international conspiracy instigated by Britain and blessed by the United Nations to overthrow the government of a country that has done us no harm and threatens no one. This is barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle. The charge that Britain brings against the Rhodesians is the one that George III once brought against Americans and sought unsuccessfully

to enforce by arms. It is that the colonies felt it necessary, as Mr. Jefferson put it, 'to dissolve the political bonds which [had] connected them with another [people], and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled them. . . .

"How fortunate were the American colonies in 1776 that there was no United Nations confronting them. I need hardly remind you that our Constitution had nothing to say about adult universal suffrage but did have a few pregnant paragraphs continuing the institution of slavery."

Dean Acheson concluded his comments with these few sentences: "Contemplating the possibilities, I am moved to salute the shade of Senator Tom Connally and thank him for his reservation which, at the time, I regretted, providing that our acceptance of the World Court's jurisdiction should not apply to disputes with regard to matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, and, he added, as determined by the United States. One of the troubles of the troubled age in which we live is that too many people are trying to achieve harmony of interest by forcing everyone to harmonize with them. Conscience used to be an inner voice of self-discipline. Now it is a clarion urge to discipline others. The new romantic impulse is to overthrow that wise inhibition in favor of a compulsion to reshape the world to fit all sorts of shared subjectivities. Another thought also occurs. Perhaps if the meek are to inherit the earth they might consider adding a clause to the litany. It could follow the passage, 'From all blindness of heart, from pride, vainglory and hypocrisy, from envy, hatred and malice and all uncharitableness,' and would add, 'and from the United Nations Charter as distorted by professors of international law, Good Lord, deliver us.'"

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1968]

NIGERIANS BATTLE FOR SUPPLY ROUTE—VITAL BIAFRAN PORT AT STAKE—DUTCH ARMS AID ENDED

PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA, June 8.—Biafran and federal Nigerian troops are fighting along a 40-mile front for control of supply routes to this vital Biafran city near the southern coast.

The federal Nigerians are believed to have been unable to obtain abroad the war material that they formerly received to sustain their civil war with the residents of the former Eastern Region, which proclaimed its independence last year as the Republic of Biafra.

The Dutch Government announced yesterday that it would no longer permit its arms to be sent to Lagos, the federal capital. In the last two months, Czechoslovakia and Italy, which were supplying Nigeria, also made the same decision.

This leaves Britain and the Soviet Union as the remaining arms suppliers to the Lagos regime in its efforts to suppress the rebellion of the breakaway region.

At issue in the year-old dispute is, among other things, the regime's plan to realign Nigeria into 12 federal districts, one of which would encompass the former Eastern Region and its various tribal groups, including the numerous Ibos.

A LONG SUPPLY LINE

The Nigerians have a very long supply line, according to prisoners-of-war held by the Biafrans. Men and supplies go by ship from Lagos to Calabar, in southeastern Biafra, and then go by road 80 miles through Abak to Opobo. They cross the Imo River by barge and go 45 miles by road through Bori to Port Harcourt.

The federal forces have tried only once to come by ship directly to Port Harcourt. Their Soviet-made frigate suddenly appeared from

a creek below the main wharf a week ago, with transport ships behind.

But a Biafran gunboat was waiting in ambush position. Rockets and shellfire were exchanged and the Nigerians retreated. Since then, the federal forces have depended on the land route.

The Biafrans believe that the federal troops have taken heavy casualties in the fighting around Port Harcourt. The Biafran troops brought in here after several weeks training have to learn to survive in almost continuous close fighting.

Most of the federal troops are spread out along their supply line or engaged in trying to cut Biafran routes. They are in a loose northern arc around Port Harcourt and seem to have few troops in the suburbs. More of their soldiers are eastward at the Enugu oil field.

BIAFRANS MOVE DOWN

The Biafrans are around the Nigerians at the airport and others have pushed down from the north to take positions 20 to 40 miles east of Port Harcourt. They have retaken the Afam power station.

At the city's airport, Biafran trenches are along one side of the runway and Nigerian Ferret armored cars, machine guns and rocket teams are at one end of the main runway.

A trip there means crossing open fields of brush through sporadic Nigerian mortar and rocket fire, which occurs for about two hours twice a day.

The other day, Nigerian machine guns opened up from 30 yards away at the sound of footsteps along the bush paths, but the firing was so close that it went overhead. The Biafran lieutenant whispered: "The closer you are, the safer. Don't be afraid."

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1968]

LAGOS SAYS PORT IS CLOSED

LAGOS, NIGERIA, June 9.—Military sources said today that Port Harcourt had been cleared of Biafran troops after a battle in the city's prison yard. They said about 300 Biafrans had been killed.

Unofficial sources also said that the Biafrans had been halted in a drive to cut a supply line 25 miles east of Port Harcourt, but that the Biafrans were still in Afam, near a power plant.

TIME TO END SANCTIONS

(An address sent to Conservatives by Mr. J. Gwynne-Evans, June 1, 1968)

The Yeomen of England upheld their old tradition of freedom when they kicked out Mr. Peart, the Minister of Agriculture, as deputy-chairman of the National Ploughman's Committee, because he refused to support the participation of British ploughmen in the Rhodesian World Ploughing Championships. Here there is no sign of the infiltration of the "pink" politics.

But the M.C.C. will not play in Rhodesia. Are the M.C.C. committee members all Socialists or are they just not sportsmen in the true sense of the word? Why, the Greeks even stopped their wars to compete in sports! Lord Love-a-Duck! It is pretty poor stuff when British sportsmen allow politics to interfere with their sport. It is quite alright of course for Rhodesians to fight and die in a common cause in the last war, but Oh! No! we couldn't play cricket with them now! I am surprised that Sir Alec Douglas Home, President of the M.C.C., allowed himself to be a party to such unsportsmanlike behaviour. I would have expected that his meeting in Salisbury with his old friend Sir Humphrey Gibbs, patron of Rhodesian cricket, would have produced something more akin to sportsmanship than this.

Two and a half years after their inception, it is now clear that sanctions are not going to bring down the Rhodesian Government. Force is ruled out by both Socialists and

Conservatives in Britain, except for a few unhappy individuals who prefer a military solution to one based on peace.

Nor will the new mandatory sanctions of the United Nations succeed in their purpose. Mr. Vorster, Prime Minister of South Africa, has publicly stated recently that South Africa will not allow them to succeed. Great Britain can in no way afford to see South Africa brought down into the dust. Therefore it is necessary for the Conservatives to grasp the nettle with both hands and hammer out without delay a new policy on Rhodesia for Conservatives. They owe it to the electorate of Britain which has turned in large numbers away from Labour policies of all kinds.

Tell the people that it is time to end sanctions now. They will be delighted that some fresh air has invaded the policy of 'six principles (or five)' which ignores so many other important and contrary principles to which I have previously drawn attention. To end sanctions now would encourage the 'Centre Group' in the Rhodesian parliament, of which Mr. Ian Smith is the leader, to prevail over the strong Rightwing who want to follow South African policies in every way. Do you want this? If so, wake up! and take Rhodesia 'off the hook.' Do you want Africans to suffer increasingly from unemployment? Elsbeth Huxley has written that it is no gain to the political advancement of Rhodesia's Africans that they should first starve to death. There is a bad drought here you know, which does not improve matters, especially for Africans in the tribal areas without sufficient capital. (Of course it would be much too unfashionable to suggest that the white man too could be suffering from lack of water on his lands!) At the time of the American revolution and for long afterwards, Liberal opinion in England supported the settlers against the British government. But today fashion has changed.

Do you want the Western World's lifelines round the Cape to be so weakened that Russian and Chinese infiltration and active take-over might result from chaos? Such is not likely to happen in the near future; but if the Labour Party, backed up by the United Nations and aided and abetted by the United States, were to get their will, then it might. If you Conservatives don't want this, then oppose sanctions.

May I remind Conservatives that when in power they consistently opposed repeated attempts by the United Nations to interfere in Rhodesian-British affairs, and always held that Rhodesia was a self-governing territory, administered through the Dominion's Office, and that Britain herself had not got the necessary data regarding Southern Rhodesia with which to comply with reporting requirements under the Charter (viz: Chapter eleven). "No resolution of this Committee or of the Security Council or of the General Assembly can make the status of Southern Rhodesia what it is not", said Britain's representative. On the proposition in 1962 of the United Nations authorizing a study of Southern Rhodesia's status, Britain voted no.

Lord Caradon, in another act of treachery towards the Western World's strategic security in Southern Africa, the imposition of total mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia, did vacate the Chair and handed over the dagger to Mr. Goldberg of the U.S.A. to complete the deed. His intention is clear, but the 'Frankenstein Monster' that his Socialist government has invented may in the long run react to the detriment of Britain, should she displease the Afro-Asians in the near or distant future.

Mr. Harold Wilson's government has come to act in a spiteful, petty and dictatorial manner with all people and with everything connected with Rhodesia. Secret blacklists tyrannical acts of bureaucracy (with no recourse to appeal in law) have become commonplace in the passport world. Respected businessmen, schoolchildren, cripples, peo-

ple traveling on compassionate grounds (e.g. going to their father's funeral), ordinary men and women traveling around, all come under the penalties of this arbitrary power. Britons and Rhodesians are sick of hearing about it.

The new race laws have undermined the freedom of British people to choose whom they wish to have in their employment or to have as tenants in their houses. It would appear that British citizens must now show 'just cause' or some similar legal concept why they should not employ a black or colored man who presents himself for the position, whereas if the applicant has a white skin they are at liberty to turn him away. This is a first class recipe for raising racial tensions in Britain to the level of distrust and riot that occurs in America since the passing of the civil rights laws. It is a sad commentary on affairs under the Labour government in Britain when the respected septuagenarian Dame Irene Ward, Member for Tynemouth, is escorted out of the House of Commons by the Sergeant-at-arms, for calling the Wilson Administration a "dictatorship".

France has succumbed to left-wing pressure and for the first time has agreed to vote for mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia. Left-wing pressure is very hard in France at the moment, but in Britain the electorate is coming down hard on the side of the Conservatives. Do you Conservatives think it is a good policy for Britain to support the United Nations policy of creating a power vacuum in the key-stone of Southern Africa, namely Rhodesia, by bringing down the government of Mr. Ian Smith? Remember what this would entail. First, economic chaos; second, infiltration by terrorists and starvation riots inside the country; third, the build up of South African forces within Rhodesia to help keep the peace; and finally, if United Nations policy is to succeed, the overthrow of South Africa (and Portuguese territory). Are the Conservatives prepared to accept this as good policy for Britain, economically and strategically? If not then they had better do some hard thinking, because what I have described is what present trends of World policy are now working for.

It is time to call for an end to sanctions.

It will be very difficult to stop this engulging "Frankenstein Monster" when once it gets its head. Now is the time to stop it. Go to it Conservatives!

HON. W. S. "BILL" STUCKEY, JR.

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently, my good friend and colleague, Representative W. S. "BILL" STUCKEY, JR., who represents the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia, was the honored guest at a testimonial dinner.

The dinner was for the purpose of raising funds for the operation of Congressman STUCKEY's congressional office and hundreds of residents of his district turned out to honor him on this occasion.

As the introduction—which was made by the sheriff of Lowndes County, Ga., Jewel Futch—points up so well a few of the accomplishments which Representative STUCKEY has made for his district while serving in the 90th Congress, I

would like to insert this introduction in the RECORD:

Although Bill's only interest in Congress (or main interest) has been our 8th Congressional District, he has succeeded in bringing National Attention to our State and our District.

During his almost two years in Congress, Bill has voted in favor of responsible legislative measures which would benefit our country. He supported the Veterans Pension Readjustment Act which provided benefits for our Veterans of Vietnam who had previously been neglected by the people back here at home—the people they had given their lives for just like the fighting men of previous wars.

Bill supported the Social Security Amendments last year which provided for an increase in the benefits of our senior citizens and a liberalization of the amount of money which they could earn and still be entitled to their benefits. This measure helped to bring the social security benefits more in line with the present day cost of living. Also, believing that the bill did not allow our senior citizens enough of an increase in the amount of outside earnings before social security benefits were penalized, Bill has been determined to work even harder to get the bill which he introduced to allow Senior citizens to be able to earn up to 3000 dollars before their social security benefits were penalized passed in Congress. (The bill which passed allows senior citizens to earn up to 1680 dollars before social security benefits are penalized).

Bill's efforts in the area of Crime Control have been untiring. He supported the Crime bill last year, and he supported Anti-Riot legislation which was passed in the House but opposed by the Administration. Now, this year, the Administration woke up and has proposed riot legislation. Bill has persistently called for more law enforcement powers to be restored to local law enforcement officials before we truly face a national crisis of crime running rampant in our streets.

Bill firmly opposed an increase in our taxes. His position, and I believe one which we all agree with, was that a tax increase should be the last resort, and it should not even be considered until federal spending was drastically cut, and it was shown that a tax increase was still needed in order to win the war in Vietnam, and save the lives of our fighting men.

Of course, Bill realized that you don't just go around arbitrarily slashing spending. Some programs need to be eliminated—others don't. Some need to be cut substantially—some don't. It was for this reason that he sponsored a bill last year which when it is passed, will provide for the establishment of a Government Programs Evaluation Commission. The purpose of this commission will be to evaluate present federal programs and let Congress know if these programs are effective and if they should be continued, and to give Congress a better idea of how much federal funds are needed to conduct each of these programs. As Bill has said, Congress presently must rely on the Departments and agencies for this information. And, naturally, since these agencies must justify their existence and spending, Congress cannot be sure that they are objective in their evaluations.

In working to help raise the income level of the people of our District, it was Bill's idea to establish the 8th District Development Council. This council which has received nationwide publicity has been getting organized and set up with a representative from each of the 24 counties and there is no doubt that it is going to be a big step toward attracting industry into our District.

Bill has established an outstanding record in securing and in working toward getting an unprecedented number of grants, loans and contracts for our District. These have included Post Offices, planning assistance grants, FHA loans, SBA loans, EDA loans, etc.

The appropriations for the new Federal Building to built here in Waycross can greatly be attributed to Bills' efforts. He worked hard to get those funds included in the original Independent Offices Appropriations Bill in the House. And, when he learned that these funds had been cut in the Senate Committee, he immediately went to work on the members of the House and Senate Conference Committee to have the funds restored in the Conference Report. And, his efforts were rewarded by the reinstatement of the funds and the ultimate passage of the bill with the funds for Waycross included.

Bill has done an outstanding job in standing firm against the federal government's acquisition of an additional 75,000 acres of the Okefenokee swamp for inclusion in the National Wilderness Act.

Bill has looked out for the interest of the tobacco growers of our District. Last year when the buyers were pulling out of our district, leaving our growers with an excessive amount of unsold tobacco and threatening to have a seriously damaging effect on our tobacco market and thus the economy of our District, Bill wasted no time in coming down to take a first hand look at this situation, and then in calling on the tobacco companies to leave their buyers in the district until our growers could get their tobacco on the market. Bill's action was instrumental in the decision of these companies not to pull all of their buyers out at the originally planned dates, but rather to extend their time.

This man that we are all here to honor has a deep commitment to the young people of our country and of our district. He believes that they should have every opportunity to achieve a fully responsible adult life. When he learned of the Intern program in Washington, he broke from the traditional method used by Congressmen of bringing the sons and daughters of good friends and political supporters to Washington for the summer to participate in this program. Instead, he established an intern selection board, comprised of the four college presidents in our district to make the selection on the basis of academic standing and extracurricular activities.

When it came time for our Congressman to make nominations for appointments to the various Academies, again, he said that this was too important to the young people of our country and to the future of their development to be interfered with by politics. He set up an Academy selection board to screen the applicants and to make the recommendations.

Because of his desire to see every young person in the United States have an opportunity for further education, and because he recognized the financial strain of a college education or vocational education on the parents, Bill has introduced legislation which would allow parents an additional tax exemption while their children were in college or vocational training schools.

Realizing the importance of staying close to home in order to be constantly aware of the needs and the opinions of the people which he represents in the U.S. Congress, Bill has traveled back home more than any single Congressman in the history of our district. . . . But, in doing this, he has not let it interfere with any of his duties in Washington. He has made his trips on weekends and during holidays. He hasn't taken a vacation or hardly a day's rest since being in Washington.

Last year, he realized that even though he was coming home almost every weekend, he still wasn't able to see nearly enough of the people who are scattered across this 24 county district (one of the largest geographically, east of the Mississippi). It was then that he called on Norman Dorminy to work part-time for him as his Field Representative. Norman has certain hours each

week in Waycross at the Post Office; at the Post Office in Valdosta; the Douglas Post Office; and the Brunswick Post Office. People from the surrounding areas can go in and tell him of problems which their Congressman can help them with or they tell him of their opinions of certain legislation which is pending in the Congress.

Norman relays all of this to Bill in Washington and he is then able to take the necessary action.

In addition to Norman traveling around the district, Bill has a full-time district office in Eastman, which is manned by the capable Mrs. Jackie Cadwell, who is always available to anyone who needs help. And his Washington staff, in addition to being on call 24 hours a day, puts in at least 10 hours a day in the Washington office.

I could go on and on, but I'm going to sit down after just one more thing. We are gathered here this evening in this room and over here on my right is the flag of our great State of Georgia—a flag which has dignity and a flag which we all honor. The most recent act of courage that Bill Stuckey has performed was his defense of our flag before the world. I was in Washington when the incident came up—and, I can tell you, I have never seen a man as indignant and infuriated as Bill was. And I have never seen anybody take such immediate and effective action as he did.

One of our Georgia servicemen from here in the 8th District who is risking his life in Vietnam was ordered to remove his Georgia flag from above his bunk. The young man wrote to his mother and dad, telling them of the incident and telling them that he had refused to remove the flag.

The mother wrote to her Congressman, Bill Stuckey, and he took it from there. Bill let the Pentagon know in no uncertain terms that he would not tolerate such a ridiculous order.

The purpose of the order, as was stated by the boy's commanding officer, was that all flags with the symbol of the Confederate flag must come down, because of the current racial tension in the United States.

On the floor of the Congress, our Congressman said, "I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our generals in Vietnam have great responsibilities in conducting this war. I am sure that they have a tremendous responsibility for their men. But I am also sure that this responsibility, Mr. Speaker, does not extend to the point of trying to destroy a soldier's faith, pride, and loyalty to his State."

Bill was assured by the Pentagon, as a result of his action, that the soldier had been allowed to return his flag to its position above his bunk and that no such order would ever again be issued.

With this, my friends—and I repeat, I could go on and on—I give you our Congressman, Bill Stuckey.

"CONGRESS MUST ENTER THE COMPUTER AGE"—REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, SEVENTH ANNUAL SPRING SYSTEMS SEMINAR, WASHINGTON CHAPTER, INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES ASSOCIATION, ROSSLYN, VA., MAY 27, 1968

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest Members of the House of

Representatives is our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD.

He has been one of the leaders in Congress in generating discussions of ways in which we in Congress can take advantage of the latest technological developments—especially computers and automatic data processing—to enable us to do a more effective job as legislators.

I insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent address by Congressman MOORHEAD, "Congress Must Enter the Computer Age," delivered on May 27, 1968, in Rosslyn, Va., at the seventh annual spring systems seminar, Washington chapter, International Systems and Procedures Association:

CONGRESS MUST ENTER THE COMPUTER AGE
(Remarks of Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, seventh annual spring systems seminar, Washington chapter, International Systems and Procedures Association, Rosslyn, Va., May 27, 1968)

It is very humbling for me, a politician, to talk with you about a field in which all of you are experts.

Of course, you know that an expert is a man who gets to know more and more about less and less until he knows everything about nothing; whereas a politician is one who gets to know less and less about more and more until he knows nothing about everything.

While I am speaking in a political vein, there is a story circulating around Washington—in this election year—about the candidate who asked a computer, "Could a computer ever be President?"

And after a few brief whirls and spins, the machine replied, "I am not now and do not intend to become a candidate for any office. But in the event of a genuine draft, I will serve to the best of my ability."

But seriously—I stand somewhat in awe before you planners, analysts and managers who have the imagination to devise the input and the imagination to use the output of the most glamorous and best-publicized embodiment of the new technology—the electronic computer.

COMPUTER TECHNIQUES CONTRIBUTE TO MANY FIELDS

I say the new technology—because there is no question that we are in an era of change. It is the overriding characteristic of our time.

For example:

At the University of Michigan a graduate student turned in a 160 page dissertation this Spring—all of it printed, revised, edited, footnoted, page-numbered and then reprinted by computer. It was done on an IBM 360 computer and required 4600 punch cards.

The Colorado State Dept. of Education has a computer model simulating Denver and its suburbs to predict how various education changes will affect the economic and social growth of metropolitan Denver—it has already shown the need for long-term commitment to educational programs for disadvantaged students.

Here in Washington within the next few weeks we will witness the institution of Washington Area Law Enforcement System (WALEs) with 31 terminals installed in the District, Fairfax, Arlington, and Montgomery Counties—to be tied into the national crime information center at the Justice Department. In the beginning the machine will be programmed just to dispense motor vehicle information, but offers great potential for the future.

In Watergate East, the 13-story apartment-house building recently completed here in Washington, no two floors are alike. Of the

240 apartments, there are 167 floor plans—prohibitively expensive without the aid of the computer in the design process.

Half an hour from where we sit, the U.S. Army Strategy and Tactics Analysis Group (STAG) plays war games to provide the Army with a basis for choosing strategies in land warfare. During a single day their versatile model, "Tartarus" with the aid of the IBM 1401 and 7090 can juggle more factors than all of history's military geniuses combined could have correlated during a lifetime.

These examples show that computers, with their versatility, adaptability, and capability, could be of great service to the Congress of the United States, but the Congress has not yet entered the computer age.

Private industry has entered the computer age. More than 50,000 computers are now operating in the United States, processing information for banks, insurance companies, retail stores, airlines, industrial firms, universities, and as all of you here know, the defense and space agencies and other branches of the government.

The computer is just beginning to make important contributions in the field of medical care; this at a time when our nation is making a larger commitment to medical care and the number of professionally trained medical personnel is declining. We can obviously benefit from the increases in productivity that a computer system can provide, particularly in such areas as medical testing and medical record keeping.

Educators were told at a recent 8-state Conference in Designing Education for the Future that the printed page is rapidly becoming obsolete as a time-consuming, inefficient method of storing information. The computer was hailed as the "library of the future."

Private enterprise has entered the computer age, and so has the executive branch of the federal government.

COMPUTERS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The growth of ADP facilities within the federal community during the past decade has been tremendously significant. In 1956 there were only 90 computers; today there are more than 3,000 computers in use in the various government agencies.

As those of you here—representing the Department of Defense—Department of Health, Education and Welfare—Census Bureau—Internal Revenue Service and other agencies know, PPBS came into its own in the federal management system during President Kennedy's administration, beginning with the imaginative prototype under Secretary McNamara at DOD. This was continued as a Presidential directive for all agencies under President Johnson.

STATE LEGISLATURES ENTER THE COMPUTER AGE

Private enterprise has entered the computer age, the executive branch of the federal government has entered the computer age, but most embarrassing to me as a member of the national legislative body is that 15 of the state legislatures have entered the computer age.

I am very proud that my own state of Pennsylvania is leading the pack in computer technology to serve state legislatures and was cited as a model at the recent National Conference of State Legislatures in San Antonio.

The Pennsylvania Legislative Data Processing Center set up shop in Harrisburg in mid-April, 1967 and has already shown great promise.

In the recently-completed Constitutional Convention, one of the great achievements of the Center was to serve the Convention by introducing into the system pertinent data on the four main topics under consideration (Taxation—Judicial and Local Government, Finance and Apportionment) from all 50 state constitutions.

The computer is now able to give the complete, up-to-the-minute status on all bills for members of the General Assembly; they plan next to get into budget and revenue forecasting; bill editing; and conversion of all statutes into readable form. By maintaining an interest profile on each Member, they are also able to provide him with literature or abstracts on matters of priority to him. They envision a legislative retrieval system where there can be a Central Data Bank for statutes and other pertinent data base files of all states, for all states' legislative use.

THE CONGRESS AND THE AGE OF COMPUTERS

Private enterprise, the executive branch, and state legislatures have entered the computer age, but Congress has not really entered the computer age.

Two years ago I spoke before a National Information Retrieval Colloquium in Philadelphia, and said:

"Today except for one small unit which the Library of Congress uses to handle its payroll, the Congress of the United States does not possess one penny's worth of ADP equipment.

"When I tell you this I am expressing my concern for the future of representative government in the United States.

"The future of representative democracy, the future of our constitutional government with its delicate system of checks and balances requires that, in the computer age, the legislative branch of government make full use of computer capability."

Since that date there has been very little progress. The Clerk of the House now has an NCR 500 to handle some of the payroll on the House side of the Capitol. I understand that the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate is considering the acquisition of similar computer facilities.

The Legislative Reference Service has designed a computer-centered system which allows entering synoptic information on bills and resolutions introduced in both chambers of the Congress to be relayed via keyboard terminals to a remote computer. The magnetic tape generated by this system may be utilized in the future by the Government Printing Office "Linotron" System in publishing the Digest of Public Bills.

Another effort being considered for initiation which will benefit internal researchers and congressional staff is the placement of selected bibliographic citations, annotated and organized by author and subject on paper tape for eventual transfer to magnetic tape. Bibliographic cards can be printed for distribution to users on the basis of interest profiles. Retrieval of key data will be in the form of regular printouts.

Because of the articulated concern of Members of Congress regarding lack of staff support in this new area, a new position was created two years ago by Congress—that of Information Sciences Specialist—in the Library of Congress's Legislative Reference Service.

This is progress, but I would hardly call it an all out entry into the computer age, and I do believe that Congress should make full use of computer capability.

Writing in the introduction of "Congress Needs Help," commentator David Brinkley said:

"Congress has great power, more than any other branch of the government. But effective use of power or leadership certainly requires change to accommodate to the changes in society. A leadership institution that fails to change will become an interesting and perhaps charming irrelevance, like the founder of the hardware business now grown into a huge corporate enterprise, an elderly gentleman whose oil portrait hangs in the boardroom, who mouths 19th century platitudes, who is ceremoniously honored for his early achievements and always remem-

bered on his birthdays—and otherwise ignored."

Congress has not yet reached this state of honored irrelevance, but it is moving toward it, and unless it makes some changes in itself, it will shortly arrive.

CONGRESS HAS CHANGED AND METHODS MUST CHANGE

The Congress of today is different in many ways from its predecessor bodies.

In the First Congress, the 65 Members of the House of Representatives came from constituencies averaging 33,000 persons. The total work load of that group resulted in 118 public and private acts and resolutions being enacted.

Today's Congressman represents an average of 450,000 constituents, and the number may double in the next 40 years.

When the Congress came into being, there were less than 4 million people concentrated mostly between a narrow 50-mile long coastal strip between the Atlantic Ocean and the Appalachian ridgeline.

Today there are nearly 200,000,000 people spread all across the United States.

In the first session of this 90th Congress, there was a record total of 20,387 bills and resolutions introduced in the two chambers. In the House alone, there were 202 quorum calls, 245 Yeas and Nays calls, hundreds of division, teller and voice votes, and mailbags of letters from constituents which included as many as 5,000 letters daily to many congressional offices.

The demands upon the time and energies of the contemporary Congressman are legion. To be effective he must be creative and decisive. He needs two kinds of information: that which applies to current matters demanding immediate attention and that which applies to issues likely to emerge in the future. How then does he cope?

Increasingly, legislators have cast about for new weapons with which to combat the myriad of problems such as air and water pollution, transportation, health and welfare, urban renewal, slum expansion, conservation, and a number have begun to examine the systems approach now at work in your departments and agencies. Such books as "we propose a modern Congress," by the House Republican Task Force, and "Congress, the first branch of government," published by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, are widely read on Capitol Hill.

I am advised that the latest knowledgeable discussion on this subject, "Information support for the Congress," is coming out shortly.

Various committees charged with examining problems of broad scope and national importance have started to explore the contributions made thus far in other fields by systems analysis and operations research.

For example, "Federal Research and Development Programs: The Decision-Making Process" was prepared by the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee where I serve. Last Fall, the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee, where I also serve, convened a series of hearings entitled, "The Planning-Programming-Budgeting System: Progress and Potentials," and Chairman Proxmire said, "It is of the utmost importance that our policymakers be armed with the best possible tools for evaluating the effectiveness of our public programs and expenditures."

Evidence has also been presented before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that the application of systems analysis, operations research and ADP techniques to the problems of Congressmen in their legislative roles merits consideration. One Senator even allowed a consulting firm to analyze his office procedures for handling constituent correspondence. Systems analy-

sis showed that ADP, properly employed, plus some changes in human operations, could result in freeing staff persons for other, more valuable work.

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS AND THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

There is another aspect of legislative activity—the Appropriations process—where systems analysis could play a major role in relieving the work load, and help us arrive at optimum solutions.

The appropriations process is essentially one of allocation of resources or budgeting. Decisions involving cross-agency or cross-program comparisons are impossible under the present appropriations system. However, decisions such as these are precisely the ones that have to be made if savings are to be effected and Congress is to play a meaningful role in the making of national fiscal policy. For example, how much do we spend for education, for defense, for housing—based on our defense needs, and our GNP?

A PPBS system of the sort which I strongly endorse for the Committees of Congress would allow us to determine the policy bases on which the budget was submitted, and the real reason why agency reductions were made by the Bureau of the Budget or the President, prior to submitting the budget to Congress. We simply have no means such as that available in the Executive branch for setting priorities to determine alternative programs affecting the taxpayers dollars.

I believe that the Congress should enter fully into the computer age.

I believe we should change the name of the Legislative Reference Service to the Legislative Research Service, and give it full computer capability.

I believe that the Federal Budget should be put on a computer for ready access to the Congress. This year, the American Enterprise Institute has used ADP to measure and analyze the priorities in the President's 1969 Budget.

A COORDINATED FEDERAL COMPUTER SYSTEM

I believe that we need on the Hill a central read-out facility that could tap the memory banks of all of the other computers in the federal government, not to secure privileged data, but to secure such public factual information as economic statistics, demographic profiles, and figures on such things of daily concern to a Congressman's office as funds allocated to his district, and project and contract awards.

I propose that there be read-out devices or closed circuit television screens in the offices of Senators and Representatives and in committee offices linked to the Legislative Research Office. And that we need a highly selective staff in LRS to provide Members with research and factual information on a range of topics.

An SDI System based on an interest profile which could be matched by computer against abstracts of bills is a great possibility.

The committee is the basic work unit of Congress. I propose that there be systems-trained people on all committees of the Congress; if we cannot initially purchase the hardware for the Congress, we can at least make a beginning with the software, using the existing computer facilities of the Library of Congress and other agencies, perhaps on a "time-sharing basis," as is being done currently in the business world.

I envision a computer system in the Congress which will have remote stations in every Member's office and in every committee office. Think how fabulous it would be to retrieve, by push-button system, the status of current legislation, issues up for vote, histories of committee action in ADP form, appropriation statistics and information, and key research items of value to individual Congressmen.

CONGRESS IS BECOMING AWARE OF THE POSSIBILITIES OF COMPUTERS

An awareness is growing among Congressmen that Congress should really enter the computer age.

This year there were two computer seminars—designed to establish lines of communication between systems technology and the government—held on Capitol Hill. These were sponsored jointly by the Washington Operations Council and the Institute for Management Science, and each seminar attracted about 100 Members and staff.

The Legislative Reference Service held introductory computer seminars for interested staff members, and approximately 60 attended from the Committee and Member offices of the House and Senate.

The Brookings Institute sponsored an evening dinner seminar in January to explore the possible uses of computer technology in the Congress, which 19 Members, representing both parties, attended—and many more expressed an interest for the future.

One large, nationally known corporation has developed a fascinating seminar on the concepts of computers. To date, 35 Members and staff have attended this innovative seminar at the company's Washington Presentation Center, and more are enrolled for future seminars.

The Legislative Reference Service—which has handled 140,000 requests for Members thus far this year—has also completed and made available several studies to aid Members and staff. Some of these are "Automatic Data Processing for the Congress", "Systems Approach, A Tool for the Congress", "Application of ADP in Legal Information Handling", "The Planning-Programming-Budgeting System." More importantly, this has resulted in more face-to-face consultations between LRS, Members of Congress and staff.

These happenings indicate that Congress may be about to enter the computer age.

With your expert knowledge you can help to bring this about.

Even if we do enter the computer age, we must remember that machines cannot make a better world without better people—a truism applicable to every material discovery from the wheel to nuclear power.

The computer, after all, then, is only a tool—an electronic device that is completely subject to human will. It can help us solve problems by providing information that previously was too costly, took too long to process, or was literally beyond human contemplation to obtain. But the choice of problems to be solved, the establishment of priorities and the broad outlook of the attack on these problems are decisions for men, not computers.

Top leadership in the Congress—as in all organizations—will find that while the computer relieves them of minor burdens, it will enormously increase the demands on them to wrestle with the moral and ethical consequences of the policies they choose and implement.

The Congressman of the future will have to be a perpetual student of the techniques of rationalized decision-making, and even more a student of the humanities.

Computers cannot make congressional decisions, but as our world gets more and more complex, Congress will be unable to make rational decisions without computers.

In the jet age, representative democracy cannot keep up using horse and buggy techniques.

With private enterprise, the executive branch and the state legislatures in the computer age Congress must change its ways or it will fall the American people.

Congress must enter the computer age.

WHAT COURSE FOR CAMPAIGNS?

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy has prompted countless Americans to question the sanity of presidential campaigning which subjects the best of our leaders to uncontrollable hazards.

Undoubtedly, this subject will be debated at length in the weeks and months ahead as our Nation picks up the pieces of a political campaign marred by a murder and moves toward the November elections.

A prominent journalist in my congressional district, Mr. W. D. Reimert, has produced a thought-provoking editorial on this subject published in the June 9 edition of the Sunday Call-Chronicle newspaper, Allentown, Pa.

I invite my colleagues to read Mr. Reimert's "Thoughts After an Assassination":

THOUGHTS AFTER AN ASSASSINATION

(By W. D. Reimert)

A nation stunned by another assassination was almost too numb for tears last week.

The senseless killing of Dr. Martin Luther King, while just as deplorable, was in a sense more understandable. Dr. King had deliberately gone into enemy territory, where racist feelings ran high. He seemed to have had a premonition of death. The open struggle between white and black has had overtones of violence from the start. And although he was a disciple of non-violence, his appearance throughout the country often triggered violence of the most vicious sort.

In the case of Robert F. Kennedy there was no premonition of death. An idol of the younger generation and the darling of a growing segment of the old, he had moved among them unafraid for weeks, touching their hands, giving them his winsome smile, speaking to them in that hesitant and almost different style of his.

He had just delivered a victory speech, after winning the California primary, before a deliriously happy crowd, when the shots rang out and within a few hours he was no more.

The immediate reaction was, of course, that this simply couldn't have happened again so soon after the killing of Dr. King, so soon for that matter after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. But it finally sank in that it had, indeed, happened to this youthful father of 10 and scion of one of America's noted families at the moment when his star was in the ascendancy. And then the inquiry began. Why has this happened here?

The answers came by the dozen and most of them were unsatisfactory.

Distinguished psychiatrists took to their typewriters and the airwaves to explain, among other things, that violence is a by-product of frustration. An imbalanced society has produced dissatisfactions that can only be protested by force.

Historians added their bit. This, they said, has always been a violent society. The pilgrim fathers landed with Bibles in one hand and guns in another. Shooting Indians was one of the pastimes of early settlers. Four presidents have been assassinated. Attempts were made on the lives of four others. The opening of the West was punctuated by gunfire

all along the way. The gun was practically the law in those days.

Sociologists pointed to this latest killing as a further sign of a complete breakdown of law and order that can only end in anarchy. Pious pleaders called for more love and less hate.

Most of this confused talk had little relevance to the Kennedy assassination. This was, from all facts presently known, the act of an unbalanced mind.

Assassinations in the United States have not been politically motivated as they usually are abroad, mainly for the purpose of toppling a government. They are usually a purely personal matter perpetrated by the emotionally unstable, and not a reflection of the national mood. They are invariably greeted with shock and dismay.

What is relevant is that while we seek the cause of and an excuse for violence, there has been a failure on a national level to agree in the first place that violence per se is an evil thing without justification. Blame for this can be spread over a wide territory.

Certainly, the liberal-intellectual movement of the post war years shares in the blame. Intellectuals, among whom college and university professors are prominent, have been busy for a couple of decades fostering civil disobedience from draft card burning to rioting on the campus, seizure of personal property, book burning and a variety of other illegal acts.

Surely, clergymen, who for years abdicated their responsibility in social problems and social injustices, get part of the blame, save their consciences by justifying looting and pillaging and burning on the grounds that if people can't get things they want one way, they have a right to get them any way they can. The prevalence of crime on TV programs and in certain newspapers contributes of course to the public mood.

And, of course, the Supreme Court of the United States, has to shoulder a big part of the responsibility for the growth of violence in this generation. The court's decisions putting the rights of criminals above the rights of citizens to protection under the law, have in effect resulted in a collapse of law enforcement. Increase of crimes has been in direct proportion to fear of courts created in the minds of enforcement officers by court decisions.

Police today go about their duties in a state of constant terror lest they offend the criminal and run afoul of the courts. The result has been to coddle the criminal and to neglect his often tragic victims. There was less violent crime when police could be assured their primary duty was to protect the public.

Even as Sen. Kennedy lay dying, the nation was treated to the spectacle of an official of the Los Angeles police department talking to the television cameras to assure the public that the rights of the senator's assailant would be protected in every possible way. Nothing was said about Kennedy's right to live.

Without a doubt, a climate has been created in which violence survives. Until there is a meeting of the minds on the elemental principle that freedom does not mean the right to break any law we do not like, there can be little hope for peace on the streets and on the campus. And not until the courts reassert the right of citizens to safety under the law can we all sleep peacefully at night.

Of distinct relevance to the Kennedy assassination is the utter insanity of our modern political campaigning.

Not only is it a debilitating thing to the candidate physically and mentally. It is an insult to the intelligence of every thoughtful citizen because on the face of it, it is contrived and meaningless.

How a group of majorettes carrying Nixon balloons or another sporting McCarthy hats

can contribute to the intelligent discussion of issues is beyond comprehension. The sight of a candidate greeting supporters with a fixed smile on his face, glassy eyed with weariness, creates only disgust in the mind of the viewer.

Calvin Coolidge once said it should not be necessary for a presidential candidate to campaign—that is in the sense of barnstorming the country.

Since then, TV has entered the scene and communications of the printed media have been speeded up immeasurably. All the campaigning that should be necessary would be a series of programs and debates in which the issues could be aired thoroughly and with dignity.

We need not exhaust our presidential candidates before they can possibly be elected. "Pressing the flesh," LBJ style is unnecessary for such an important thing as choosing a president.

And above all we should not be exposing our great national leaders to the uncontrollable danger of assault by some deranged crank with a revolver or rifle in his hand.

Let Sen. Kennedy's tragic passing bring some sanity back to campaigning—and while we are at it to the national conventions, too.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL ROGERS FAVORS STRONG ANTICRIME BILL

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, PAUL ROGERS, for a long time has been working for a tough anticrime bill. PAUL ROGERS is a lawyer who understands the necessity for that kind of a bill. He succeeded his father, Dwight Rogers, who also served with me on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the recent fight to enact the kind of control and antiriot legislation that would be effective, he took a prominent part.

Aldo Beckman of the Chicago Tribune has written an article, which appeared in the Sunday, June 9, 1968 issue, on PAUL ROGERS and I am sure my friends in the House will want to read it. It follows herewith:

BOLD DRIVE TO THWART CRIME IS REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS' GOAL

(By Aldo Beckman)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—Rep. Paul Rogers [D., Fla.] was determined that the Congress would adopt a tough anti-crime bill.

He has been one of the most vocal members of the House in urging that tougher methods be employed against the criminal element, and frequently has expressed his shock at the rising crime rate.

It is the Florida democrat who continually reminds the House of the deterioration of law and order in the nation's capital, and he reminds his colleagues of this with every new crime of violence, which are almost daily occurrences here.

GOES INTO ACTION

So Rogers went into action when he learned that Rep. Emanuel Celler [D., N.Y.], the chairman of the powerful house judiciary committee and the man who would head House conferees in any House-Senate conference on the controversial crime bill, had said he would rather see the bill die

than accept certain provisions tacked on by the Senate.

He promised the House that he would offer a motion to instruct the House conferees to accept provisions in the Senate-passed bill aimed at offsetting recent Supreme Court decisions.

Adoption of his motion, Rogers promised, would require Celler and his conferees to accept provisions striking at the Supreme court rulings, the very part of the bill which Celler had attacked.

LEADS TO ADOPTION

Rogers' speech was the first effort made to head off the liberal New Yorker, and it triggered a series of moves which ultimately led this week to the House adopting the extremely tough Senate-passed anti-crime bill.

Ironically, Rogers never had a chance to offer his motion because the House refused to send the bill to conference and there were, thus, no conferees to instruct. But he was not unhappy about the chain of events, and, in fact, urged the House to follow the action which it took.

"I planned a two-pronged attack from the beginning," he explained in an interview. "I wanted the House to accept the Senate bill, which it finally did, but if we had lost the vote and the bill had gone to conference. I still had my motion to instruct."

MOVE WAS QUICKER

"I feel that either method would have produced the desired results of a tough bill, but the one we took was quicker and easier," he said.

Rogers, an attorney from West Palm Beach, Fla., said he has been concerned for the last several years about the rising crime rate. * * * adequately enforcing our laws," he said. "I've been concerned about these weighted decisions from the Supreme court. It's vital that we bring our system of law back into balance, so that the rights of society are given the same consideration as the rights of the criminal.

"Unless we begin to do this, we're headed for an unprecedented growth in crime in this country."

He cited statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, showing that crime rose 88 per cent between 1960 and 1967, with the incidents of violent crime rising 72 per cent. "At the same time, our population rose only 10 per cent," he said.

CALLS IT TYPICAL

"This is typical of what is happening all over America, and the trend has got to be stopped," he insisted. "Instead of tying the hands of our police, we need to begin a trend to back them up."

Altho Miami isn't in his district, Rogers enjoys pointing out that since the police chief there announced he was putting police dogs and patrolmen carrying shotguns in high crime areas, the incident rate has dropped in these areas by 62 per cent.

The over-all crime rate in the city has dropped 45 per cent since the chief's announcement, Rogers said.

"This shows what good law enforcement will do," he emphasized.

Rogers was born 47 years ago in Ocilla, Ga., but moved to Florida with his family when he was only 4. His late father, Dwight L., served in the House for 10 years before his death in 1954.

REPLACES HIS FATHER

The junior Rogers was elected to fill the seat of his father and has won handily in every election since.

Altho he had been around politics all his life, Rogers' first try for public office was in the special congressional election in January, 1955.

"I liked politics, but didn't think I should get active in it as long as dad was in congress," Rogers explained.

Altho he has never had any difficulty in getting reelected, Rogers refuses to take his district, which extends from coast to coast in south-central Florida, for granted. He goes home at least once a month, and sometimes oftener.

He and his wife, Rebecca, have one daughter.

WORKS ON COMMITTEES

Much of his time is spent here working on the interstate and foreign commerce and the merchant marine and fisheries committees.

He was author of a sea-grant college bill, aimed at setting up programs to improve oceanography schools, and he was one of the hardest hitting members of the investigating committee which recently looked into charges that a television outlet staged a pot party at Northwestern university, so it could be filmed.

Rogers heads the House health subcommittee, and has pioneered in the investigating of radiation hazards of colored television sets and other household appliances.

THE NEED FOR STRONG GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a tragic act of violence struck America last week. It is only the latest of a long series of unspeakable acts which have cut down our youngest and most vigorous leaders. Robert F. Kennedy was murdered with a pistol, but so many others were murdered with rifles. Just 2 months ago Martin Luther King, Jr., was gunned down with a rifle. John F. Kennedy was also killed by a rifle. And shortly before he was killed a lurking sniper murdered Medgar Evers—with a shotgun.

The omnibus crime bill sent to the President so recently strikes a long-overdue blow at the unbelievable ease with which handguns are bought and sold in America. But to bring handguns under some control is just a small step. We must control, if only to a small extent, the traffic in rifles, shotguns, and ammunition. Of the four murders by firearms that I related three were killings by rifles or shotguns. Robert Kennedy could as easily have been shot from ambush by a rifleman as by a handgunman. Both types of deadly weapons just must be controlled.

The bill proposed by the President will add rifles, shotguns, and ammunition to handguns as the weapons which must be controlled in some way.

The bill strikes at mail-order sales in interstate shipments of rifles. It was just such a mail-order gun that killed President Kennedy. It stops the flagrant abuse of local firearms laws by residents who cross State lines to buy their weapons and it keeps guns and ammunition out of the hands of the young.

These are minimal steps—but steps that are overdue. Let us act now before we are hurt again.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incredible that we should have seen 6,500 Americans murdered last year in homicides involving the use of a gun. No other civilized nation in the world has as hor-

rible a record of destruction of human beings in peacetime through the use of guns as our own Nation.

England, France, Germany, and all the other nations of the world had only a fraction of homicides during that period. England had only 30 people killed with guns in nonmilitary activity.

President Johnson made the point the other day that since the turn of the century, 750,000 Americans have been killed in homicides involving the use of a gun. This is more than our total losses on the battlefield in all of our wars in this century.

These startling and sickening statistics prove more than anything anyone can say the need for stronger gun control legislation.

I have been furnished information which indicates that there are 40 million guns in this Nation today and the rate of increase is alarming.

In the light of this heavy traffic in arms, we have a right to ask the following questions:

First. What is wrong with requiring that every gun be registered?

This practice is now being followed by almost all reputable gun dealers. In most reputable shops when a citizen comes in to buy a gun or rifle—even if it is for legitimate sport use—the gun dealer registers the gun and fills out an extensive questionnaire on the purchaser of the gun. Those who have raised questions as to how this will effect legitimate sport and hunting fans know that the legitimate purchaser of a gun already registers that weapon under practices being followed throughout the country today.

Second. What is wrong with requiring that a purchaser of a gun—be it a handgun or a rifle—present himself personally to the gun dealer to complete the purchase?

The traffic in mail-order guns is one of the greatest tragedies of our time and I cannot see how any law-abiding citizen or bona fide sportsmen would object to requiring that the purchaser of a gun—a lethal weapon—must present himself personally to complete the transaction. Years ago in rural America when you did not have gun dealers in every community and people had to travel long distances in primitive vehicles—there might have been justification for mail-order traffic in guns. But in modern America I cannot see how we can justify mail-order traffic in guns any longer.

Third. What is wrong with requiring that an owner of a gun advise the authorities whom he has sold his gun to when in fact such a sale is made.

We today have to register our automobiles and when we transfer ownership of an automobile we have to notify the appropriate State authorities of such a transfer. Why then should there be such violent objection to the proposal that when a bona fide owner of a gun disposes of this weapon he notify the proper authorities as to the new owner's identity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these are three valid and reasonable questions and should be incorporated in any new gun control legislation.

I am encouraged by the fact that legitimate, bona fide, gun owners and gun

collectors have said to me that as individuals they have no objections to any one of the three suggestions listed above.

Who then, Mr. Speaker, is opposed to stronger legislation?

Who are the faceless lobbyists who have frustrated the will of this Nation time and time again to deal effectively with this monstrous problem of traffic in guns in America?

Every single survey that I have seen in recent years clearly shows the American people are overwhelmingly in support of stronger gun control legislation. Victor Hugo once said that there is no force greater than an idea whose time has come.

I am convinced that the time for the idea of stronger gun control legislation has not only come, but has been long overdue.

I shall do all in my power to help enact effective gun control legislation in this Congress.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND CRIME CONTROL

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is more than a fair question to inquire what the Supreme Court is trying to do to criminal law enforcement in this Nation by continuing to hand down decisions that are out of touch with the realities and necessities for public protection against vicious criminals. The latest evidence of the Court's amazing and continuing disregard for the right of the public to such protection is described in an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of June 11, 1968, entitled "Judicial Travesty," which I am including in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

For the life of me I cannot understand why the Court does not get out of its ivory tower and come down to earth and see how the other half lives in terms of handing down decisions that will allow the police to protect the general public, all without permitting the Star Chamber or police brutality in any way. Requirements that officers must actually witness the commission of a crime to make a valid arrest or that persons caught in the commission of a crime may not at that instant be allowed to confess or tell what they were doing without first being cautioned by the detaining officer not to talk unless a lawyer is present, are worse than sentimental judicial drivel. They prevent trial judges from receiving into evidence, direct and responsible proof of guilt of guilty criminals.

Can it be that those who author these decisions do not realize what they will do to law enforcement in America when they phrase them? They must. Yet despite such awareness why do they continue to destroy the ability of an enlightened democratic society to protect itself against rising crime by responsible and intelligent law enforcement? Why, Mr. Speaker, Why?

Unfortunately, about all that can be done in terms of pragmatic reality is to hope and pray that an aroused people will elect a President this fall who will make the solemn commitment to the American people that he will not appoint to the Supreme Court of the United States any person whose record does not convincingly demonstrate his responsible dedication to reasonable and restrained interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, regardless of political affiliations. It has cost this Nation dearly to indulge in appointments of philosophical crusaders to life tenure on the High Court as judicial legislators. This practice must be ended once and for all.

The editorial referred to follows:

JUDICIAL TRAVESTY

The Supreme Court has just come forward with a powerful argument in support of the proposition that President Johnson should sign the newly enacted crime bill.

In a ruling which displays an amazing disregard for the right of the public—if there is any such right—to be protected against criminals, a majority of the justices have voted to overturn the *third* murder conviction of a Washington man, Eddie M. Harrison.

Harrison's first conviction was reversed by the Court of Appeals because his lawyer was not in fact a member of the bar. The second conviction was reversed by the Court of Appeals on the ground that a confession used as evidence was obtained in violation of the *Mallory Rule*—the requirement that a suspect be arraigned without unnecessary delay. At the second trial, however, Harrison, while properly represented by counsel, took the stand and gave an explanation of the killing which implicated him. He was found guilty by the jury.

At the third trial the confession, of course, was not used. But Harrison's own testimony at the second trial was read to the jury, and he again was convicted. The Court of Appeals affirmed. But the Supreme Court, without ascertaining whether, in fact, the *Mallory Rule* had been violated, reversed.

This brought outraged protests from the three dissenters. Justice Black thought the majority's reasoning was wholly illogical and completely unreasonable. He agreed with Justice White that "holdings like this" make it far more difficult to protect society "against those who have made it impossible to live today in safety."

Justice Harlan said "there is no suggestion that the testimony in question, given on the stand with the advice of counsel, was somehow unreliable."

Justice White said this decision "has emanated from the court's fuzzy ideology which is difficult to relate to any provision of the Constitution and which excludes from the trial evidence of the highest relevance and probity." He went on to say that "criminal trials will simply become less effective in protecting society," and he pointed out that by the time of the third trial "prosecution witness were dead or unavailable. This will be even more true of a fourth trial—if there is one. There may not be a fourth trial, however. For the prosecution, discouraged by its encounters with judge-made roadblocks, may decide simply to release Harrison—a chilling prospect for this community.

What does all of this have to do with the new crime bill? Simply this: That legislation modifies the *Mallory Rule* to permit questioning of a criminal suspect for a period of up to six hours. It also undertakes to modify other Supreme Court decisions, to permit wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping in certain types of cases, restricts the sale of hand guns, and authorizes major financial assistance to police departments.

If the President's repeated calls for a war on crime mean anything, he will sign this bill.

BILL MAULDIN WRITES TO JOE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following in the RECORD:

[From the Reporter, Feb. 12, 1953]

BILL MAULDIN WRITES TO JOE

My kid Andy got a lot of toy guns for Christmas. They sure are making them realistic now. If we get into another big war, all that Ordnance will have to do is ask the young fry to turn in their small arms, then chamber the weapons for standard ammunition, put in real firing pins, and the Singer Company can go right on making sewing machines. We'll have plenty of guns.

Anyway, the other day Andy was sitting in front of the television set with a gold-plated Colt .44 in a holster, a rocket pistol in his belt, a rifle on his lap, and a comic book in his hip pocket. Man, you should have seen the cover on that book. It would have scared you to death. A bunch of wild men wearing U.S. Army uniforms and using knives, fists, and what looked like broken beer bottles were tangling hand to hand with some unidentified villains, who were naturally getting the worst of it. A flying saucer hovered over their heads.

The television show took up where the book jacket left off. It was a space-man moon-shooting program that must have been trying to keep its hold on the lollipop lickers who are still loyal to cowboy stuff, because cattle rustlers in a jeep kept coming in and out of the picture. There was some military stuff from time to time, too.

"I don't wanna be President any more," Andy told me. "I wanna join the Army and be a sojer all my life."

"Don't worry, you can do both," I assured him. "There's no limit to the opportunities open for an ambitious soldier."

"A space cadet can kill a cowboy, but a sojer can kill cowboys and space cadets," he said. "I can kill you, too. *Kersp-cheouwwwww!*" He can't even whistle yet, but he can purse his mouth and imitate perfectly the sound a ricocheted rifle shot makes on a sound track.

Understand, Joe, I didn't give him those weapons. They came from grown-up friends of Andy's who watch television or who notice on drugstore magazine shelves that instead of the innocent, old-fashioned comics with horrible, warty ghouls dragging half-naked ladies around, now there's the steady drip, drip, drip of gore and the gleam of an occasional flying tooth with a bit of jawbone attached when the leading character doesn't want to get his bayonet wet and so uses the horizontal butt stroke instead. These friends assumed, more or less accurately, that this is the trend with the younger set, and so for presents they gave the kid an arsenal.

All our parents had to worry about was explaining sex to us. Our parents could answer straight or they could duck the questions and let us get our misinformation elsewhere. Today with our own kids there's this added problem. "Daddy, did you get to kill anybody in the war?" "Are people dead when they're killed?" "I want to kill somebody." "Why do they lie down when they're dead?"

It won't do any good to take the books and the guns away and throw out the television. They'll just go over to a little pal's house and feel that much more adventuresome about

it. And you can't duck it and say it's all a lot of make-believe when they'll find out soon enough that there's real shooting going on in the world and more of it brewing.

But I finally hit on the right thing to say. It occurred to me that what puts a lot of the glamour in this battle stuff is that the television and comic-book projectiles travel a more or less one-way street and the badmen always drop dead first. I told Andy that *this* part is sure enough make-believe.

"You mean when I'm a sojer and shoot, he kills me back?" he asked. He thought about it for a while. He decided it didn't seem fair to him. Damned if he was going to play that kind of game. He laid down his guns and I hope he won't pick them up again until he's drafted.

Regards,

BILL.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IMPOSES RESTRICTIONS ON MAILING OF FIREARMS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has imposed restrictions today upon the delivery of firearms through the mails.

Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson announced a major revision in postal regulations to prohibit delivery by postmasters of any firearms without prior notification to law enforcement officers.

General Watson also announced that the Department has classified sawed-off shotguns and short-barreled rifles as concealable weapons. This bars the weapons from the mails unless sent to certain authorized recipients such as law enforcement officers.

The Postmaster General said he has asked private express companies to follow the lead of the postal service in doing what they legally can to assist local law enforcement officers in keeping abreast of the traffic in guns.

Mr. Speaker, these are firm administrative actions by the Postmaster General who said he hopes that "Congress acts soon on effective gun control legislation."

He continued:

Meanwhile, this is an interim measure that I believe will assist in achieving that goal.

The Postmaster General also unveiled a comprehensive "plan of action" to strengthen equal employment opportunities throughout the postal system.

The policy directives of the Postmaster General were disclosed in an address to the National Press Club in Washington today. The address follows:

POSTMASTER GENERAL WATSON SPEAKS TO NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

One of the most serious challenges to our democratic process is the growing tide of violence threatening every American. It is a violence that could construct a Berlin Wall of fear between those who aspire to political office and the American people.

Weapons fired from the darkness of sick minds can not only kill an individual but also destroy our hopes of making this nation a finer, freer place where the human

spirit can flourish and all men reach their full potential.

Each of us must do what he can to reverse this dangerous and frightening trend.

And each of us must do so in a way that will not compromise or modify the freedom we now enjoy.

Last February, the President asked the Congress for the most comprehensive crime control legislation in our history—legislation that would strike a heavy blow against crime while at the same time maintaining our tradition of local control. Again, just last month, in a letter to Senator Mansfield, the President said that "... the key to effective crime control is effective law enforcement—at the local level."

Thus, while we must find ways of dealing with crime and with the instruments of crime, we must also be careful not to endanger our system of federalism—a system based on divided but equal responsibilities at all levels of government.

Certainly, if each level of government carries out its responsibilities, the problem of combating crime and violence will be much diminished.

I am here today to tell you that the Post Office Department intends to carry out its responsibility.

In accordance with our duty, I have concluded that shipment of firearms through the mails under existing procedures seriously interferes with enforcement of state and local laws designed to control firearms. The national interest demands that activities of the postal service shall not hinder effective enforcement of State and local gun control laws.

Therefore, I have today issued regulations that all firearms shipped through the mails be clearly labeled with the word: "Firearms."

If the shipment is not so labeled it will not be accepted in the mails.

I have also ordered that all postmasters shall not make delivery of any firearm without first notifying the chief law enforcement official of the community that delivery of a firearm is to be made.

This regulation will be effective immediately.

I have also ordered that sawed-off shotguns and short-barreled rifles be barred from the mails as concealable weapons. This means they cannot be sent through the mails except to authorized recipients such as military officers or law enforcement agents.

In this way—though we are not restricting the shipment of the larger weapons—we are doing what we can under the law to assure that they do not flow into the hands of irresponsible persons.

This will enable local law enforcement authorities, in those many states and local jurisdictions having gun control laws, to take action if there is a violation of their laws.

We all recognize that the passage of arms is also accomplished by means other than government mails. Many weapons are sent through private express carriers. The Post Office Department cannot direct these private businesses to follow our lead. However, we recognize that these public firms are as interested in the good of this country as any private citizen.

For that reason, I have sent the following wire to these businesses and transportation organizations this morning. It reads, quote:

"I have today ordered the Post Office Department to require all shippers to clearly identify firearms with a label. Before delivery of such a package, our Postmasters will notify local law enforcement officials of the name of the recipient. It is my hope that you will freely join with us in this endeavor. The Post Office Department stands ready to assist you in this in anyway you desire. I personally will be available to meet with your representatives." Unquote

I fully realize that guns do not kill or threaten . . . men do.

I fully realize that neither these new regulations nor, indeed, any laws will of themselves solve the problem of sick minds or violence in our streets.

But it is a beginning. And I think we must recognize that this step plus the crime proposals made last February by the President are part of a broad program—a program of housing, education, health and jobs that not only treats the symptoms of tension in our society, but also attacks and can defeat those causes.

I think it is self-evident that a society in which social and economic justice has been achieved is a society that will produce less tension, less sickness and less violence. All government agencies are working toward that end. This is particularly applicable to the Post Office Department which is the largest civilian employer among government agencies.

I take particular pride in my association with 711,660 fellow employees. In my 44 days in office, I have travelled some 15,000 miles and seen 30 different postal facilities and I am told that I have met over 8,500 employees. This was done for two purposes—first, to get to know the system and those who make it work; and, second, to search out ways to do the job better and at less cost.

I think both aims have been to some degree achieved. Certainly I am more convinced than ever that the Post Office is an often overlooked cornerstone of democracy—an organization which by its daily delivery of mail affects every home and every business. And I am convinced that our people are doing a good job of delivering over 82 billion pieces of mail this year.

But I am equally convinced that we must give them further assistance, both in modernization of machinery and in modernization of our employee programs. This is particularly important in the Post Office—for, as the largest civilian department of government, everything we do has an effect on the nation as a whole.

Therefore, I have pledged myself to these fine people and to these programs for a better post office. Today, I am pleased to be able to announce a new Plan of Action that will enhance our goal of full equality of opportunity for all.

Effective today, I am ordering an advanced program to aid the disadvantaged—and thus aid our land as well. This is not a hastily conceived program. It is one we have worked on intensively during my six and one half weeks as Postmaster General.

The Plan of Action is designed to pinpoint responsibility for action to carry out the President's program and my own; it is designed to require explanations if qualified minority members are passed over for employment or promotion; it is designed to assure regular and detailed reports on the status of equal employment in every post office and postal installation.

It is direct and specific.

It is a Plan of Action that will work.

It is a Plan of Action which keeps the Post Office Department in the forefront of aiding the less advantaged.

I hope you will clearly understand that we are not suddenly creating equality or social justice.

Rather, we are improving on the very good program we already have—a program which has served as a guidepost for many other government agencies.

What we are doing now is adding to this program and strengthening it. This is in keeping with our postal policies which date back to the last century.

The first Negro lady postmaster in the United States, Minnie M. Cox, was appointed back in 1896 at Indianola, Mississippi. Some years later when elements of that city at-

tempted to make things unpleasant, President Teddy Roosevelt shut down the post office until her safe return was guaranteed.

We have all come a long way since then, both as a government and as a people.

In the post office, we guarantee social and economic justice, not by shutting down post offices, but by opening them up as wide as we can.

To understand what we have done and what we propose to do, six facts are necessary:

First Fact—we are the largest civilian employer of minority group workers in the world. Our workforce includes over 150,000 minority group members, mostly Negroes, who constitute almost 22 per cent of our total employment.

Second Fact—we employ and recruit not on the basis of race or religion or color, but ability.

Third Fact—our minority group employees are of proven high quality. Minority group members now hold the Postmasterships of the three largest post offices in the United States—in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Fourth Fact—all the trends in minority group employment in our Department are upward.

In virtually every major city in America, our percentage of minority group employment exceeds the percentage of minority people in the city's population.

Fifth Fact—we insist that those who contract with the Department also provide equal employment opportunity. Our contract compliance program is sternly enforced. So far, enforcement of regulations requiring contractors to follow equal opportunity job policies has resulted in the hiring of 13,000 minority group employees in many fields outside the Post Office. More importantly, it has helped break down long standing patterns of discrimination in numerous key industries.

Sixth Fact—we are now starting new programs to search out talent where it may be hidden, and to find ways of telling members of minority groups that they are wanted and they are welcome in the postal service.

One of the finest of these new programs has a bureaucratic name, but a human intent.

It is called the Concentrated Employment Program.

Translated into English that means we are testing a way of finding postal work for the so-called hard-core unemployable. Right now such a test is being conducted in San Francisco for 200 persons recruited from the ghetto areas.

Another project along this line will begin shortly in Oakland, California, and others will follow.

Under the concentrated employment program, each worker receives two weeks of pre-appointment orientation with a small salary from the Labor Department. When he begins on-the-job training with the Postal Service, the appointee must attend two hours of school each work day outside working hours for a maximum period of one year, or earlier if he passes the Civil Service examination.

We are also providing training in 70 locations for veterans about to be discharged and we are making special efforts to hire recent service veterans.

In addition, our summer employment program is aimed primarily at young people from families with income at the poverty level.

Thus, the door is open.

We should be proud and satisfied.

And to a large degree we are.

But we are not completely satisfied.

We think we can do better.

It is for that reason that I approved this morning our Equal Employment Opportunity Plan of Action.

The Plan has one basic philosophy—that old patterns will not just fade away. They must be attacked.

So we are moving forward aggressively. Today, I am informing every postal employee that no discrimination of any kind will be tolerated. Together, we will push hard, both where we have already broken through, and where new breakthroughs are needed.

Our new plan of action—based on our philosophy of equality for all people—translates into hard hitting programs which fight discrimination and strike against poverty.

First, I have designated a special high level task force to survey postal installations and assure that equal opportunity fully and truly exists in promotions as well as hiring. These top personnel will travel over the nation and will effectively assure that our plans become fact.

Second, I am intensifying our contract compliance program. We are hiring 23 additional Contract Compliance Examiners to make sure all our contractors are meeting the requirements of President Johnson's Executive Order on contractor employment.

Third, since there is a post office in every city and almost every village, town, and hamlet, it is our responsibility to assure that national leadership in racial justice is also brought home at the local level.

Therefore, I am asking all our postmasters to contribute their influence and abilities to improving equal opportunity in their communities. I am also encouraging them to aid as community leaders in helping to eliminate racial or cultural bias from local school systems and housing arrangements.

Postmasters are local leaders. Since elimination of racial, social, and economic injustice is one of our major problems, these are the areas where their leadership can be most helpful.

Since big cities crystallize this problem, I have designated postmasters of all 4,859 first-class post offices as deputy equal employment opportunity officers. They will have special responsibilities, and they will report directly to our Equal Opportunity division in Washington.

We intend to take full advantage of our postmaster's places as leaders in their communities. As a Federal Agency, it is our responsibility to work in accordance with President Johnson's policy of education, jobs and housing for all people without regard to race or any other irrelevant consideration.

Fourth, I have issued an order to begin pre-supervisory training on a large scale to all candidates who are eligible for promotion to postal supervisors. I have also directed that maximum encouragement be given to minority group employees to take the next nationwide supervisory promotion examination. This will be given in the fall, and a special handbook will be provided for all who wish to prepare for a supervisory examination.

I will require all post offices to cooperate with all employee organizations or community groups who are willing to help employees prepare for the supervisory examination.

In the same vein, post offices will also cooperate with groups preparing job seekers for the civil service test leading to postal employment. And we will now step up our efforts to recruit in the neighborhoods—efforts which have been successful in our test programs.

Finally, we will take a number of detailed and quite specific steps to make our Plan of Action a meaningful weapon in the war against poverty and discrimination.

This war is perhaps the most challenging that has ever faced America. I intend to wage it with intensified effort.

For this war touches the very essence of America. As President Johnson said, "We shall either find the means to open employment to all of our workers—to find decent housing for all of our citizens—to provide a good education for all of our American children—or we shall see the American promise spoiled for each of them."

The American promise has for 200 years served as a light pointing the way.

Today I have described two steps to protect that promise and that light.

I have done all that I can within the law to support local and State law enforcement agencies in their effort to control and regulate the possession of firearms, and ban certain lethal weapons from unrestricted passage through the mail. I hope that Congress acts soon on effective gun control legislation. Meanwhile, this is an interim measure that I believe will assist in achieving that goal.

And I have taken a number of major steps to assure that the Post Office Department serves the nation, not only as an effective channel of communication, but also as an instrument of social justice.

May I end by promising to you, that this great Department of government will do everything possible to serve the American people and advance the American dream.

SENIOR CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR SOCIETY

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the Northbrook United Brethren Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, was the third-place winner in the Christian Endeavor's 1968 Christian youth witness program sponsored by the International Society of Christian Endeavor. The Senior Christian Endeavor Society of the Northbrook United Brethren Church will receive the Albert H. Diebold Award of \$100 plus an award plaque.

The program is sponsored annually by the International Society of Christian Endeavor. For the last 12 years the awards have been named in honor of the late Albert X. Diebold, a Christian layman of New York City. Through the financial support of Mr. Diebold and the Diebold Foundation this continuing program has been made possible.

Society winners of the program were required to complete a Christian witness activity. Each activity was evaluated on the basis of group participation, goals established or achieved, its Christian witness to the community, and overall effectiveness in implementing the purpose of the Christian youth witness program.

To receive third-place honors, the Senior Christian Endeavor Society held a youth revival November 24 through 26. The group included approximately 14 high school youth, and the evangelist was Dan Boen, 17-year-old high school senior from Kettering, Ohio.

To make this a successful venture, the young people distributed posters to local stores; sent invitations to other churches; held prayer meetings twice a week in homes; presented skits on their weekly radio program on station WAKW, and made house-to-house visitations in teams.

It is most gratifying for me to be able to represent in Congress such a fine group, and I would especially like to commend the young people on their hard work for and participation in such a worthwhile program. A tremendous

amount of time and labor was put into this project by the youth participants and our community can indeed be proud of them.

GUIDELINES ON DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RELIGION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of our colleagues a report made public by the National Jewish Commission on Law and Public Affairs on the application of the "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion," promulgated by the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in proceedings before the New York State Commission for Human Rights. The text of the report follows:

The New York State Commission for Human Rights in a precedent setting ruling has held that employers in the state must make reasonable accommodations to the religious needs of the prospective employees who are Sabbath Observers.

This decision was made by the Commission Chairman, Robert J. Mangum, in a case brought by Bernard Rubin, of Brooklyn, a computer programmer who was denied employment by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company because he would have to leave work early on Friday afternoons during the winter in order to be home before sunset, when the Sabbath begins. In effect, Chairman Mangum adopted the "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion" that were promulgated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) of the Federal Government in July, 1967. These provide that the "duty not to discriminate on religious grounds includes an obligation on the part of the employer to make reasonable accommodation to the religious needs of employees and prospective employees where such accommodation can be made without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer's business."

The guidelines also provide that the burden of proving an undue hardship is upon the employer.

In adopting these guidelines for New York State, Chairman Mangum wrote that he deems them "as a good and workable device in attempting to determine whether or not discrimination is involved. It is my opinion that if a guideline can be used throughout the United States it should be a basic minimum throughout New York State. This is true not only because that which is good for the nation as a whole is good for the State, but by its position as first in the field of anti-discrimination and human rights laws the State has indicated that its citizens demand a maximum amount of protection against discrimination."

Applying the Federal yardstick to the refusal to hire Rubin, Mangum found the nature of computer work is such so as to make it an undue hardship to accommodate to the special needs of the job seeker. "The computer is a million-dollar piece of equipment and must be used at all available times, including late evening hours."

However, in a second case against the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company involving a Sabbath Observer, brought by Rochelle Sachs, of the Bronx, Commissioner Francis X. Giaccone held that the refusal to hire a secretary on a full-time basis constituted "probable cause to credit the allegations of the complaint". Commissioner Giaccone

based his findings on the principles in the Rubin case.

Mr. Rubin and Miss Sachs were represented before the Commission by Howard I. Rhine on behalf of the National Jewish Commission on Law and Public Affairs (COLPA), which was formed in September of 1965 for the purpose of promoting the interests of the Orthodox Jewish Community in legal and legislative matters. Apart from representing Orthodox groups, COLPA has a specialized membership of 125 lawyers and social scientists who volunteer their services as they are needed. Mr. Rhine, a lawyer with the firm of Greenman, Zimet, Haines, Corbin & Goodkind, in the City, is Chairman of a special COLPA committee of lawyers, including Sidney Kwestel, Julius Berman and Judah Dick, who represent Sabbath Observers without fee. He said that apart from the Rubin and Sachs cases, four other complaints are now before the State Commission and one other case is before the Federal Commission. He estimates that since September of last year approximately 200 complaints alleging job discrimination against Sabbath Observers have come before COLPA. In a number of these, COLPA has worked out a satisfactory arrangement with the employer.

The actions of the New York State Commission were hailed by Mr. Rhine and Dr. Marvin Shick, President of Colpa. In a statement they declared that "The adoption of the Federal guidelines by the State means that tens of thousands of Orthodox Jews and others who live according to the dictates of their religion will be afforded equal opportunity as they strive to make a dignified living and support their families. We regret that Chairman Mangum did not find in Rubin's favor, particularly since many companies ranging from IBM to smaller computer firms have found that accommodation to the religious needs of sabbath observers in computer programs positions involves no hardship whatsoever. We believe that perhaps Chairman Mangum does not fully understand what is involved in programming work and based his decision on an inadequacy of information. It is Colpa's intention to seek to reopen this aspect of the Rubin case and submit affidavits from the many hundreds of sabbath observers employed by other companies in this very capacity. It is also Colpa's hope that the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and other employers that have discriminated in the past will now voluntarily comply with the new rules."

According to Dr. Shick, a professor of Constitutional Law at Hunter College, Colpa has been intensively involved in problems of sabbath observers since the group was founded two years ago. He said that each year in New York City alone there are thousands of instances of discrimination against sabbath observers, with the job hunter persevering, going from one prospective job to another until he succeeds without making any formal complaint.

Last year Colpa prevailed upon the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to promulgate the guidelines that are now effective in New York. Earlier this year New Jersey became the first state to adopt and implement them. The success in New York is Colpa's most notable victory. However, Mr. Rhine points out that most of Colpa's work lies ahead. "We must successfully conclude the cases that have been brought, get Human Rights commissions in other states with significant numbers of Orthodox Jews to follow the conduct of New Jersey and New York, and most importantly we must get employers to recognize their obligation and to understand that sabbath observers are responsible employees who deserve and are entitled to equal employment opportunities."

AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND COPYRIGHT LAW

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the second installment of the report on the American University Symposium on Automated Information Systems and Copyright Law is contained in the following material—"Automated Information Systems and Copyright Law, Part II":

COPYRIGHT AND THE COMPUTER: WHY THE UNAUTHORIZED DUPLICATION OF COPYRIGHTED MATERIALS FOR USE AS COMPUTER INPUT SHOULD CONSTITUTE INFRINGEMENT

(By Arthur J. Greenbaum,* Cowan, Liebowitz and Latman)

The purpose of this paper is to explain why I believe that the conversion of copyrighted works into machine-readable form for use as computer input should be considered copyright infringement.

First some definitions. Computer "input" consists of the material which is available for manipulation or retrieval by the computer. By "conversion into machine readable form" I mean (a) transferring text to punch cards, magnetic tapes, disks, or related information storage vehicles, or directly transferring the information into the computer in some electronic form, so that the printed words can be utilized by the computer, and (b) the further duplication of materials which are already in the machine readable form defined in (a).

The value to the computer user of copyrighted works which have been copied for use as computer input can be considerable. The computer is a remarkable tool that can be used, for example, to disseminate all or part of the copyrighted material throughout the nation or to utilize it within the computer operator's own area or organization in various ways which are not feasible with printed works. This value to the operator can perhaps be measured partly by what it would cost him to accumulate independently the information which he feeds into the computer, costs which the copyright proprietor had to bear. The value of a copyrighted work when utilized with the powerful assistance of a computer may bear no relationship to the value of the work when utilized by a single individual or institution in the usual ways that printed materials are used.

The idea of different values attaching to different types of uses is not new. To cite just one example: an individual might spend \$3.50 to buy a printed copy of *My Fair Lady* in order to read it, but he cannot perform the play commercially unless the copyright proprietor's consent is obtained and a substantial royalty paid.

In short, use of a copyrighted work in a computer operation constitutes a different and higher quality of use which cannot be equated with a single or multiple use of a single work in print form. The mere purchase of the printed work for ordinary use was not intended by the publisher to permit use of the material as input in the computer—a truly extraordinary use with possibly devastating consequences to the copyright proprietor. It takes little imagination to foresee the impact on the publishing industry if a printed work, such as, the recently published Random House dictionary, were converted into machine readable form without payment to or editorial control by the publisher for use in a nation-wide computer network with

innumerable outlets in libraries, industry, and homes.

The above discussion illustrates that information produced in print form has value to a computer user far over and above the value to the ordinary purchaser or user of a copyrighted work in print form. In view of the possibly enormous value of this copyrighted material to the computer user he naturally wishes to utilize it and should recognize that the copyright proprietor is entitled to compensation. My personal opinion is that the question of the amount of compensation can be best solved as similar problems have been in the past, by having the various interests work out their own solutions in the competitive milieu.

Most people would agree that the copyright proprietor should be compensated for his efforts. In addition to the question of how much the payment should be there is the important question of determining the point in time that this payment should accrue. This question is crucial because its answer determines the control which the copyright proprietor has over each individual work. In many instances, particularly in the case of fact works such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, legal digests, statistical tables, directories, etc., if this control cannot be exercised effectively the proprietor cannot profitably conduct his business and therefore will not produce the work.

In order to protect the copyright proprietors and to provide a fair system, I urge that proprietors be able to control the use of their material at the point that it is converted into machine readable form for use as computer input. In other words, copying of a copyrighted work into machine readable form should constitute copyright infringement. My reasons are as follows:

1. Some computer uses involve the manipulation or scanning of a considerable amount of input derived from copyright works, yet the output may, for example consist only of a solution which appears for a few moments on a screen or of a minute bit of the total copyrighted work. Manipulation or scanning within the computer is not considered by some to be infringement and such limited uses may not be an infringement at the output level either because there is no copying or the copying may be so limited as to constitute a fair use. If the copying into machine readable form is not an infringement, no compensation is available to the copyright proprietor for the use of his work (other than the income from the sale of one copy of the original work), although his potential sales of the printed work could be materially diminished. Such a result hardly seems just in view of the considerable benefit obtained by computer users.

2. One example of manipulation without output would be the use of a copyrighted book of mathematical computations to determine steel stress. These printed calculations would be converted into computer input with no payment made to the proprietor. The computer user would wish to know if his particular construction was feasible and the answer would be either "yes" or "no." Again the copyright proprietor would receive no payment no matter how adversely sales of the admittedly useful work were affected.

3. Similarly, copyrighted statistical materials could be manipulated to determine such things as the projected price of a stock on the New York Stock Exchange, production schedules, the length of women's skirts for next season, wage scales, or tomorrow's weather. In each of these instances, and there are innumerable examples, the compiler of the statistics, would receive no compensation for his considerable efforts, except possibly for the sale of the initial copyrighted volume.

In each case of such manipulation of the

* (C) Copyright Arthur J. Greenbaum, 1967.

copyrighted mathematical or statistical data, the copyright proprietor would be reasonably compensated only if it were infringement to convert his work into machine readable form. If this is not the law, then he receives little or nothing for his labors while others benefit.

The uses to which other forms of fact works can be put provide examples of the extreme importance of properly setting the point at which copyright infringement occurs. For example, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* can be converted into machine readable form and used as the input of a computer. If this conversion does not constitute infringement at this point no payment need be made to the copyright proprietor or permission obtained. Now if someone in the great public with access to this computer input desires information in the encyclopedia he can retrieve it and have the pertinent material flashed on a screen for him to read and, if desired, the image on the screen can be converted into hard copy, i.e., can be reproduced in print form on paper. Of course, in addition to this one encyclopedia, the computer proprietor might utilize the other nine leading encyclopedias so as to provide better service to the computer users. If the law is that only if the end use is an infringement can the various copyright proprietors object to the use of their works, all of the proprietors may collect exactly nothing because any one use of the input by an individual would very likely be considered a fair use and, therefore, a non-infringing use. Accordingly, each of the encyclopedia publishers would obtain no revenue from and have no control over the use of its copyrighted publication, even though such use could destroy the salability of the work which it produced at enormous expense.

The point of this discussion is that if input does not constitute infringement, and if the manipulation does not constitute infringement, and if the output happens not to be infringement, the copyright proprietor is defenseless. The inevitable result of such a system is that there will be no publication of material which can be "borrowed" in such a way as to destroy or seriously impair the market for the copyrighted work.

2. Unless the conversion of copyrighted materials into machine readable form constitutes infringement, the copyright proprietor also loses potential income from the sale of his own works in machine readable form. The solution of this problem is to hold that the conversion or copying of a work into machine readable form for computer input constitutes infringement.

An illustration of this point is the case of the publisher of a directory listing all United States retailers of drugs and providing twenty characteristics of each retailer, such as location of principal office, number of employees, annual sales, names of the proprietors or principal officers, non-drug products carried, etc. The directory is available in either printed form or in punched cards or tape for use as computer input. It is certainly easy to see that if a competitor also markets the same information, taken free of charge from the original printed work or a duplication of the punched cards or tape, that the original publisher cannot compete because the second comer has avoided the tremendous expense of gathering the information.

The copyright proprietor cannot enjoin such blatant copying or collect damages from the one who copied the materials unless conversion of copyrighted material into machine readable form for eventual use as computer input and the duplication of copyrighted materials already in machine readable form both constitute infringement. As for suing the end user of the copied cards or tapes, his use may be a fair use because the copied data has been integrated into a nation-wide computer network and each end user only utilizes small bits of the information at a time. The result, unless the conversion into machine readable form for use as computer

input constitutes infringement, is that the copyright proprietor has no remedy even though his works are being unfairly used to destroy him.

3. Again, unless the conversion of copyrighted materials into machine readable form constitutes infringement, the copyright proprietor may find himself at a disadvantage in using his own works as part of his own computer system since other systems operators could (a) appropriate the printed work by copying it into machine readable form or (b) duplicate the originator's machine readable materials and thereby avoid the expense of independently obtaining the information.

To illustrate this point, consider a publisher of a legal digest which classifies all of the published case reports into a legal classification system and publishes the digest in printed form. It also offers an additional computerized search system to lawyers. The computer input consists of the cases as classified in the digest. A competitor can convert the cases listed in the original publisher's digest into machine readable form for use as input for a competitive computer search service. Now if the use by the lawyer is the sole test of infringement, then no infringement exists (because such use is a "fair use"). It is submitted that such a result is atrocious as a matter of law, good sense, and ethical behavior.

4. If the copyright owner must rely only on computer output as infringement, he will find it most difficult, if not impossible, to police the system. The potential for abuse is enormous because the computer has such widespread application. It is submitted that the only way the copyright proprietor can control the mis-use of his copyrighted materials is to control the input. This involves a reasonably feasible task compared to the impossibility of discovering and checking each bit of output and then trying to determine if it constitutes an infringement or a fair use.

CONCLUSION

As of the writing of this paper (May 1967), the House Copyright Law Revision Bill provides that the conversion of copyrighted material into machine readable form constitutes, subject to the defense of fair use, infringement. I agree with this solution to the problem and hope that the Senate will also agree with the House. If experience indicates that his solution is not in the public interest, then the Bill can be amended to reflect the deficiencies which may appear as time goes by.

My prediction is that the publishers will do an excellent job of handling the new technology and there will be no need to make any major revisions in the future. The publishers will not be able to sit back and do nothing (as predicted by some) because there will always be at least one publisher (or the fear that there will be one) in the vanguard and he will force the others as a matter of competitive necessity to find the best ways to utilize the computer and related devices. No publisher will want to concede the new technology to his competitors.

ECONOMICS, AUTOMATION AND COPYRIGHT

(By Charles H. Lieb, Paskus, Gordon & Hyman)

Most people agree that full use should be made of the burgeoning computer technology—for education, for information storage and dissemination and for any other purposes that can be found for this modern-day genie. Publishers and authors certainly concur with this. Their function is to generate and to distribute their intellectual work product to all within reach and the broader their reach, the greater their satisfaction.

The perplexing problem, however, is how to accomplish these imaginatively useful purposes and at the same time assure the producers adequate reward and recognition and

protection against distortion to encourage them to continue to produce.

My purpose is to discuss the first factor, the reward, and to leave other problems for separate consideration.

REWARD TO AUTHOR AND PUBLISHER

If reward—royalties to author and profit to the publisher—is recognized as a basic factor which influences the production and flow of most intellectual work, we must keep in mind some simple but immutable laws of economics when we consider the rules under which the work is to be stored and used in computers.

A work usually will be published only if it is expected to be profitable.

Publishing profits depend on sales, sales depend on "effective demand," a desire to purchase implemented by the financial ability to purchase.

The effective demand or "the market" varies widely for different kinds of work. What is needed for meaningful discussion is a searching examination of the market for each of the various kinds of publishing upon which computers will draw for their input and the effect of that input upon the relevant market.

In stressing the importance of the market, we must stress at the same time the direct relation between it and the amount of the make-ready cost that precedes publication. Many of those participating in the copyright revision discussions seem not to realize that there is more to publishing than the simple printing of a manuscript. In many areas of publishing, publishers create the publishing concept, seek out and commission the authors to write the work, pay substantial advances to finance their efforts, and actively participate in the shaping and editing of the work. The lead time between concept and publication may be five, six, seven or more years; the investment before the first dollar of return may be and frequently is very substantial.

It does not appear to be fully understood that the make-ready cost of producing a given work is fixed regardless of the number of copies sold. The size of the market in relation to the size of the make-ready investment therefore determines whether the work is accepted for publication.

For the most part the market to which publishing is geared is a market for books in traditional format, to be read in volume form. Another way to say this is to say that a book's price is fixed in the light of the publisher's estimate of the number of copies that will be purchased for reading in volume form. There is, of course, a difference between the number of readers of a book and the number of copies sold because many books are purchased for multi-person use. But this is a factor that the publisher can measure and take into account when he makes his market estimate.

The appropriation of the textual content of a book for computer use may drastically shrink that market. The effect will be different for different kinds of publishing. Computer input of the contents of a general purpose desk dictionary or of a summer novel may have no noticeable consequences, but input of a technical encyclopedia or a textbook may have a devastating effect on the number of copies sold.

An example may be helpful. A publisher believes that a reference book on an advanced subject if acceptably priced will have a worldwide market of 4500 copies. He estimates on the basis of past experience that he will sell 2500 copies to librarians and institutions and the remainder to miscellaneous purchasers. His break-even point may be half of what he hopes to sell. He proceeds to publish, trusting that his market estimate is correct.

Suppose, however, that the copyright statute is changed, as some suggest, to permit computer storage and use of the text of the work at an initial cost to the system no

greater than the single copy price of the book. Suppose also that after such a change in statute the 190 libraries making up the Edunet system, instead of purchasing 190 copies, together purchase only one; that the libraries serviced by the New York State library system together purchase only one; that government agencies instead of purchasing 100 or 200 copies as before, also purchase only one, and that industrial institutions with multiple branch libraries follow the same practice.

The publisher now faces a substantially reduced market. What will he do? Can he publish the work? In a classroom marketing exercise the answer would be easy. If he thinks that the systems composing the smaller market will pay more for the work, he will raise the per copy price sufficiently to assure the needed return. Instead of planning to sell 4500 copies at \$10 per copy, he may now plan to sell 100 copies at \$450 per copy. His return and the author's royalty will be the same. But society will be the loser. The individual desiring to read the work in volume form will be unable to do so. He will have been priced out of the market by a misuse and malfunctioning of the distribution system. This would be undesirable socially, politically and philosophically.

And what of the educational program prepared specifically for computerized instruction systems? If the publisher sells the program to one school district will schools in other districts be free to use it merely by obtaining a printout? Will the publisher then feel impelled to charge the first school district a sufficiently high price to enable him to recoup his entire cost and provide him with a profit? If he does so is it not likely that the district, no matter how much it desires the program, will decide that it cannot afford to pay such a price? These, it seems to me, are not unfair examples of what may flow from the broad computer exemptions from copyright protection so earnestly but misguidedly requested by some of those participating in the copyright revision debate.

Uncontrolled input subject to royalty payment on printout would not seem to be a solution. It would be difficult and expensive to monitor the use of printout and to charge, collect, and pay (how much?) for such use. It might be difficult in the context of free input to determine the parameters of fair use. But even more importantly such a system of uncontrolled input subject to payment on printout would not help the publisher with his pre-publication problem. Certainly he could make no market estimate under conditions as they exist today, with no experience on which to base his judgment and, indeed, with only the barest prototype of a computerized information system market in existence. If because of computer input without arrangement for payment, the publisher is unable to make a reliable pre-publication market estimate, he may lose his ability to publish the very works which the computer system will need.

It may indeed be argued that protection against free input will be more important to the publisher in the years immediately ahead when the marketing experience is being built up, than later when the extent of computer use and its effect on the market for works in their traditional form will be better known.

VARIABLE PRICING SYSTEM

One approach, however, appears to meet all needs. This is to retain copyright protection against unauthorized computer input and to adopt what I will call for the purpose of this paper a variable pricing system, a system under which one price will be paid for the work in traditional format and a higher price for system use. The systems should not feel aggrieved about the price

difference. The nature and the value of their use is different and there is no reason, equitably or logically, why their cost should not be different.

We shall have problems, of course, in determining the price to be charged for system use under a variable pricing system. No one need fear, however, that the prices will be unreasonable. Publishing is a competitive business, and no one publisher can monopolize the body of knowledge in any field. If one publisher's price is too high, it will not be long before normal competition brings it down. The price that the systems will be charged may be in the form of a single payment, a series of payments in the nature of royalties, or a combination of both. Possibly the charge may vary from system to system, depending on the size of the system, the number of locations served, the number of uses, and the quantity of information used. But in any case it will be arranged in advance of input and use so that the publisher can estimate his return.

Let me turn to our hypothetical example of the reference book again to see how the variable pricing system might operate. We assumed that in today's market, the publisher estimates a sale of 4500 copies. Now let us look at the same publisher contemplating publication of the same kind of work ten years hence, and let us suppose that during the ten-year interval he has been publishing under the variable pricing system. He may at that future time estimate his market at 1000 copies for sale for traditional use (much below his former break-even point) and 50 copies (perhaps in machine-readable form) for sale to systems. Because of years of experience in publishing for this dual market, pricing has become a routine affair. The probable return from sale for traditional use and from systems is reasonably ascertainable. The work is published, it is circulated in volume form, and it is stored and used in the computer systems. All are satisfied; the reader has his volume, system users have the work available in the systems, and the author and publisher, enjoying their normal return, are encouraged to create and distribute more of their intellectual work product.

Accepting the projection as fact, how then during the transitional period can we make published work accessible for computer use, protect copyright owners against loss of their incentive to publish, and at the same time build the body of experience upon which a variable pricing system can be based?

RECOMMENDATIONS

An approach of gradualism—one which will encourage the parties themselves to work out solutions as best they can and at the same time assure them of government help when needed, would appear to be indicated. Such an approach would encompass the following steps:

1. The prompt enactment of S. 597, the copyright revision bill. Too much time and effort have been spent to permit further delay. Exemptions which would enlarge the rights of computer users should be avoided. No matter how well intended, they may weaken or destroy the incentive to create and publish. It would be a Pyrrhic victory if computers gained free access to works in print only to lose future works which because of lack of economic incentive might never be produced.

2. Publishers and interested computer users should cooperate in experimenting on an informal and ad hoc basis in each of the various segments of publishing that are of mutual interest. First steps have already been taken along these lines. Federal agencies, including not only those that are information producers and users but the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission as well should encourage and

assist these efforts. In this manner the necessary body of experience can be acquired in judging the interaction between the needs of advancing computer technologies and those of the producers and publishers of intellectual work.

3. A Study Commission should be established to keep in touch with the experimentation and should from time to time make recommendations to Congress for needed changes in the law. This would assure all interests of a ready forum for redress of inequities as they develop.

This kind of program would permit experimentation by educators, librarians, equipment manufacturers, and others, and at the same time preserve the economic underpinnings of the publishers and authors who produce the material that the educators, librarians, and equipment manufacturers need for their experiments.

Some have expressed the fear that publishers will not cooperate in this effort. This is hardly reasonable. Publishers today are offering their cooperation to government and private systems. They do it not only in the public interest but in their own self-interest. It would be a short-sighted industry which would refuse cooperation if the alternative were likely to be unpalatable legislation.

Some have expressed concern about the delays that may result from the need to negotiate with publishers for system rights to particular works. This seems a needless fear for the immediate future. It will be years, we are told, before large amounts of text will be stored in automated systems for general use. Certainly the minor delays that may result from the need to negotiate input agreements are a small price for the preservation in the public interest of the economic viability of authorship and private publishing during this transition period.

There is a kind of unreality to the pleas we hear from some for the right to take copyrighted works preemptively for computer use. I say "unreality" because we live in a society in which much of the published material that the pleaders desire to use is produced and published for a profit incentive which would be destroyed by the taking. In approaching the problem before us, then, we must consider not only the needs of the users but those of the producers. Sound solutions can be found, but only if they satisfy the needs of all.

ELECTRONIC COMPUTERS: STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL

(By Mervin E. Muller, University of Wisconsin)

Following is a brief perspective of a few of the main arteries of a road map to view the use of electronic computers in the storage and processing of intellectual information in the next few years. It may appear somewhat negative, but I want to be sure we recognize that many problems are still in need of answers if computers are to fulfill their promise in this application.

To interpret what follows, the meaning of computer storage and processing of intellectual information must be clear. Intellectual information is in computer storage if it resides on some medium which can be accessed and used (directly manipulated) by the computer. Computer processing of intellectual information implies that the information can be analyzed or compared within the computer for logical relevance. Thus, one can make a distinction between processing information about information (something which computers can do today—for example indexes) and actually processing the information. Thus, one could imagine storage and processing of information separately.

The cost implications of storage and processing of information is a complex topic. I will explain a few of the reasons why it is

difficult to determine costs, which will, I hope, be sufficient to justify the real need to question some of the claims made that computers are a threat to authors and publishers.

(Legend: P—possible; M—may be possible; N—not possible)

	Outside of computer (manual)	Within computer	
		Storage	Processing
Index or reference pointers..	P	P	P
Access and inventory control	P	P	P
Intellectual information:			
Noncomputer usable.....	P	N	N
Computer usable.....	N	M	P

One of the great contributions that John Von Neumann made to the development of digital computers was to recognize and exploit the fact that computer instructions and data in machine sensible form could be treated together. However, for large scale information handling systems involving many users simultaneously executive different functions it now appears to be essential to keep in mind the differences between the storage of information and the processing of instructions or information, especially if all of the intellectual information is desired to be in computer usable form. The reasons for this separation are economic—large files of information are expensive to create and maintain within computer storage if one is to have computer access to the information quickly.

The potential for computers to aid in the storage and processing of large volumes of intellectual information is limited not only by current technology and their economics, but also by social, environmental, legal, and psychological components. I will try to indicate why these components are relevant.

A classical approach to the economic component would be to try to measure the cost per bit or cost per character of information for the storage and processing of the information. This approach is difficult to carry out if multiple users and multiple machine activities can take place simultaneously. Certainly most of the fears of the threat of computers to authors and publishers become real only if multiple users can share a computer for economical use.

Furthermore, a device which provides a low cost per bit or character of information may not be as reliable, or it may require use of the computer's central processor, or it may require greater implementation costs than another device. I have ignored the cost of converting the non-machine created information into machine usable information. Finally, in addition to cost there is need to consider aspects such as space and durability. Historically, since the introduction of digital computers (1951), we have been viewing, in general, an increase in computational and data processing productivity related to an economy of size.

This apparent increase in productivity and capability has encouraged many to consider digital computers as information handling machines. For information handling, the "economy of size" argument may be a deceptive view of the economic component, especially since much intellectual information is not in a computer usable form. However, historically, in general, the curve is correct, although usually as computers got bigger and faster, one tried to do more, with the end result that the total computer installation cost more. To get at the various components of the problem, one needs to

look at them collectively and in terms of the functions of the computer, keeping in mind needed distinctions between storage and processing capabilities. This approach can also help one avoid the pitfall of pricing a storage device simply in terms of the cost per bit. While this can be a very technical matter, I will not indulge in technical details but indicate the need to look at the factors together. Surprisingly, this includes a psychological component.

The psychological component which is relevant here includes one's insistence on information availability when it is needed. From the viewpoint of the computer, this could mean to perform either processing or storage in one of three time modes as follows:

1. When convenient for the machine.
2. At pre-specified time points.
3. On demand.

These three time modes of computer operation can be conflicting and can cause a price/performance analysis to be very difficult to derive, if not impossible with today's equipment and knowledge, if simultaneous operations are occurring. Of course, these problems are solvable by at least fair approximations.

To realize the economy of size and increase in computing power, one can imagine many users having access to a facility at the same time. This possibility arises because of fantastic accomplishments in memory speeds during the past 15 years—from 10^{-2} seconds, to 10^{-9} seconds to 10^{-9} seconds; comparable improvements in input or output have been by a factor of 10 to 30 instead of 10^6 .

Thus it appears that because of this imbalance many users could have simultaneous access—the concept of time sharing. However, this ignores the time mode of operation or media mode of the intellectual materials. Furthermore, current high speed memories are exceedingly small when compared to the needs of information handling systems (32 to 256) x 48 x 10^8 bits compared to storage currently estimated to be somewhere between 10^9 to 10^{14} bits for a large library.

However, all is not bleak, by the early 1970's we may have nano-second speeds for large and fast access storage, for example: BORAM—Block oriented random access memory; SONIC—Film memory; and laser beam techniques associated with photo disc storage.

With this in mind, let us consider other components of the feasibility and cost aspects. If one could preclude the need to update files of information (insert, delete, modify, send to history) and imagine only adding information—namely books, or images of them—then the economic and technical questions are considerably simplified.

It is important to keep in mind the user interface to the computer, that is, how many other users can be served at the same time, and whether or not there is a single service line or more than one—the size of the information files is also important. The possibility of such services today are summarized below, where Y implies Yes it is possible today, M implies maybe, and N implies No.

USER INTERFACE TO COMPUTER

Mode	Service line					
	Single		Multiple			
	C	T	D	C	T	D
One user at a time.....	Y	M	M	Y	M	N
Multiple users at a time:						
Single application.....	N	N	N	Y	M	Y
Multiple applications.....	N	N	N	Y	M	M

The organization of files influences the ease of use and cost and both depend on the

mode of use (C—convenient, T—time initiated, D—demand initiated).

The organization of files of information affects whether or not each item must be examined in order in a serial file or whether one can get directly to the information in a random file, or some compromise between the extremes of serial access and random access, identified here as hierarchical. These implications are summarized below:

FILE ORGANIZATION—ACCESS (READ/WRITE OR BOTH); RANKINGS FROM 1 THROUGH 4

	Ease of use			Cost		
	C	T	D	C	T	D
	Serial (with or without useful ordering of data).....	1	1	4	1	1
Random.....	4	4	3	3	4	4
Block random/serial without block.....	3	3	2	2	3	3
Hierarchical.....	2	2	1	4	2	2

1 Not available.

There are several other important aspects which will be mentioned briefly. One is the question of security of the information, that is, the control of access for reading or writing of information, or both. This in turn depends upon such factors as: (1) mode and number of users, (2) file organization, (3) use of removable or non removable storage, (4) media (digital, analog), graphical, pictorial, audio, and (5) back-up need in case of machine failures.

Other cost factors that need to be taken into account include the number and types of data channels for getting information between various types of storage. They play an important role in determining costs. However, the amount of channel use is usually inversely related to the amount of available computer memory for a specific user's task. Cost of access involves not only channel cost and cost per bit per time interval of storage, but such factors as central processor time, memory size needed, safety/reliability factors, and software cost for level of performance. The cost of handling intellectual information. Also, it is determined on the relative size of main memory and auxiliary memory. This is reflected both in CPU utilization and channel utilization as well as programming complexity.

In summary, the economical use of computers appears to require a number of users and a number of different applications. This type of environment raises many legal questions of access and protection; such as—what can be stored about individuals. The cost aspects include a psychological factor—what is really needed on demand. (Information from poison centers, yes, but prior election results?)

I do not have a simple solution to a complex problem. I have tried to indicate why the determination of costs are complex and why computers today cannot pose a real threat to the publishers or authors. It is my hope that multi-media information systems will be encouraged by the establishment of permissive and flexible legislation which is adaptable and which recognizes the need to encourage research and education.

REFERENCES

1. On Cost of Storage:
1. David C. Evans, *Scientific American*, September 1966, especially page 82.
2. L. C. Hobbs, *Proceedings, Fall Joint Computer Conference, 1963*, especially page 302.
- B. Legal and Educational Implications of Proposed Legislation. See May 1967 issue of *Communications of the ACM*.
3. James P. Titus, page 314.
4. A. G. Oettinger, pp. 315-317
5. EDUCOM Resolution, pp. 318-321.

¹David C. Evans, *Scientific American*, September 1966, especially p. 82.

MAN IN A TOUGH JOB

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal carries an enlightening article by Jonathan Spivak on the difficult conditions with which Commissioner Walter E. Washington must deal. As ranking minority member on the House District Committee, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

MAYOR ON THE SPOT: WORSENING DIFFICULTIES CONFRONT THE NEW HEAD OF CAPITAL GOVERNMENT—WALTER WASHINGTON GETS SOME PRAISE, BUT RACIAL, SOCIAL PROBLEMS PERSIST IN DISTRICT—THE TOURISTS STAY AT HOME

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—Gangs of teen-age delinquents demanding protection payments from local merchants; a rash of arson attempts; shopkeepers shot and killed during brazen daylight holdups; insurance cancellations throughout much of the central-city ghetto; mounting fear of trouble as the Poor People's Campaign plans a mass demonstration of public support here on June 19.

This is only a partial catalog of the woes of Walter E. Washington, the capital's first mayor in more than a century and one of the most sorely beset municipal administrators in the nation. After only seven months in office, starting with a period of seeming peace and progress, the mayor and his metropolises are now caught in a web of worsening difficulties.

Washington's April riots, worst in the nation, following the assassination of Martin Luther King, have left a bitter aftermath of heightened racial tensions, economic woes and political problems. How well the Negro mayor handles them may determine both the future of the city and his own political prospects. His Presidential appointment expires in February 1969. Should he appear to hold the key to racial harmony in the capital, he would almost certainly be retained by whoever succeeds President Johnson; if not, another Negro leader will likely get the post.

Amid the mounting pressures, Mr. Washington remains cool and contained. He carefully walks a political tightrope. So far, he satisfies most members of his own race, who form a majority of the district's 850,000 residents, by promising social change. Yet, despite criticism from some white merchants who charge excessive police restraint increased riot damage, he retains the support of most of the white minority because of what they view as his emphasis on law and order. The newspapers and most of the business community back him. By hard work and responsiveness, he preserves amiable relations with key Congressmen, many from the South, and turns aside the "Uncle Tom" complaints of Negro militants.

In private, the mayor is affable, articulate and persuasive. In public, he exudes infectious optimism. "This is where the action is, a great city where everyone has an opportunity; that's what we want, that's what it's all about," he tells a group of high school students, and they chorus approval.

Mr. Washington's achievements win wide praise. During the riots, his nightly television talks helped calm tempers. He rapidly mobilized the business community to provide emergency food and housing to victims, and within a week of the disorders he organized an ambitious spring vacation program to keep 3,500 youngsters occupied and out of trouble. Job training programs for poor youths have been pushed, slum landlords hauled into court for housing code vio-

lations, and police-community relations improved.

CALLING FOR HIGHER TAXES

The mayor has filled more than half the 384 vacancies that existed in the police department when he took office and has stepped up police patrols by 20% in high-crime areas. He has spurred salary increases for police, firemen and teachers. With the President's blessing, Mayor Washington is seeking Congressional approval to hire an added 1,000 policemen at a cost of more than \$10 million a year. He has proposed major budget increases for health and welfare and has faced up to the district's financial plight by calling for \$40 million in increased taxes.

"He ranks with the top few mayors in the country in terms of program understanding, commitment and political ability," maintains Thomas Appleby, who heads the district's urban renewal program.

Nonetheless, an undercurrent of criticism mounts. On the one hand, there are the complaints of the whites who see him as too soft on lawbreakers. On the other, there are charges from the Negro community that the mayor has not moved rapidly enough to attack the district's underlying social and economic ills and has not given strong enough leadership.

"What did he do? He restored order. That's no big deal; so did Daley (Chicago's mayor)," snaps C. Sumner Stone, a leader of Washington's Black United Front who has been critical of the mayor from the start. "There's been no substantial increase in Negro jobs, no substantial economic improvement in the ghetto."

The district's Model Cities slum-rehabilitation program was limping when the mayor inherited it, and it remains bogged down bureaucratically; not before July will detailed objectives be adopted. An ambitious program to develop a new community on surplus Federal land, proclaimed by the President last August, is still in the planning stage. Studies by outside experts on jobs, housing and the like produce little progress. Decentralization of the district government into convenient, quick-responding neighborhood service centers, one of the mayor's first commitments, has not yet begun. A bitter fracas over building new freeways, pitting white business interests against militant Negro home owners, gains intensity while the mayor stalls.

THE CRITICS' VIEW

"He is a gatherer of consensus, moving along lines of least resistance," asserts one critic in the district government. "He likes to keep his options open, postponing decisions until the last minute."

There's no doubt the mayor does tend to be cautious. He prefers to avoid controversy and hesitates to commit himself until he feels assured of strong community support. Thus, he delayed calling in Federal troops until the April riot was already raging, remained silent on post-riot rebuilding plans for weeks while sensing community sentiment and vigorously pushed his anti-crime campaign only when crime appeared to rise dangerously.

Mr. Washington's highly individual style of administration troubles others. His own office is not well organized, and his time is sometimes squandered. He delights in ceremonies and social affairs, arguing the public exposure is essential to personalize his government. Minor problems needing decisions pile up, and frequently the mayor can be reached only on the run. Two confidants, Charles Duncan, the district's chief legal officer, and Julian R. Dugas, director of licenses and inspections, constitute a protective "palace guard"; other subordinates complain of lack of access to the mayor and uncertainty about general policies. Even Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher, supposedly the mayor's alter ego, can't count on a quick response from his chief, though both men insist their relationship is smooth.

Mr. Washington tends to bristle at any implication of inaction. He stresses that he labors 16 hours a day and argues that a few months is hardly long enough to attend to fundamental failings that have accumulated for decades. "I've studied cities and worked with cities long enough to know that it takes time," he insists. Many of the steps so far taken, he reasons, should improve the district government's services to citizens in the future.

But Mr. Washington is under pressure to produce performance now. "Since he's taken office, he's raised hopes; now hopes must be fulfilled," says Ruth Bates Harris, his community relations adviser.

"He has a problem of achieving visible change. . . . He's got to do it quickly," insists the Rev. Walter Fauntroy, vice chairman of the city council. If not, the mayor's allies fear support among slum-dwellers will weaken and he will become vulnerable to attack by ambitious local leaders.

BALKY CONGRESSMEN

But the district's serious difficulties and the legal limitations on the mayor's powers impose great obstacles. The cleavage between affluent white businessmen and their allies on Capitol Hill on the one hand and the deprived Negro masses on the other makes speedy solutions to Washington's social ills almost impossible. Congress goes over the district's budget line by line and refuses to allow the mayor authority to transfer funds should emergencies arise. (He's now being challenged on a \$100,000 expenditure to renovate the city council chambers.) And conservative lawmakers, who dominate Congress' committees dealing with the district, resist the steadily rising cost of the local government. Democratic Rep. Basil Whitener of North Carolina complains there is "too much emphasis on spending more money, instead of bringing the ship into order."

Whatever long-range plans the mayor may wish to pursue, the immediate issues of crime and civil unrest absorb almost all his energies. "The majority of the people are afraid to visit Washington, and many of its own citizens are leaving the city," warns a full-page newspaper ad sponsored by a local business group. The ad may overstate the case, but this spring's spring tourist influx is far below normal and many local residents are clearly afraid.

During April and May, \$40 million worth of visitor business, much of it high school tours, was canceled. Hotel occupancy is off 20% from last spring, and restaurant business is down 15%. Serious crime, though now slackening slightly with the increased police patrols, climbed to a post-riot peak of almost 900 reported incidents a week from the pre-riot rate of 800. Bus drivers fearing violent robbery refused to operate at night until they were allowed to reduce the sums of cash carried for making change.

The mayor acknowledges the urgency of restoring calm. "The important thing now is to keep the city on an even keel," he says. He is acting to try to quell crime and public concern about it, though without great success as yet. Two-thirds of the district's 3,000 police are working a six-day week; forty extra officers have been ordered to help guard buses. Congress is being asked to stiffen penalties against extortion from businessmen and to authorize the arming of volunteer police reserves to strengthen the regular force.

DEMANDS FOR TROOPS

Extensive preparations are under way to prevent violence arising from the Poor People's Campaign. The district's 1,700-member National Guard unit will probably be called up at any sign of real trouble, and extra Federal troops are being stationed at nearby Army bases.

But some Congressmen are demanding that the troops be called in to patrol the city routinely, and many small merchants

remain dissatisfied with the mayor's anti-crime moves. These shopkeepers, mostly white, assert that during the April riots police and Federal forces deliberately refrained from shooting looters and indeed even stood by and watched stores being emptied, thus sacrificing property and spurring post-riot lawlessness. (Patrick Murphy, the district's public safety director, denies the charge, pointing to the 8,000 arrests made during the five-day outburst.)

"The district government tolerated the creation of great losses. . . . It has a moral obligation to compensate the merchants," insists Milton Hoffman, whose H Street clothing store was damaged.

"The appeasement of the people in the riot situation means they'll do the same damn thing again," declares a leading local businessman.

Meanwhile, rebuilding the city's 20 acres of riot-devasted property is making little progress. Rubble still litters many blocks, and only a handful of damaged stores have reopened. Lack of insurance deters some merchants; others shun the risk involved.

With nearly 300 homes and 1,000 businesses damaged or destroyed, the cost of reconstruction could total \$100 million. The mayor has called for a community-wide effort, pooling public and private funds and delegating much of the decision-making to neighborhood citizen groups. He would rely on urban renewal projects to reconstruct commercial property and provide hundreds of new low-income housing units. Negroes would almost certainly be retained by whoever succeeds President Johnson; if not, another Negro leader will likely get the post.

But Negro militants are belligerently demanding sole control over rebuilding policies and assured Negro ownership of restored businesses, even though most of the financing comes from public sources. Otherwise, some threaten a repetition of trouble. "The guys tell me if you build the same way, they will burn them down again," warns Marion Barry, a black power proponent. The mayor and his lieutenants seek to conciliate these conflicts, but a middle ground will be hard to find.

FINDLAY, OHIO: FLAG CITY, U.S.A.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the strong patriotism of residents of my district has rarely been better exhibited than the present project which will make Findlay, Ohio, Flag City, U.S.A., on June 14, 1968.

On Flag Day, 1968, every house in the entire city of Findlay will fly replicas of the flag of the United States. Fourteen thousand small flags have been purchased and distributed for this communitywide display on front lawns, window ledges, or in an appropriate conspicuous manner from all of the city's homes. The John Hancock Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, are seeing the flags are delivered to each home through the enthusiastic cooperation of the Boy Scout troops, Girl Scout troops, and Campfire Girls of the area.

Appropriate ceremonies will be conducted on June 14 in our Flag City including the dedication of a plaque to the men and women of our Armed Forces at the courthouse of Hancock County. I am pleased to provide a flag especially flown over the U.S. Capitol for this occasion.

The John Hancock Chapter, SAR, under the capable leadership of John B. Cooke, civic and business organizations, and others who have helped make this event possible deserve high praise.

END MAIL-ORDER MURDER

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1968, the Buffalo Evening News published an excellent editorial on the need for stronger gun control legislation. I think the Buffalo Evening News should be commended for speaking out on this subject and I would like to share the article with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

END MAIL-ORDER MURDER

In a message eloquent for its blunt urgency, President Johnson has put it squarely up to Congress to enact a "strong and effective gun control law governing the full range of lethal weapons."

"What in the name of conscience," he wants to know, will it take to convince Congress to close the "brutal loophole in our nation's laws," when "weapons of destruction can be purchased by mail as easily as baskets of fruit or cartons of cigarettes?"

What, indeed, when the annual toll of firearms inflicted on Americans—6500 murders—compares with the 30 in England, 99 in Canada, and 68 in West Germany? Or when some two million guns are sold annually, far too many to the "demented and the deranged, the hardened criminal and the convict, the addict and the alcoholic."

Despite repeated opinion surveys reflecting strong public support for strong gun control legislation, Congress has stalled for years against taking even any mild action to restrict indiscriminate trafficking in weapons.

And now that it has finally passed the first significant controls as part of the omnibus crime-control bill, LBJ quite rightly calls this bill what it is: A halfway measure that is simply not enough.

Since it applies only to interstate sales of handguns, it "leaves the deadly commerce in lethal shotguns and rifles without effective control"—and this, "55 long months after the mail-order murder" of President Kennedy.

To strengthen this half-hearted approach, LBJ seeks adequate curbs that, besides regulating interstate shipment of long guns, would prohibit their sale in one state to the residents of another, and to "persons too young to bear the terrible responsibility" of a gun owner.

This, LBJ correctly says, would not inconvenience legitimate sportsmen. To be sure such a control in itself would not prevent hardened criminals from obtaining weapons. But such a reinforced law would give the states the "proper incentive to shape their own gun control legislation."

The nation has paid too tragic a price already for the incomprehensible pusillanimity of Congress in curbing mail-order traffic in longarms—with 1747 citizens murdered with rifles and shotguns in 1966 alone, with 15 per cent of the purchasers of such weapons having criminal records, and with sniper rifles a mounting source of danger in urban disorders.

In an hour of grief, Congress now must take constructive action against lawlessness, as the President says. "The voices of the few must no longer prevail over the interest of the many."

AGRICULTURE AND THE UNDER-DEVELOPED WORLD

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, only for an interim period can shipments from nations with surplus farm capacity such as the United States continue to cover the food deficits of the less-developed countries. There are limits to how long food aid can fill the gap.

The populations of the developing countries are increasing steadily. Within 10 to 15 years, if present trends continue, the food deficit in the less-developed countries will be larger than food aid from other countries can cover. The only permanent solution to the food supply problem is increased farm output in the developing nations themselves.

Fortunately, food production is beginning to rise. Particularly in Asia, the less developed countries stand on the verge of a "green revolution" that could spell an end to the threat of famine.

In 1967, the developing nations set new agricultural records—total farm production increased by 7 to 8 percent over 1966, and per capita output by over 5 percent. In fiscal year 1969, the Agency for International Development proposes a commitment of about \$800 million to agriculture to support this trend.

The New York Times of May 21 recommended that Congress not cut heavily into the AID appropriations request so that adequate funds will be available to further this "green revolution." I should like to include a copy of that editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of our colleagues:

THE GREEN REVOLUTION

Some years ago one American aid official in Eastern India was good-naturedly referred to by Bengali bureaucrats as the *pugla sahib*—crazy gentleman—because he kept rushing about the countryside calling for instant revolutionary changes in age-old agricultural practices.

He was one of hundreds of "crazy" Americans who for the past two decades have been devotedly spreading the gospel of modern agriculture—research, credit, fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation, improved seeds—to farmers and their governments in the developing countries. For years such energetic agents of American governmental and private aid organizations have had relatively little to show for their efforts. Modest improvements in food output were overshadowed by massive increases in population—and for that matter still are.

Today, however, there are signs that what William Gaud, head of the Agency for International Development, calls the Green Revolution has begun to catch on. A panel of development specialists in Washington reported the other day that the underdeveloped world is on the verge of an agricultural revolution that may prove as important to mankind as the Industrial Revolution of the early nineteenth century. If population control made comparable progress, the outlook would indeed be bright.

The optimistic agricultural forecast is based on record crops during the past year in at least a half-dozen developing countries, ranging from Turkey to the Philippines and including all-important India. Immediate

credit for the spectacularly increased production of wheat, rice, corn and sorghum is given to new, high-yield seeds developed in research institutes in Mexico and the Philippines, initiated and supported especially by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations.

To extend the breakthrough that has finally been achieved will require an even greater effort than before. Extensive indigenous research will be required to adapt new varieties to local conditions and to minimize destruction by pests and disease. Additional trained extension workers, more fertilizer, more pesticides, more credit will be necessary, as will new storage, transportation and marketing facilities to transfer larger crops to consumers.

This is why the A.I.D. has been devoting an increasing proportion of its tight budgets to agricultural programs in recent years. This is why it is especially important that Congress not cut heavily into A.I.D.'s modest budget request for the new year. The Green Revolution is one revolution that deserves the wholehearted support of even the most conservative American.

LIKE IT IS, BABY—IV

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following article, which appeared in a Minneapolis Star series entitled, "Poverty in Minneapolis: Like It Is, Baby":

A MAN DEEP IN DEBT FINDS A COUNSELOR WHO'S GLAD TO HELP HIM—GET IN DEEPER
(By David Nimmer)

Doug is a white 29-year-old North Side resident who got into debt, not really way over his head but certainly enough for him to worry about.

And the harder he struggled to pull himself out of trouble, the worse things seemed to get until he finally ended up seeking financial counseling at the Northside Citizens Community Center.

Doug, a slender young man who has been married for eight years, started having problems with creditors late last summer.

He had outstanding bills of about \$3,900, having purchased an automobile, household furniture and a color television set on credit.

His total monthly payments were amounting to \$156.50.

Doug was taking home about \$100 a week from his job as night manager of a North Side bar. He took on another job of cleaning cooling coils in his basement to try to earn enough to cover the payments.

"But it didn't work," Doug says. "Everything was piling up and I started getting angry calls from two of the creditors.

"I almost had enough money to make the payments, with the second job, but I didn't have the time to handle the bookkeeping."

"IF ONLY I COULD"

Doug says he kept thinking, "Everything would work out better if I could just consolidate all these bills and make only one payment."

One way to consolidate bills is to get a loan, pay off the bills all at once and then make payments on the single debt—if you can qualify for the loan in the first place.

Another possibility is to turn to a debt counseling company. These firms don't lend you any money but—for a fee—they will take charge of your income and spread it among your creditors.

The fee, which is not subject to regulation under state statute or local ordinance,

is for the bookkeeping service the counseling firm provides, and for its skill in keeping your creditors happy so they don't hound you.

Doug contacted a counseling firm and signed a contract clearly stating that he was to pay a fee of 17 per cent of his outstanding debt to the company for its service.

The minute Doug signed the contract, he added another creditor—the debt counselor—and he owed this one \$664.53, the 17 per cent fee.

But, Doug thought, at least the creditors would be "off my back." He was to pay the counseling firm \$35 a week and his creditors would, in turn, receive their payments.

It was tough for Doug to make the payments since he had quit his second job and was taking home only \$400 a month.

The firm's counselor figured that Doug and his family needed \$296 a month for living expenses, leaving him with only \$104 left over each month to pay creditors.

In spite of that limitation, Doug's financial counselor had him paying \$140 a month on his debts—\$36 more than Doug could afford, according to the counselor's own figures.

"It was awfully tough," says Doug. "I kept finding that we had to cut all sorts of corners, just to make the payments."

THEY CALLED HIS WIFE

For four months Doug paid the counseling firm. Then one day Doug's wife got a call from one of the creditors.

"The next day we got a call from another creditor," Doug recalls, "and they were both bellyaching about the bills not being paid fast enough.

"Man, was I teed off. Here I was paying this company to keep creditors off my back and they weren't doing it . . . I was still being called an S.O.B. by the creditors."

So Doug called the counseling company. A spokesman told Doug not to worry. "Everything will blow over in a couple of days," he said.

"Well, we waited a couple of days," says Doug, "and my wife got several more phone calls from the creditors. Then I decided to hang it up with this debt company and go to Legal Aid."

Doug ended up at the financial counseling service at the North Side center.

The counselors discovered that Doug had paid the debt pooling firm a total of \$700 over 20 weeks.

But how much of that \$700 had gone to creditors to pay Doug's bills?

DOUG WAS CURIOUS

He asked for a statement from the company and, after several requests he got one.

The company agreed it had received \$700 from Doug. It said it had disbursed \$616.68 of that money. To whom the money was disbursed was not noted on the statement.

The other \$83.32 the company was holding in escrow to be used in eventual payment of its fees.

But Doug was curious. How much of the \$616.68 listed as "disbursed" actually went to his four creditors?

After the North Side center called the creditors, it was apparent the company had paid out only \$393.50 to the creditors. It kept the rest for fees.

"FEELING I WAS HAD"

"I gave 'em 700 bucks," says Doug "and they paid out less than 400 bucks to the creditors!

"Damn near 50 per cent of the money went for their fees. I get the feeling that I was had by these debt arrangers."

Nothing in the contract Doug signed requires the counseling firm to prorate its fee over the life of the contract. The fee becomes due and payable when the contract is signed.

"That sure isn't made very clear," says Doug. "You think you're getting out of debt and half of what you're paying is in fees."

BRAZILIAN AID IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Brazil is one of the largest and most important countries of this hemisphere, and what happens in Brazil is of great interest and concern to the people of the United States. Our U.S. economic assistance programs to Brazil have been designed to strengthen its economic development and its democratic institutions. Despite great difficulties we have had a large measure of success in helping to reduce the inflation rate from 140 percent in 1964 to 25 percent in 1967; in helping to create an overall economic growth rate of 5 percent in real terms compared with only 1.3 percent in 1963; and in helping to restore the international credit of that country, which so recently was in grave difficulties.

It is important to remember, when we hear criticism of our aid programs in countries such as Brazil, that we continue to make progress in our overall political objectives in behalf of international freedom. We also encourage countries such as Brazil to develop economic institutions compatible with growing markets for American technology, trade, and investment.

Recently the distinguished representative of the Miami Herald, Mr. Peter Laine, wrote from Washington on the response of Mr. James Fowler, Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, to criticism of U.S. loans to Brazil. I would like to present this article to my colleagues so that these charges may be considered in the context of the good we are accomplishing in Brazil:

CRITICIZED U.S. LOANS TO BRAZIL DEFENDED

(By Peter Laine)

WASHINGTON.—A key official of the Alliance for Progress Monday defended 11 foreign aid loans to Brazil criticized by the U.S. General Accounting Office.

"Ten of the 11 projects are actually on-going, successful projects contributing directly and materially to the development of Brazil," said James Fowler, deputy U.S. coordinator of the Alliance.

"Some initial, but not expected, implementation problems have long since been overcome."

On May 16, GAO accused the Agency for International Development of a "significant lack of effective administration" over the 1962-64 projects involving \$105 million in U.S. funds.

AID retorted that the GAO review as "not representative" and did not take account of the turbulent conditions in Brazil surrounding the April 1964 revolution.

Fowler agreed with AID that "it is not irrelevant to recall the political turbulence and leftist influence then seeking control of this strategic country and the fact that most of these projects were launched under adverse circumstances in the most depressed underdeveloped area of Brazil."

GAO pointed out that its review was based on 11 of the 18 loans for which funds had been disbursed at the time.

The controversy is particularly significant because Brazil is the largest recipient of U.S. assistance in the hemisphere, and because

the foreign aid program in general is under heavy fire from critics in Congress. The GAO is Congress' watchdog over federal spending.

Fowler said that each loan is guaranteed by the Brazilian government and that the U.S. has lost no funds in any of the 11 projects.

Fowler termed "incorrect" a GAO comment that AID had failed to give enough thought to the severe inflation in Brazil. With inflation approaching 140 per cent in the first quarter of 1964 "no precise financial planning was possible," he said.

STRONGER FEDERAL FIREARMS REGULATION NOW

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in this hour of mourning we need to act swiftly to halt the horrible rollcall of violence barked from the barrels of firearms. The Congress has just passed a gun-control measure in title IV of the Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act to cover the purchase and sale of handguns but it does not go far enough. In his statement on June 6, 1968, the President reiterated his previous recommendations, made both in his 1967 state of the Union message and in his separate crime messages, for a more effective gun-control law. He has not transmitted a bill to the Congress which would extend the handgun restrictions of title IV to shotguns, rifles, and ammunition.

The President's proposal would place the same restrictions on mail-order purchases of rifles, shotguns, and ammunition as Congress had just put on the mail-order purchase of handguns. It would ban the sale of rifles, shotguns, and ammunition to persons under 18 years of age who are generally too young to accept the heavy responsibility of guns and ammunition. And, it would restrict the over-the-counter sale of rifles and shotguns in one State to residents of another State.

This legislation will not interfere with the purchase of firearms by legitimate hunters and sportsmen. It will, however, encourage the 50 States to enact their own gun-control licensing, and registration laws—to provide a nationwide network of systematic safeguards for all our citizens.

We must act now. We cannot and dare not delay.

I was a cosponsor of the President's original Firearms Control Act, and tried unsuccessfully a year ago to get the House to consider it on the floor as an amendment to the anticrime bill. The firearms control provisions in the crime bill that was finally approved by both Houses and sent to the White House are inadequate. In voting for the final version of the crime bill I expressed the hope that, at an early date, the bill's provisions would be extended to include more effective firearms control. With that in mind I am cosponsoring the President's most recent legislative proposal for stronger Federal regulations that would cover rifles, shotguns, and am-

munition, as well as handguns, and I shall press for earliest possible consideration and passage of these measures by the House.

VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit an excellent address by Adm. Ben Moreell to the Conference of Allegheny County League of Women Voters, at Pittsburgh, Pa., for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

(Address by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, USN, Retired, to the Youth and Government Conference of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters at Pittsburgh, Pa., April 27, 1968)

History records that from time immemorial man has engaged in struggles to be free. Most often he has been on the losing side and, even when he won, his innate indolence and apathy have prevented him from enjoying the fruits of freedom for very long. He usually disregarded the time-tested warning of the great Irish patriot, John Philpot Curran:

"The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

BASIC PRINCIPLES AND FREEDOM

An essential part of man's striving for freedom has been his effort to establish a set of values from which he could derive a code of principles to guide his thoughts and actions. It is as though God, having endowed him with life and liberty, decreed that man should erect a beacon by whose constant light he can know when he is off course, and then make appropriate corrections.

Let us look briefly at some of the great pronouncements on life, liberty, values and principles which have guided mankind to proper conduct over the ages.

Some 3500 years ago, Moses led the children of Israel to freedom from slavery in Egypt. God then saw fit to endow them with The Ten Commandments, the brightest star in the firmament of human freedom.

The first four Commandments are essentially religious. They define man's duties to God. The last six define his duties to his neighbor and are primarily secular. These religious and secular rules of human behavior are inter-dependent and mutually sustaining. The basic values are; first, love for our Father in heaven, Supreme Ruler of the universe, Giver of life and Author of liberty; and second, love for one's neighbor, including the neighbor one has never seen. The principles derived from those values are first, obedience to God's code of moral laws and second, devotion to The Golden Rule, that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

Some 1500 years later there came another of the great pronouncements on human liberty, revealed to mankind in the Sermon on the Mount. There Jesus defined His mission in this manner: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." From the context it is clear that by "the law" He meant The Pentateuch, the first five books of the Old Testament, which include the

whole of the Hebrew law, both religious and secular.

While the moral and ethical principles taught by Jesus are those enunciated by Moses, there are important differences in exposition, emphasis and, in some cases, severity of application. For example, He taught that the rule of law should be tempered with kindness, humility, tolerance and charity. His pronouncement of The Golden Rule and the Beatitudes, as well as His expositions of man's rights and collateral responsibilities, establish the doctrine essential for human freedom, that man's rights are a gift of the Creator; they are not conferred by government or by any other human agency. Man's debt is solely to God and, therefore, he must ultimately account to God for his transgressions. There is no mention of government or the civil law in Jesus' Sermon.

The world was thus endowed with a code of principles destined to exert a profound influence on the development of Western civilization.

In 1215 A.D., there came a titanic struggle for human freedom which culminated when the Barons of Runnemead forced King John to sign a declaration of "liberties, rights and concessions," the Magna Carta. By that agreement, the Barons assumed "for themselves and their heirs . . . in all places forever" the duty to preserve those rights which had been won at such great cost.

The Magna Carta has been called "the first rock upon which the British Constitution was built." It was a long and complex instrument, destined to have a stormy career. But, eventually, as a result of the struggle with the Stuart kings, it was accepted as the fundamental charter of the people's liberties.

It is noteworthy that, in spite of its declared noble intentions, the freedoms guaranteed by the Charter did not filter down to the lower levels of Britain's social order. The Barons were almost the sole beneficiaries. The reason may be that the Charter was completely secular; no attempt had been made to appeal to man's higher nature, his duties to God and to his fellow man. Thus, it differed both in letter and in spirit from The Decalogue and The Sermon on the Mount.

THE NATURE OF LIBERTY

Human liberty is essentially a spiritual value. It embraces the concept that man cannot be made good by force of secular law. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," wrote St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. And the noted theologian, Dean Inge, wrote, "From within, out of the heart of man, comes all that can exalt or defile him."

There were other differences between the doctrine expounded in the Hebraic-Christian code, and the concepts held by the Barons. The wording of Magna Carta reveals that the Barons thought of rights, not as coming from God but as a concession they would wrest from the King when they had enough power to do so. Thus, they forced him to sign this statement of purpose:

"Wherefore our will is, and we firmly command . . . that the men in our kingdom have and hold the aforesaid liberties, rights and concessions . . . to them and their heirs, of us and our heirs, in all things and places forever."

In 1776 there came our Declaration of Independence, followed by our Constitution, with its Bill of Rights, in 1787. The Declaration adhered to the religious doctrine that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." It asserted, further, that the sole purpose for which governments are instituted among men is to make those rights secure.

The basic concept of the Declaration, buttressed by the Constitution, is that government should have a monopoly of force with which to protect the citizens' lives, liberties

and livelihoods (that is, their honestly acquired property); to define a system of laws; to invoke a common justice; and to keep the records incident thereto. Other than this, the people would be free to pursue their own interests, provided this would not lead them to trespass on the rights of others. Government would not be empowered to administer the affairs of men; it would dispense justice amongst men who would be free to manage their own affairs.

These were truly revolutionary ideas. Never before had any people established themselves as a nation of sovereign individuals under the rule of God, a benevolent ruler who not only gives us power to disobey Him but also power to deny Him! His only enforcement officer is the individual's own conscience! Never before had the political power, government, been relegated to the status of an agent, with only delegated, narrowly limited and precisely defined authority. Never before had there been established the inviolable right of the individual to the fruits of his only labors, to keep, to trade or to give away, as he may choose. Always it was government that was sovereign, and any right to the products of one's labor, and often even to one's life, was a right granted to the people by the government.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

Our Constitution was designed to provide a government of laws, not of men. But it was not a perfect instrument. It contained flaws, some of which were noted at the time; others were discerned later. George Mason, delegate from Virginia, and author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, which served Jefferson as a model for our own Declaration, refused to sign the Constitution because it did not abolish human slavery. Also, he believed it failed to protect individual rights adequately. The latter defect was remedied, in part at least, by the Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to the Constitution. But the former was not remedied until we had paid for our sin by a bloody fratricidal war. The Nation still suffers grievously from that transgression.

There were other flaws in the Constitution. It left unresolved the matter of equal rights for women; a defect corrected by the 19th Amendment, in 1920. Furthermore, while the Virginia Declaration was specific in asserting the citizen's right to own, use and dispose of his honestly acquired property, our Declaration substituted an ambiguous paraphrase which proclaimed the individual's right to the "pursuit of happiness." With the passage of years, zealous humanists and political opportunists distorted this to mean "the right to happiness—at the expense of others." They attach no importance to the fact that our political forebears merely asserted the right to freely pursue happiness, the responsibility for catching up with it remaining with the pursuer.

Later, real or imaginary ambiguities were detected in the wording of the general welfare clauses, the interstate commerce clause and most recently, the provision in the first amendment which prohibits Congress from making any law "respecting an establishment of religion." These alleged deficiencies have been seized upon as vehicles which the Central Government in Washington can use to increase its power.

The Founding Fathers knew that political, economic, technologic and social changes are inevitable and, if the Constitution is to serve as a living code for the conduct of government, it, too, must be susceptible of orderly change. For this reason, they incorporated in the Constitution itself clearly defined procedures for amending it. But these do not include provision for "de facto" amendments by judicial or executive decisions or by judicial, legislative or executive disregard of its clearly stated provisions.

Nevertheless, in spite of the real and imag-

inary defects, which are, to a large degree but reflections of human frailty, our Constitution stands as a bulwark of individual freedom in these United States, this "last best hope of earth." In 1878, the great British Statesman, Gladstone, stated: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

While this notable progress toward freedom was being achieved in America, grave events were transpiring in France. They culminated in violent revolution. In 1789, the French Constituent Assembly voted a Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. It was an important contribution to the history of human liberty. But it contained the seeds of its own destruction.

The political agency envisioned in our Declaration and made operative by our Constitution was designed to end man's control of men. The goal was a society in which each person would be free to govern himself; political intervention would be used only to remove outside interference with this aim and to prevent trespass on the rights of others. The essential disciplines were to come from within a man's own being as he sought to live out the demands of his religion. Our Founders held that individual freedom cannot survive for long unless it is restrained from excesses by internal controls which stem from the moral law.

By contrast, the French revolutionaries tossed both religion and historical experience overboard. Their aim was to establish a completely rational, new society whose object was to emphasize the primacy of the rights of man by denying the existence of God. The result was the reign of terror which ended in the dictatorship of Napoleon.

No doubt George Washington had both America and France in mind when he said in his Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can prevail without religion . . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the French Declaration of Rights has a place on the roster of great pronouncements on human liberty. It asserted that the "Public Force," which we call the "political power," is "instituted for the advantage of all," and is not to be used for the benefit of those who control it. Furthermore, although this provision was later to be "more honored in the breach than in the observance," the French Declaration held that private property is "an inviolable and sacred right."

THE WAY TO NATIONAL REDEMPTION

I have dwelt upon these historic pronouncements because, collectively, they constitute a system of values and principles by which we can chart a prudent course for the conduct of economic, cultural, social and governmental affairs.

Some years ago, the late President Lowell of Harvard University remarked: "No society is ever murdered; it commits suicide."

In light of recent world-shaking events—political, economic, military, social and scientific—and our panicky reactions to them, one may well ask, "Is our American society committing suicide? If so, can we reverse course, and what price must we pay to correct past errors?"

Many perceptive students of current affairs believe that we are now on a collision course with national disaster. In recent decades we have tried to abdicate our personal responsibilities in favor of impersonal centralized government. The result has been a marked weakening of the political, economic and social fabrics of our society; a weakening revealed in the impairment of constitutional

guarantees of individual rights, a costly war which we dare not win and are afraid to lose, the debauchery of our currency which resulted from unwise fiscal and monetary policies, unilateral surrender of our military and economic defensive strength, and unbridled anarchy in our cities.

We face a crisis of such proportions as to threaten our survival as a constitutional, federated Republic. The basic issue is morally responsible individual freedom, of which freedom of speech, of worship, of assembly, and of enterprise are the major facets.

There is a way ahead which will lead us out of the morass in which we are now mired. But it is not by resort to political legerdemain. It is by beating our way upstream, against the swift-running current of coercive political force, to those moral and spiritual values and principles which guided our forebears in building this nation.

Such an effort will invoke the support of cosmic sanction, for God intended men to be free. "The God Who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time . . ." Jefferson observed. But we will need conviction, courage, tenacity, understanding, humility, tolerance, compassion and, above all, *faith*, to set in motion what William James called, ". . . those tiny invisible, molecular moral forces which work from individual to individual, creeping in through the crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, but which, if you give them time, will rend the hardest monuments of man's pride."

An appropriate supplement to this discourse is the recent statement by the Episcopal Bishop of Michigan, the Rt. Reverend Richard Emrich. He said:

"There can be no 'Great Society' without great people, and, constitute the social order as we will, its day by day working will always depend upon the character and self-restraint of the people . . .

"We have lost sight of the deep evil in man, and we easily assume that outer improvements will correct inner disease.

"This half-truth can undo a nation. It is the fallacy which says that by moving furniture, or by getting a bigger house, or building a swimming pool we can make a people good, happy, and law-abiding. So we pass laws, but the inner man goes to seed. We conquer space and time, but fail to conquer our own arrogant self-will . . .

"The best rule for parents and young people is to face frankly that the 'Great Society' is in many ways sick and degenerate; for only if we see this, can we save our souls in it . . .

"There is no legislation in Washington, no item in a national budget, no grant to a university that can heal this inner sickness, for its cause is not outer but inner. The healing will come when, one by one in our hearts, we recover gratitude, humility, reverence, spiritual discipline, and the importance of our souls. Outer riches can never supply inner order."

In a free society it is of vital importance that each one formulate his personal standards of values and principles. Each of us begins life with certain inherited physical, mental and moral characteristics, some of which are as unique as one's finger-prints. As we grow older, the variations at birth are expanded by differences in environment, education, training, associations and experiences, and by the influences of our studies, meditations and such Divine guidance as we are able to invoke.

In light of the resulting wide variations in human beings, it follows that the conclusions they may draw from any given set of circumstances will vary widely and there will be differences in the values and principles which they are willing to accept. As we acquire increased knowledge, we will refine, amplify or correct our earlier views. And as we develop keener perception, we will be able

to distinguish more precisely between true and false values, between sound principles and expediencies.

In this manner we can reach more valid conclusions by the process of self-improvement. If we accept, without question, alleged principles of right and wrong offered to us by others, we may become victims of gross deceptions.

There are two significant questions one might ask in appraising the worth of proposed values and principles. They are, first, have they worked productively? And second, have they endured, *under fire*, over the ages? It is evident that the great moral precepts of the Judeo-Christian code pass these tests with flying colors, while the doctrines of dictators, although sometimes temporarily successful, have ultimately failed miserably and at tragic cost to the human race!

I urge that you pursue relentlessly your search for truth and understanding. With knowledge born of truth you are sure to find sound principles. The Scripture tells us, "Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free." Thus protected by the armor of righteousness, you can discharge your debt to God and Country. You can restore our free Republic to its former place of respect, yes, even of affection, in the hearts of all peoples everywhere, who love freedom!

I submit for the Record from the "U.S. Navy Biographical Dictionary," the biography of this outstanding American, popular Adm. Ben Moreell:

Moreell, Ben. Admiral, Civil Engineer Corps (Retired): b Salt Lake City, Utah, Sept. 14, 1892. After graduation from Washington Univ. in 1913. Ben Moreell was appointed a lieutenant (jg) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Navy. Following a brief indoctrination course at the U.S. Naval Academy, he became assistant to the Public Works Officer at the Naval Base, Ponta Delgada, at San Miguel in the Azores, where he remained until May 1919. A month later he was appointed Civil Engineer Member of the Plant Board at Quincy, Mass., and there also served as Plant Engineer of the Destroyer and Submarine Base, Squantum, Mass. From Sept. 1920 until Aug. 1924 he served as principal assistant and Executive Officer to the Engineer in Chief of the Department of Public Works in Haiti; then in succession he saw duty as Assistant Public Works Officer, and later Public Works Officer at the Norfolk Navy Yard at Portsmouth, Va. from Sept. 1924 until Apr. 1926, and as Assistant Design Manager in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Dept., Washington, D.C. until the summer of 1930.

While assigned to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in 1929, he wrote *Standards of Design for Concrete*, one of the outstanding and most widely accepted treatises on concrete. In June 1930 he reported as Public Works Officer of the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Washington and of the Thirteenth Naval Dist., HQ at Seattle, Washington. In June 1932, he was sent to France to study European methods of engineering design and construction at the Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées in Paris. Upon his return to the States in June 1933, he became Assistant Design Manager, with personal supervision of planning the Ship Model Testing Basin, later named the David W. Taylor Model Basin, at Carderock, Md., while attached to the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

In May 1935, he was named Project Manager of the Shipbuilding and Repair Facilities, Storage and Submarine Base Section, Bureau of Yards and Docks. In Aug. 1937 he reported as Public Works Officer of the Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, T.H., and of the Fourteenth Naval Dist., in the rank of commander.

He was returned to the Navy Dept. in Dec. of that year to accept appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with the

accompanying rank of rear admiral. Then 45 years old, he was one of the youngest naval officers to hold that rank. Six days after he was sworn in for his second term as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and the United States entered WWII. As early as 1937 he had stressed the need for extension of docking and repair facilities on United States possessions in the Pacific and Dec. 1941 saw the formation of the Naval Construction Battalions known as the "Seabees," under his direction. The Seabees, whom Adm. Moreell nicknamed the "Can-do Boys," became famous for their Paul Bunyan-like exploits. Comprised of trained construction men and engineers, the Seabees not only preceded the main forces of assault by laying out roads, manning floating drydocks, and building advance bases, airfields and barracks, but also took part in the actual fighting.

While serving as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Moreell was nominated by President Roosevelt for advancement to the rank of vice admiral. Confirmed by the Senate, he was promoted to that rank, effective Feb. 1, 1944, the youngest naval officer with that rank at the time, as well as the first CEC officer to hold the rank of vice admiral. He continued his duty as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks throughout the war period until Nov. 1945, and his nickname as "King Bee of the Seabees" followed him long after the war.

His foresight in urging the construction of two giant graving docks at Pearl Harbor and the transfer of an inactive floating dry dock from New Orleans before the outbreak of war proved invaluable when the first crippled battleships were dry-docked and repaired after the Japanese attack.

Another pre-war accomplishment was his direction of the world's largest integrated construction program in building the shore establishments needed to back up the Fleet, which totaled during the war more than 900 naval bases and stations, including 300 advance bases, some as large as Peoria, Ill. or Columbia, S.C.

This vast network of bases and facilities kept pace with the rapid advance of our armed services during the war. Before the war, practically all Navy construction work was done under the Bureau of Yards and Docks contracts by general contractors and their civilian personnel. But the fate of the construction workers at Wake and Guam strengthened his conviction that the Navy needed men who not only could build, but also could take up arms and defend themselves and their installations. Thus, the Seabees, an organization composed of construction workers, officered by construction experts, and trained in combat, under his direction, grew during the war from an original authorization of 3,300 men on Dec. 28, 1941, to an organization of more than ten thousand officers and 240,000 men, approximately three-quarters of whom were actively engaged overseas.

In Oct. 1945 he was designated Officer in Charge of Petroleum Facilities, fifty-four strike-bound oil refineries and pipe lines which had been seized by the Navy in accordance with Executive Order. In Nov. 1945 he was also designated Chief of the Material Division of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to coordinate all material procurement in the Navy.

In May 1946 he was made Deputy Coal Mines Administrator, in charge of the operation and administration of the bituminous coal mines seized by Government Executive Order 9728. Subsequently, as the Coal Mines Administrator, designated by the Secretary of the Interior, he had complete charge of this activity. On June 11, 1946, his nomination for the rank of admiral was confirmed. He was relieved of all active duty and transferred to the Retired List of the U.S. Navy on Oct. 1, 1946.

RESTORATION OF FUNDS TO THE IMPACTED AREAS SCHOOL AID PROGRAM

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my pleasure over the recent approval by the House of Representatives of the amendment to restore the much-needed funds to the impacted areas school aid program, as included in the supplemental appropriation bill.

This Federal assistance program, familiarly known as Public Law 874, was enacted in 1950 and since that time has provided needed assistance to local school districts burdened by the obligation to provide educational services to the children of families employed by the Federal Government in local communities all over the Nation. Federal payments are made at rates determined by formulas in the legislation, and eligible school districts have a continuing expectation to receive these annual payments.

Had my colleagues in the House of Representatives not voted as they did yesterday, school districts all over the country in these impacted areas would have been in serious trouble. These schools have depended on the authorized Federal aid to meet their operating cost, and would have been severely handicapped without it.

This is certainly a time of financial crisis for our country, and I do believe that certain cuts in Federal expenditures must be made. But I feel, and have stated before, that this program of Federal assistance is an obligation of the Federal Government which should be met, and local school districts entitled to this assistance have had every reason to believe that their entitlements would be met by Federal payments. Fortunately, because of the action taken by the House on Tuesday, and hopefully by the Senate very soon, these school districts can expect to receive their full entitlement of funds as provided for in Public Law 874.

As a former schoolteacher and principal, I strongly feel that education must be one of our first priorities in America. Therein lies the hope and future for our country. We have witnessed, recently, some of the most horrifying and frightening events which have had no comparison in the history of the United States. The prime topic of conversation among legislators and people all across the land is what can be done to prevent further recurrences of the violence we have seen, and what measures can we take to stem the tide of hatred which is seeping over our country. My feeling is that education should be our foremost area of concentration to this end. For this reason I could not have taken any other position than to support the amendment to fund the impacted areas program 100 percent.

In the Third District of New Jersey, which I have the privilege of representing here in Congress, there are three substantially large areas which are affected

by this program. The State of New Jersey can now expect to receive \$1,951,763 in funds for their impacted area schools, when and if this measure is approved by the Senate and signed by the President. I am hopeful that the Senate will take quick action on this appropriation, since our school boards have been kept in suspense far too long.

**SPECIAL STAMP COMMEMORATING
100 YEARS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FOR WOMEN**

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to provide a special stamp commemorating 100 years of higher education for women.

Until the Civil War, higher education for women in the United States was a rarity. Although the first woman's college was chartered in 1839, in Georgia, and two State universities—Iowa and Utah—admitted women from the date of their founding, in 1850, in general, higher education for women was regarded as unnecessary.

Then came the Civil War drain on manpower. Women were needed to take over men's jobs, notably teaching. Public demand opened all State universities and many denominational colleges to women students. Seeking further freedom of intellectual and cultural development, the new women college students began to form their own campus clubs and societies.

In January 1870, four women students at DePauw University—then called Indiana Asbury College—Greencastle, Ind., founded the first chapter of Kappa Alpha Theta. In October 1870, six women students at Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill., founded the first chapter of Kappa Kappa Gamma. Both groups were chartered in their Greek-letter names. Both included in their purposes opportunity for higher education for women, encouragement of academic excellence, and development of high moral standards.

As the two organizations grew in the number of chapters and alumnae, philanthropy, community service, and leadership training were added to the purposes. Through the years, thousands of members have made outstanding contributions in education, the professions and arts, and in business and industry. Even greater numbers of alumnae of the two groups have given voluntary community service and leadership in hundreds of communities around the world.

Recognition of academic excellence continues over the years. The first two women ever elected to Phi Beta Kappa were members of Kappa Alpha Theta. Kappa Kappa Gamma, to date, has had a total of 1,758 Phi Beta Kappas. In recent times—1963-67—Kappa Alpha Theta had a total of 8,033 members elected to the top scholastic honor societies, including Phi Beta Kappa, Phi

Delta Phi, and Alpha Lambda. Both organizations have long records of members elected to Mortar Board, the national campus honor society, established in 1918 to recognize campus service as well as academic achievement. Kappa Mortar Board; and, during the period Kappa Gamma has 1,114 members of 1963-67, Kappa Alpha Theta had 469 Mortar Board members. Since 1963 Kappa Alpha Theta has had 18 Woodrow Wilson Scholarship winners and eight Fulbright awards. Undergraduate and graduate members of both groups have received scholarships and fellowships from a number of sources.

For more than 50 years, both Kappa Kappa Gamma and Kappa Alpha Theta have provided scholarships, fellowships, and aid to education for women. Funds established by the officers in the early 1900's have grown through additional allocations and contributions, all from members. Kappa Kappa Gamma has provided more than a million dollars in aid to education, including nonfraternity women and foreign women students among beneficiaries. Kappa Kappa Gamma Foreign Fellowships, named in honor of Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, a Kappa who was the only woman member of the first U.S. delegation to the United Nations in San Francisco, provided the first two Japanese women teachers to come to the United States to study after World War II. Kappa Alpha Theta's foreign fellowship program provided study in the United States for a woman judge of a juvenile court in Holland; a Chilean girl who became a staff member of ILO; an Indian woman who later became a deputy minister of welfare in Delhi State; and a children's dentist from Bolivia who returned home to pioneer in dental clinics. Dr. Chung-Hi Oh, the acknowledged ranking authority on rehabilitation in Korea came to the United States to study under Dr. Howard A. Rusk on a Kappa Kappa Gamma fellowship. Dr. Oh has also participated in world conferences on rehabilitation in Europe and Asia. She is one of 87 women from 25 countries who have held Kappa Kappa Gamma foreign fellowships. The centennial scholarships and fellowships will provide higher education for additional qualified women, to be selected in consultation with academic authorities.

In 1946 Kappa Alpha Theta adopted the Institute of Logopedics, in Wichita, Kans., the world's largest training center for communicatively handicapped children and adults, as a permanent national philanthropy. Since that date, members of Kappa Alpha Theta have given \$405,184 to the institute. The Institute of Logopedics is a nonprofit, nonsectarian philanthropy, with a three-part program for training the speech-handicapped, educating logopedists, and research. Kappa Alpha Theta is the institute's largest single contributor. Kappa Alpha Theta has also contributed more than \$100,000 to the foster parent plan, and, for this aid to orphan children overseas, became the first organization to receive the Brotherhood of Children Award.

In 1917 Kappa Kappa Gamma began aid to French orphan and refugee children, under the direction of Dorothy Canfield Fisher, a Kappa working overseas who later became a noted author. This project was maintained through the postwar 1920's. During World War II, Kappa sponsored a similar children's project in a workers' residence area near Paris. Kappa alumnae associations also provided 5,000 layettes for Norwegian war babies. Today Kappa alumnae groups have a total of 319 service projects serving the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, socially deprived, and the aged. A number of alumnae associations also give special scholarships in rehabilitation, this in addition to their share in the overall program of scholarships and fellowships.

In 1970, Kappa Alpha Theta and Kappa Kappa Gamma, the two pioneer Greek-letter women's college organizations, will commemorate their 100th anniversaries.

Participating in the two centennials will be 150,000 members, including alumnae groups in 275 cities in the United States and Canada, and collegiate chapters at 90 colleges and universities in the United States and 4 universities in Canada.

In keeping with 100 years of work for higher education for women, both Kappa Kappa Gamma and Kappa Alpha Theta will mark their centennials by giving Centennial Scholarships and Fellowships to qualified women. Funds contributed by members for this purpose already total a quarter of a million dollars.

Kappa Alpha Theta and Kappa Kappa Gamma are asking for the opportunity to sponsor a commemorative stamp in 1970, celebrating the theme of higher education for women. Because of close connection with education, the two organizations are very much aware of the urgent need of more education for young people of the future, and of the responsibility of adults both to help provide more facilities for education and to urge youth to make the best use of educational opportunities.

If the commemorative stamp is granted, members of Kappa Alpha Theta and Kappa Kappa Gamma will give vigorous leadership in promoting the stamp, and the goal of higher education it would represent. The stamp would be publicized in every State, and in the cities where alumnae groups are located, and on the 90 college and university campuses where there are collegiate chapters. First-day cancellations could take place appropriately in post offices in four cities: Columbus, Ohio; Greencastle, Ind.; Evanston, Ill.; and Monmouth, Ill. Working through all channels, the membership would expect to make cancellations and sales of stamps satisfactory and profitable.

Officers of Kappa Alpha Theta and Kappa Kappa Gamma would join in a special memorable event at Washington, to announce the stamp and to honor leaders in government, education, and cultural life.

It is my hope that prompt action will be taken on this proposal.

THE JAPANESE BOYCOTT OF
ISRAEL

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to read in the Wall Street Journal of May 13, 1968, of the prospect of seeing American executives pitted against Japanese businessmen, as a result of having major Japanese firms complying with the Arab boycott against Israel.

It was surprising to read that piece of information at the time when major Japanese companies, through their subsidiaries in the United States, circulate letters in this country calling for advocating free trade, and for opposing restrictive trade legislation, while they treat the nation of Israel as a less favored nation than others.

I would like to call the attention of the Government of Japan, and of these Japanese companies to our Government's opposition to foreign pressure aimed at restricting trade with nations friendly to the United States, and to express my hope that these Japanese companies will adhere to free, multilateral and nondiscriminating world trade.

Copies of the Wall Street Journal article and the letters circulated by Sumitomo Metal Industries, Ltd. and by Fuji Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 13, 1968]

ARAB-ISRAEL DISPUTE MAY END UP AFFECTING
JAPANESE-UNITED STATES TRADE—AMERICAN
FIRMS ASSAIL JAPAN FOR OBSERVING ARAB
BOYCOTT—STEEL CONCERN CANCELS ORDER
(By Martin Hollander)

NEW YORK.—Unlikely as it seems, the 20-year-old Arab-Israeli struggle is beginning to pit American executives against Japanese businessmen. The result is sure to be a change in Japanese trade—one way or another.

The dispute centers on Japanese companies' observance of the Arab boycott of Israel. Japan is the only major non-Communist industrial nation where most companies observe the boycott and refuse to deal with Israel, and the practice is beginning to rankle American businessmen, both Christians and Jews.

The Anti-Defamation League, a Jewish organization, has long been bothered by the Japanese reaction to the boycott. For years, the organization has been trying on its own to persuade the Japanese to change their policy. Now, evidently wearying of these efforts, Anti-Defamation League officials are seeking the aid of American corporations.

"We wouldn't organize a boycott" against the Japanese companies, says Arnold Forster, general counsel to the Anti-Defamation League. "We wouldn't stimulate one." Nevertheless, there are indications that the Japanese boycott is leading to an American one. A few businessmen have already said they will refuse to deal with Japanese companies that observe the boycott against Israel until that boycott is dropped; others may do so in coming months.

"A THOUSAND PITIES"

Dale Industries Inc., a Detroit maker of metal products, is one of the first companies to act against Japan. It dropped plans to place a sizable order with Kawasaki Steel Corp. after learning that a sister company of

Kawasaki had refused to build a tanker for an Israeli company.

Kawasaki Steel responded that it wasn't responsible for its sister company's actions, which "have caused us much trouble." The sister company, Kawasaki Dockyard, also said it was troubled by the matter. It refused the Israeli shipbuilding job "with a thousand pities" because still another Kawasaki company "has a business transaction" with Egypt. Despite all the apologies, though, Kawasaki Dockyard still refuses to build the tanker—and Dale Industries still refuses to buy Japanese steel.

Other American steel buyers may follow. Paul Goodwin, vice president of Eastern Steel & Metal Co. of West Haven, Conn., says American steel distributors are clearly concerned. "We aren't at this point boycotting the Japanese steelmakers who observe the Arab boycott," he says. But if persuasion fails, "I would apply much greater pressure." And he adds, "There are other places to buy steel."

Other American customers of Japan also are concerned. Last weekend a committee of apparel manufacturers flew to Japan to discuss the situation. Late last week some 50 importers of Japanese products protested the boycott to the Japanese consul in New York.

TRADE IS SUBSTANTIAL

Japanese government officials say they are powerless to stop the boycott of Israeli goods, which they say is corporate, not government, policy. "We aren't happy about this situation, but we can't do anything about it," says Hiroshi Ohki, first secretary for economic affairs in the Japanese embassy in Washington. Some American businessmen claim the Japanese government could do something about it, however.

Officials of some Japanese companies say they fear they would lose their Arab business if they trade with Israeli companies. In 1967, Japan sold \$410 million of goods to the Arab states of the Middle East and purchased \$1.5 billion of goods from them. The sales represent about 4% of Japan's exports. The purchases, mostly oil, account for under 10% of the nation's imports. In the same year, exports to Israel totaled \$19.1 million, and imports totaled \$21.1 million; nearly all the imports were polished and cut diamonds. Israel's exports to Japan are declining yearly.

Mr. Forster of the Anti-Defamation League says the Japanese boycott of Israeli goods even goes beyond what the Arabs asked. "They overreact. They over-comply," he says. "They refuse to sell a completed commodity to Israel. There's never been anything in the Arab boycott operation to stop the selling of something like kitchen knives to Israel."

The "Principles of the Arab Boycott," as stated by the Arab nations, don't forbid shipping finished products to Israel, "except those which are helpful to the (its) war effort. Nevertheless, one Japanese company once refused to sell dishwashers to an Israeli wholesaler. More recently, Sumitomo Machinery Co., a maker of cranes and machinery, cabled an Israeli company: "We are exporting machinery to Arab. Therefore regret unable entertain enquiries from Israel."

SUMITOMO METAL INDUSTRIES, LTD.,

New York, N.Y., November 17, 1967.

We are asking your help and support in a matter of the greatest importance.

As you know, existing and proposed import quota bills now under consideration in the U.S. Congress would affect up to \$12 billion of U.S. imports—nearly 50 per cent of total American imports. Many of these measures could seriously affect your business and ours.

As a purchaser of Japanese steel, you should be particularly concerned with steel import quota bills introduced by Senator Vance Hartke and Representative John Dent. These bills would reduce the amount of allowable imports into the United States and maintain the imported steel supply at a fixed, low level from year to year.

President Johnson, liberal trade Congressmen, and other advocates of the freer trade philosophy have already voiced strong opposition to these measures. We believe that you will also want to make your viewpoint known.

We, therefore, most respectfully suggest that you consider: Making your feelings known to members of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees—who have primary responsibility in these matters. Contacting your own Congressman or Senator directly, either through a telephone call, telegram, or letter.

We have enclosed for your information: Various points you may wish to include in your appeal. Members of Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees. Reprints of recent editorials on import quotas.

As you know, this situation has grave implications. Passage of these quota bills would directly affect all relations between our two countries, have an immediate influence on U.S. international trade, and destroy all of the advances made in the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations.

We seek your support in this matter of mutual concern and hope you will let us know what steps you are taking.

Yours sincerely,

Y. IKEJIRI.

JAPANESE STEEL INFORMATION CENTER.

DEAR SIR: As you undoubtedly know, the United States Congress has recently been overwhelmed by a large number of so-called "protectionist" measures—in one form or another—primarily aimed at controlling imports through various systems of quotas.

Steel is only one of dozens of commodities which would be controlled through quota measures.

In the interests of protecting domestic industries, Senators and Representatives from virtually every state have identified themselves with at least one of these import-controlling measures. It would seem that a "bandwagon" effect has swept Congress, and we would like to ask that you pause for a moment to consider what is really going on.

It is certainly a sympathetic cause for an industry to call on the government for protection from competition. Wouldn't it be valuable if drug stores, for instance, could call on the government for protection when supermarkets handle competing products? We would be quick to recognize that such a request would not be in the spirit of Free Enterprise, which the United States has pioneered.

Foreign imports—and especially such a basic commodity as steel—are valuable factors in the operation of the free enterprise system. Steel imports have filled market demands when domestic steel fell short; steel imports have kept the costs of domestic steel (and therefore consumer products) from skyrocketing; steel imports have forced the domestic industry to modernize; steel imports have made it possible for foreign countries to purchase U.S. exports, thereby giving the United States a favorable balance of trade (exclusive of military commitments). And U.S. exports account directly or indirectly for some 3.5 million American jobs, according to the U.S. Department of Labor.

Trade is vital to the maintenance of a free world, as well as to the maintenance of a healthy domestic economy.

We have selected a few editorials from leading U.S. publications that will indicate the critical nature of the new wave of protectionism. If you agree that world trade should be maintained with as few controls as possible, we urge that you write now to your Senators and Representatives calling on them to defeat the protectionist movements now before Congress.

Sincerely,

JACK P. WHITEHOUSE,
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.

FUJI IRON & STEEL CO., LTD.,
New York, N.Y., December 20, 1967.

Mr. SAMUEL GOODWIN,
Eastern Steel & Metal Co.,
West Haven, Conn.

DEAR MR. GOODWIN: We want to take this opportunity to express our gratitude for your patronage, which we value so highly.

Today, we are writing to ask your help and support in a matter of the greatest importance.

As you know, various import quota bills have been or are proposed to be introduced in the U.S. Congress would affect up to \$12 billion of U.S. imports—nearly 50% of total American imports. Some of these measures could directly and most seriously affect your business and ours.

We are referring to the steel import quota bills introduced by Senator Vance Hartke and Representative John Dent. As a purchaser of Japanese steel, you should be particularly concerned with these bills, because they would reduce, and maintain, the amount of allowable imports of steel into the United States at a fixed, low level from year to year.

Administration leaders, liberal trade congressmen, and other advocates of the free trade philosophy have already voiced strong opposition to these measures during the Senate Finance Committee hearings in October. We believe that your viewpoints should also be known to the legislators.

Unless you have already done so, therefore, we most respectfully suggest that you make your views known, by telephone calls, telegrams, or letters, to members of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, who have primary responsibility for considering these bills, as well as to your own Senators and Representatives, or any other members of Congress with whom you are personally acquainted.

We have enclosed for your information:

1. Various points you may wish to include in your appeal.
2. List of members of Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committee, and
3. Reprints of recent editorials on import quotas.

You know that the current surge of protectionist sentiment has grave implications. There is no doubt that the passage of these quota bills would have an immediate, adverse effect upon economic relations between our two countries, and destroy all of the advances made in the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, which would envision the reduction of the U.S. tariff rate on imported steel by an average of 7 percent.

Although observers seem to be agreed that few quota bills are expected to be acted upon during the remainder of the current session of the Congress, they seem to be equally agreed that pressures will mount next year for enacting at least some of these bills, including the steel quota bill.

We are doing what little we can to counter this unfortunate development, but nothing could be more effective than your personal appeals to the Senators and Congressmen.

We seek your support in this matter of mutual concern and would appreciate anything you can do to help us.

With best wishes,
Yours sincerely,

TADAYUKI OTA,
General Manager.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 142d day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday considered and passed a supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 17734, including funds for many governmental activities, the largest share of which however was designated for Vietnam spending. It is interesting to note that while the past Vietnam supplemental appropriation measures were considered capable of standing alone, this year it had to be lumped together with a number of other programs of interest to many Members of Congress. Even in the face of this fact, opposition to the bill increased. This despite the fact that the other programs funded by the bill, such as aid to federally impacted schools, veterans compensation and others merit support and surely would have had mine saved for the inclusion of the Vietnam appropriations in the bill.

I opposed passage of the supplemental because it required an implicit reaffirmation by Congress of the policy of escalation our Nation continues to pursue in Vietnam. I cannot in good conscience support a policy that has failed, that is costing our Nation some of its finest young men, that promises to be even more costly and that generally has lost the support of the people in Vietnam as well as in the United States.

A year ago, in March 1967, Congress faced the same question on a supplemental appropriation for Vietnam. At that time a number of us protested the fact that the money sought was not for the protection of our troops in the field, but would require additional numbers of our soldiers to risk their lives in support of a bad policy. This has been borne out and unless the policy is altered it will be repeated in the months ahead.

The present policy calls for continued intensification of our part of the conflict, imposing increased violence on the country and people of Vietnam, and ever-increasing and saddening American casualties as well.

By the end of December, the United States will have 549,000 men in Vietnam. Continued escalation has not produced a military victory. In fact, it is widely doubted whether victory is attainable in the ordinary sense of the word or whether victory, at the expense of the Vietnam nation, should be our goal. The vastly increased expenditures that have accompanied the buildup are the cause of our domestic and international fiscal problems. They have imposed on the average citizen rising taxes and rising prices as well. Furthermore, escalation will only make eventual disengagement more difficult and continue to drain off billions of dollars that are sorely needed at home.

We had hoped that the initiation of negotiations at last signified a recognition that escalation must cease. We had hoped that the initiation of negotiations would mark a genuine willingness on the part of the administration to reach a

compromise settlement and to begin by scaling down hostilities.

Instead, under the guise of "improving our position," hostilities have increased. The past month has been the most costly of the war in terms of American lives lost. The area of bombings may have been circumscribed, but the intensity of bombings has increased.

It is time for the Congress to draw the line. The passage of the supplemental would nearly wipe out any savings to be gained from reductions in domestic programs. It would heighten the imbalance of priorities which puts a debilitating war ahead of urgent domestic needs.

Our policy must be changed if the war is to be ended. Continuing appropriations will only postpone the day the policy will be changed and I do not support it.

POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the House Committee on Agriculture for its work in reporting to us H.R. 16363, a bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act. I wish also to congratulate the Johnson administration for recommending the legislation.

Hopefully, this bill will provide as effective a mechanism for insuring the safety and wholesomeness of the Nation's poultry supply as the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 provides for the red meat supply.

However, there is one provision in the bill reported to us by the Committee on Agriculture which contains a serious gap in consumer protection.

Subsection 15(c)(1) provides for exempting certain small poultry slaughtering and processing operations and poultry producers selling direct from their farms. The exemptions would apply to operations doing less than \$15,000 in volume of business per year, and would be based on the condition that such exemptions would not permit unwholesome, misbranded, or adulterated poultry to be channeled into the human food supply.

While I recognize the need for exempting certain small operations from inspection, I believe exempting such operations from all the requirements of the bill we are considering today would make it impossible to enforce the conditions of exemption.

Certain small operations—the size of which should be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in keeping with the basic intent of the inspection law—could be exempted from costly and, in some cases, impractical continuous inspection. But these operations should be subject to all other provisions of the law. It would present no insurmountable problems to the small operators or the Federal or State inspection systems to require minimum sanitation requirements in these operations, recordkeeping, and identification of the producer of the product.

Imposing these requirements is the only means of enforcing the basic conditions of exemption. The Secretary of Agriculture should also be empowered to immediately revoke any operator's exemption if the Secretary determines that the conditions of exemptions are being violated.

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES EDITORIALIZES ON THE RIGHT TO CONTROL ARMS

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon address itself to the very complex problem of reasonable control in gun traffic.

The Los Angeles Times on June 11 devoted most of its editorial pages to firearms control. I call to the attention of my colleagues the very thoughtful lead editorial, as well as a letter to the editor from a group of professors at UCLA, and a report on the gun control laws in Great Britain, France, and Japan.

These excerpts from the Times editorial pages follow:

THE RIGHT TO CONTROL ARMS

Out of the shock and sorrow at the shooting down of yet another national leader, the American people are demanding strict gun control laws as never before.

No member of Congress, no state legislator dare ignore public outrage at the incredible ease with which instruments of violence are obtained and used. Latest opinion polls again show that the people are far ahead of their leaders in favoring strong controls.

The Times calls on President Johnson to veto the woefully inadequate firearms restrictions recently voted by a timid Congress. He should take the lead in a fight for restraints far tougher than any previously introduced.

Surely the tragic assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy will now exert a greater influence upon the Senate and House than even the relentless pressure of the gun lobby.

Or will the National Rifle Assn. and its assorted comrades-in-arms again prevail, as they did after the murders of President Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King?

The Times believes that Congress, as a beginning, must do no less than require the registration of every gun in the United States and prohibit all interstate sale of firearms.

Laxness of U.S. gun controls is a national disgrace. The rest of the world can only wonder how a civilized society can tolerate so obvious a threat to its safety.

On the page opposite, the highly restrictive gun regulations imposed in Britain, France and Japan are detailed by Times correspondents. And Canada's much more rational approach is described in a letter in the adjoining column.

The result in all these countries is that the rate of gun-caused deaths is far less than in the United States. So effective are the French restrictions that during all the weeks of recent rioting not a single gun was fired. In Japan no one at all may possess a handgun, except police and military personnel.

It would probably take a generation to achieve anything similar in this country. But we can start now with gun registration, reinforced by prison sentences and heavy

finances for those who do not comply. Nothing indeed should prevent any citizen from immediately registering or surrendering a gun to local authorities.

If automobiles, and even bicycles, can be registered, so can firearms. And those who choose to keep arms should pay necessary fees for their registration.

In addition to increasingly frequent assassinations, more than 5,000 Americans are murdered by gunfire every year. That toll will continue unless Congress acts to protect the public.

The people must make certain that their concern is heeded. Effective gun control action should be demanded of their representatives in the Senate and House as well as in state legislatures.

An aroused public can always shout the gun lobby.

LETTERS TO THE TIMES: RECREATIONAL HUNTING IN CANADA IS NOT HAMPERED BY STRICT GUN CONTROL

We believe that you would be performing a useful service in bringing to the attention of your readers the nature of the regulations governing the ownership and use of firearms in Canada, and by advocating similar legislation for the United States.

While there are differences in cultural and historical background, visitors from the United States will be much more impressed by the great similarities in social attitudes between the two peoples. . . . Canadians find no difficulty in getting along quite well without handguns. In Canada, all firearms must be registered and, apart from law enforcement, the military, and the confines of licensed revolver clubs, it is almost impossible to own a handgun or a concealable firearm.

In order to obtain legal possession of a handgun in Canada a permit must be issued and this is not easy to come by, only for cause and on authority of the chief of police of the municipality. The applicant's background is first checked for a criminal record.

In spite of this, the proportion of time, in relation to population, spent by Canadians in recreational hunting probably far exceeds that spent by citizens of the United States in this country. Moreover, a great many U.S. citizens participate, in game hunting in Canada. There is absolutely no reason to believe that firearms legislation similar to that of Canada would endanger hunting as a sport.

As geologists, several of whom have worked frequently in central and northern Canada as well as Alaska and elsewhere, we can attest that the occasional need for a gun in very remote areas for physical protection, and the rather common need for one as a source of food, is enormously greater in Canada than in most parts of conterminous United States.

The control of guns does not eliminate armed crime in Canada, but it could simplify law enforcement, and it could reduce tragic crimes of passion, of accident and of stupidity, or by the mentally incompetent.

Signed by: Donald Carlisle, W. A. Dollase, C. A. Hall, L. S. Hollister, George C. Kennedy, N. G. Lane, C. A. Nelson, G. Oertel, J. L. Rosenfeld, W. W. Rubey, K. D. Watson and G. W. Wetherill, all professors of geology at UCLA.

A PROBLEM FOR CIVILIZATION: FIREARMS CONTROL STRICTER ABROAD

(NOTE.—The United States has the world's most lax gun control laws. It also has more deaths by firearms than any other nation. To illustrate the contrast between our regulations and the tough restraints in other countries, Times correspondents Robert Toth, Don Cook and Don Shannon have filed reports on gun laws in Britain, France and Japan.)

GREAT BRITAIN

Britain has a long history of firearms control—and an enviably small number of deaths by shooting. Only 45 murders involving guns were recorded in Britain and Wales last year as compared to the more than 5,000 such slayings in the United States.

Even its constables don't carry guns. Despite the killing of three unarmed policemen in August 1966 in London, the Police Federation voted against being armed.

On the decision of local chief constables, guns are issued to combat criminals known to be dangerously armed. But police have agreed such decisions are taken only in "most exceptional circumstances," says the Home Office.

Weapon controls for civilians are similarly strict. Restrictions are in three categories:

1—Guns which fire in bursts, i.e., sub-machine guns, may be possessed only with certificate of approval from the Ministry of Defense. Even police must have such certificates for holding weapons of this kind.

2—Other weapons, including handguns and rifles but not shotguns, are covered by the Firearms Act of 1937, which consolidated bits and pieces of earlier law.

It is an offense to possess such weapons without a certificate issued by the chief constable of one's locality. An applicant must show "good reason" for possession. "Self defense is most unlikely to be considered a good reason," says the Home Office.

Usually an applicant must show he is a member of an established rifle club with known facilities, or has an estate for hunting, or is a farmer who shoots rats and predatory beasts, or a shopkeeper.

Penalty for unauthorized possession is maximum of three years in jail or 200 pounds (\$480) fine or both.

In 1965 a total of 220,000 certificates (permits) had been issued for all England and Wales, population about 50 million. There is no reason to expect that the number has increased since then; if anything, there are fewer permits now than before, according to the Home Office.

3—Shotguns were not controlled until the 1967 Criminal Justice Act clause came into force May 1 this year. Although a certificate from a chief constable is needed, the constable must have reason for not giving a permit. The penalty for illegal possession is six months and 200 pounds or both.

Controls on shotguns followed a rise in indictable offenses involving firearms in England and Wales in recent years, increasing from 552 in 1961 to 2,337 in 1967.

Prior to the shotgun law coming into force, a three-month amnesty was held for returning guns that had no certificate. A total of 25,088 were turned in, including 8,847 revolvers and automatics, 4,340 rifles and 9,488 shotguns, whose owners apparently didn't want to apply for permit. Most weapons were usable. There have been three other amnesties since World War II—1946 when 76,000 turned in, 1961 when 70,000 were turned in, and 1965 when 41,000 were returned.

FRANCE

The French style of controlling firearms is devastatingly simple and strict.

Tough weapons laws are the reasons for the rather remarkable phenomenon in the last few weeks of continuous violence without one shot being fired (except grenade launchers by the police).

As far as is known, not a gun was found on any of the several thousand who were rounded up by the police during this period. The only homicide in Paris during the demonstrations and fighting was a death from stabbing.

Personal arms, such as pistols or revolvers (apart from hunting weapons), can be purchased in France only on a police permit.

Two kinds of permits are issued. One is for

possession of personal weapons at home or office, if there is a special security problem and the police agree that this kind of added protection is reasonable or desirable.

The other is a permit to carry a weapon—and this is almost impossible to obtain. Such permits are issued only on the final authority of the Minister of the Interior himself, and would apply only in very special cases of private citizens needing personal bodyguards.

Anybody found in possession of a weapon without one or the other of these permits is automatically arrested in France. He is subject to varying degrees of jail sentence depending on the circumstances and/or explanations.

For example, if a gun is found during a road-check of car papers, the motorist would immediately be arrested.

An individual cannot walk into a shop and buy a revolver without first obtaining a police permit. If he should then sell or transfer the weapon to somebody without a permit he would be in violation of the law. Serial numbers and full identity of the weapons is, of course, part of the police files.

Hunting weapons are easier to obtain. But they also are purchasable only with a hunting license, and can be transported only if such a license is in the possession of the person carrying the gun.

JAPAN

Possession of pistols, carbines and other small guns is absolutely prohibited in Japan for anybody except police and military personnel.

Possession of such a small arm carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or 200,000 yen (\$555).

National police headquarters claim there are never more than 50 pistols in circulation illegally in Japan because of the vigilant watch kept on this score. Biggest source seems to be U.S. servicemen from Vietnam trying to finance their rest and recreation here.

Rifles and shotguns for hunting or target practice must be licensed with the following requirements placed on the license holder: minimum age of 20 years, mental health certified by a doctor (this requirement was briefly imposed on driver's license applications but dropped because doctors made only a cursory examination and collected their fee); reasonable grounds for possession; if ever imprisoned, at least three years must have elapsed since finishing prison term.

About 800,000 shotguns are licensed in Japan and only 30,000 rifles. Shotgun licenses are issued by chiefs of police stations; rifle licenses by chief of police of a prefecture, a jurisdiction corresponding to a U.S. county.

Shotguns and rifles are licensed only for use in hunting and target shooting areas. Someone who used his weapon to shoot tin cans on the beach or in some other area not authorized for shooting would be subject to a two year sentence or a 50,000 yen (\$139) fine.

Nobody in Japan is allowed to possess a knife or sword longer than 15 centimeters (7 inches) unless it is an antique certified by the Cultural Properties Protection Commission. Switch blades longer than six centimeters (three inches) with a switch angle larger than 45 degrees are also banned.

NEED FOR AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, of all categories of Federal aid to educa-

tion I believe that which is made available through Public Law 874 is the very best. It recognizes a Federal responsibility to support education for children of persons employed in federally connected capacities, but it leaves to the individual States and the local school districts the determination of how the money can best be spent.

In the State of Utah 27 out of 40 school districts participate in the distribution of funds under this program. We have over 52,000 students involved, or one out of every five students in the 27 districts. There are 297,000 students in the Utah public schools, including those districts which do not receive impacted aid funds. Thus, 17.5 percent of students in Utah schools receive help through this program. You can see how vital it is to our State. If full entitlement is authorized, a total of \$6,200,000 will go to Utah schools for the current fiscal year. This is money that Utah education needs and, in fact, has counted on.

The single most difficult problem faced by State government in Utah today is that of providing adequate funds to support the educational needs of our children. We in Utah have always put forth an extraordinary effort in this regard, as evidenced by our high ranking by the National Education Association; but in spite of this there remain needs that go unfilled because of insufficient funds. We need Federal help. We have made good use of that which we have received to date. We think it would be a great mistake to cut back the amount of Federal funds available under this program.

I am pleased that the House has accepted the amendment to increase the appropriation for Public Law 874 by some \$91 million, thus allowing the program to be fully funded. To have done otherwise would have shortchanged education in our country, a most shortsighted policy, indeed.

WINNER OF NATIONAL 4-H CLUB'S LAND JUDGING CONTEST FROM GEORGIA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to youth, our Eighth District can be proud of its boys and girls and young men and women.

More than once I have praised the efforts and achievements of the youth of our district. Hardly a month goes by that a student or a group of students from the Eighth District does not win some sort of statewide or national recognition.

Once again I would like to call to the attention of the adults of the Eighth District and the adults throughout the United States the outstanding accomplishment of one of our young people.

The young man is John Braswell, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Braswell, Sr., of Eastman.

John represented Dodge County and the State of Georgia, along with three other boys, Bobby Tankersley of Columbia, Wallace Lamb and Harold Lamb of the Eighth District's Wilcox County, and as a team they placed fourth in the Nation in the National 4-H Club Land Judging Contest held at Oklahoma City, Okla.

John tied with another 4-H member for first place and in accordance with the rules the tie was broken by a draw and John drew second place.

We can all be very proud of John, as there were 33 land judging teams in the competition. They stretched from New Mexico to New Jersey.

A NEW EDUCATIONAL TV STATION IN COCHRAN, GA.

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, a new educational TV station, WDCO, was dedicated in Cochran, Ga., located in my Eighth Congressional District. I would like to take just a minute to praise the efforts of the citizens of the Eighth Congressional District and of Cochran in getting the new station.

Educational TV is probably one of the most important mediums of our communication system today. This is true because the television set probably has more influence on the minds of our children and young people than any other outside influencing factors.

Educational TV not only enables a faster, better, learning process for our youngsters, but many adults, through the use of educational TV can further their educations and continue to broaden their minds with more knowledge of the sciences, history, and other areas that meet their interests.

I do not believe that it is a secret to any of us that education is the key to many and most of the problems which plague our country—poverty, unemployment, crime—all of these, we know can be reduced, if not completely eliminated in the future by means of better education.

Of course, it is also no secret that our schools are overcrowded. Our teachers are too burdened to give our children the individual attention which they need and which is necessary to the learning process.

The use of closed circuit television, is becoming an important aid to our overworked teachers in their classrooms.

In many instances today television and education have become synonymous because of the influence which television has on the minds of its viewers.

Therefore, I feel that educational television is becoming vital to the educational benefits of our American people.

I am most happy that we have been able to get station WDCO in Cochran. The dedication of the new station is truly significant of the fact that Cochran, along with the rest of the Eighth District, is on the move. I am proud to be a part of this move and this progress.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT F. KENNEDY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the past week of national tragedy and mourning, many friends of Senator Robert F. Kennedy remembered those impressions of him that symbolized the man.

In the Boston Herald Traveler, of June 6, 1968, was an article by George Sullivan. This article was on the sports page of the Herald and that is fitting for George Sullivan knew Bob Kennedy from the days of the Harvard football team.

George Sullivan is the distinguished son of an illustrious father. I knew his father Tim for many years; he was a close, personal friend. Tim Sullivan was one of the most beloved public figures in the city of Cambridge for many years.

George Sullivan has the same sensitivity as his father and his memory of Senator Robert Kennedy is one of the most touching I have read. The article has been acclaimed by the national television and radio system and by the Nation's press. I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD STADIUM VISIT RECALLS KENNEDY THE ATHLETE—SENATOR USED TO CHAUFFEUR WATER BOYS

(By George Sullivan)

Harvard Stadium was never as silent as it was yesterday morning.

I know because that is where I went to meditate after receiving news of a tragedy that had occurred nearly 3000 miles away. People retreated to many places to pray and try to comprehend that catastrophe. They went to churches and dark rooms and other places of solitude to be alone and try to cope with this twisted and awful thing.

NOT STRANGE PLACE AT ALL

I went to an empty football field, a seemingly odd place to mourn the fate of a United States Senator and presidential candidate fighting for his life. But for me it was not a strange place at all, for it was in Harvard Stadium that I first knew that man and formed a friendship which I have treasured for nearly 22 of my 34 years. I have known the man as an Attorney General of the United States and as a Senator from New York. But in many ways I prize more the memories of the earlier years, for they are basic to the knowledge of the man who was to rise to such rare and enormous offices.

So let me tell you what kind of an athlete Bob Kennedy was—and what kind of a sports enthusiast he has always been—because the telling of it reveals an insight into the type man he is.

You must understand from the start that my story is basically unflavored by what happened in Los Angeles yesterday. It is written objectively—although with the heaviest of hearts—and without glorification. Such is not needed, because it is compiled from simple facts which speak eloquently enough for themselves and need no embellishment. And so it is the same story I would have told you the day, month or year before yesterday if you had asked me.

Let me also make clear from the beginning that while I am a friend of Bob, I am not an intimate one. But that only makes what I want to tell you all the more significant. That I've been a comparative nobody over the span of this friendship—first as a

kid, later as a sports writer—only accentuates the portrait.

I have known the man since I was 12. That was in 1946 when I was a water boy for the Harvard football team on which Robert F. Kennedy '48 was a junior and reserve end.

Dick Harlow's 1946 and 1947 Crimson editions were not typical collegiate football teams as we know them today. World War II had just ended and the team was composed mostly of service veterans just back from overseas. The median age was 23-24 and I believe one of them—Johnny Gorczinski—was approaching 30. And they had a unique maturity a youngster could admire.

The 1946 team sort of adopted me and another water boy, Ted Rattigan, off the field as well as on. We both lived in Cambridge's modest Kerry Corner section within the shadow of Harvard.

On weekends we were the guests of the players at the Harvard Varsity Club. Many of the athletes resided there, and others who roomed instead in the "house" dormitories still used the club as their base of operation.

LEARNED ABOUT POLITICS, TOO

The athletes taught a couple of 12-year-olds how to play pool on those weekends. They also taught us something about politics, too—the favorite topic of conversation outside of football shop talk. An ex-sallor named Kennedy and a former navigator-bombardier named Ken O'Donnell were always discussing and arguing politics and their teammates eagerly joined in.

These were full weekends for a couple of youngsters, and activities were not confined to the Varsity Club. The players often took their two "mascots" around town on their errands and to events like Celtics games. The principle modes of transportation—shared by the players—were a somewhat beat-up black convertible belonging to Kennedy and a war surplus Jeep owned by a student manager. Both invited pneumonia—the convertible's heater always seemed out of order, and the Jeep's canvas top was shredded and did absolutely nothing to keep out snow and rain.

The next session—1947—was much more of the same. There was one change, among others, however, Kennedy—at 5-10, 165—won a starting berth for the season's opener.

In all frankness, despite his enormous popularity among most of his teammates, Bob's promotion wasn't greeted with total joy. A few suggested the Kennedy name had contributed to his choice as a starter. It was a bum rap. Ask anyone who knew how Harlow evaluated football talent. He was a coach influenced by only one thing, and that wasn't anyone's name.

Harvard scored a 52-0 victory over Western Maryland in the opener, and six of those points came on a six-yard O'Donnell-to-Kennedy pass. It proved to be Bob's first and last touchdown for the Crimson.

Despite pinching a neck nerve in that game, Bob had a special collar fitted and practiced the next week. At least he did for a day or two. During a scrimmage he tried to block an opposing back near the sideline—and missed, crashing heavily into an equipment wagon out of bounds. But he scrambled to his feet and returned to his position. Three days later he collapsed. X-rays revealed he'd been practicing on a broken leg.

So Bob's Harvard football career was ended, although he wore No. 86 twice again as he made token appearances against Brown and Yale at season's end.

It is probably presumptuous and unfair to suggest who Bob's closest football friends were at Harvard—the guys who were always needing his non-smoking, non-drinking and clean-living habits. That's impossible to gauge. But I don't think any of them will complain if I top the list with Ken and Cleo

O'Donnell, Nick Rodis, Chuck Glynn, Bill Brady and Chuck Roche. They were among the ushers in the wedding party when Bob and Ethel were married in June, 1950.

OUTSTANDING ON DEFENSE

I talked with one by telephone yesterday: Rodis, now athletic director at Brandeis. Besides the need to commiserate, I suppose, I wanted to double check on my assessment on Bob's abilities at Harvard. I didn't want to risk possible miscalculation since I had observed them as a youngster and decided to get the impressions of one of his contemporaries. And the views of Rodis—who headed the State Dept.'s athletic programs for five years until joining Brandeis last summer and who currently along with Stan Musial co-chairs of the Sportsmen For Kennedy committee—coincided precisely with mine.

These are Nick's words:

"Harlow said it all for Bob's football ability when he once told me after practice one day that Bobby was the toughest kid pound for pound—more guts and zip—he had coached since Bobby Green 10 years before. Bob was a tiger and without question earned the starter's job. Because of limited size, he wasn't devastating on offense, although not bad either. But on defense he was outstanding—almost impossible to knock off his feet and tough as nails. So while we might have had better pass-catcher in '47, Bob still deserved the starter's job because he put the entire game together—defense and offense—in that day of one-platoon football.

"And he did it with heart.

"That heart is also his key as a person and always has been since the day I first bumped into him in his sailor suit in 1946. That bull peddled by some in recent years—the part about him supposedly being cold and ruthless—has always infuriated me. Nothing could be further from the truth. He was a man with a golden heart if there ever was one.

"All the fellows on the team at Harvard knew he was extremely wealthy. But nobody tried to take advantage of him. Yet anyone in trouble always knew he could go to Bobby—and would. He was always the first guy wanting to help and be with you when the chips were down.

"And he has never changed over the years. Never. He is the most considerate man I've ever known. And don't take my word for it. Ask anyone who has ever worked alongside of him—on the football field or anywhere else."

I can vouch for that with many examples, but will restrict myself to one.

My employment as water boy had lasted only one year. In the summer of 1947 an ankle-to-thigh cast was placed on my left leg—to remain there for the better part of two years. So, I could no longer be employed at \$1 a day to carry the water buckets and help tote the equipment. Out of sympathy, I guess, my pal Teddy resigned too. From then on we were strictly "mascots"—and settled for those wonderful weekends and being privy to the team's secret practice session, developing into shutter bugs, becoming the team's "official snapshot photographers" as the players used to say.

USED PLAYERS' ENTRANCE

Our only problem was on game days. We always joined the players as they headed from Dillon Field House across the lawn to the Stadium for pre-game warmups. They'd embrace us among their ranks and march us through the players' entrance into the field.

The problem was, you had to show a ticket to get within the enclosed outer perimeter of Soldiers Field in those days as well as once again to get inside the Stadium itself. We couldn't afford those tickets. So every game morning—pal Teddy would boost me to the

top of the 10-foot, spike-topped fence along Soldiers Field and I'd jump—cast and all. We'd often get caught inside before we'd reach the field house and would be ejected—only to repeat the process a second and sometimes third time. But we never missed our "appointment."

The players never knew about these acrobatics—they assumed we had passes, and I guess we were too proud to enlighten them. Bob was the first to find out about it and roasted me for risking breaking my neck. From then on, Bob—his own left leg encased in a smaller cast—insisted on picking us up at my home in his convertible on future game mornings and driving us to the field house. And he did—often driving out to the suburbs after collecting us to pick up his date on route to the Stadium.

I've often thought since that those girls must have been delighted to find two 13-year-old boys along on their dates.

And I've never failed to remind Bob in later years that he was an excellent chauffeur. After all, how many people can claim they had a future Attorney General, brother and advisor of a President, Senator and presidential candidate chauffeuring him around? This is only one example, but I could cite others over the years.

And these were the things—among so much that scrambled through my mind yesterday as I stood in an empty stadium.

The sun high above seemed a mockery. It was shining brilliantly.

ADAM YARMOLINSKY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, why a committee to investigate violence in America? Why not a committee to investigate "who" created the condition to permit violence? And why?

The American people are far more interested in investigating the Communist influence in Washington governmental circles—the results may answer many questions for the American people.

Who were the 75 young attorneys screened by Adam Yarmolinsky, Ted Sorensen, and Sargent Shriver for high Government posts as unselected "untouchables"? How many remain, and who are they?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Herald of Freedom for January 14, 1966, and November 8, 1963, follow:

[From the Zarephath, (N.J.) Herald of Freedom, Jan. 14, 1966]

ADAM YARMOLINSKY REVISITED

At 7:00 P.M. on Monday evening, October 26, 1966 after most of the reporters had left the Pentagon, two days after the President had left for Texas and three days after Congress had adjourned, the Defense Department announced the appointment of Adam Yarmolinsky as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. The appointment, made by Secretary Robert Strange McNamara, does not require confirmation by the Senate.

The Defense Department's International Affairs Section is concerned with overseas forces and facilities, planning, arms control, dealing with foreign nations on such programs as training and the sale of weapons, and the important item of counter-insurgency.

In the September 20, 1965 issue of "Tactics" (page 2), edited by Edward Hunter, internationally known authority on psychological warfare and brainwashing, Mr. Hunter pointed out that Raymond A. Loughton had been in the Department of Defense and "was upset over being overruled regarding Adam Yarmolinsky." Mr. Loughton, a highly experienced security man, had been employed in the Defense Department in 1961 and, in his capacity as a security officer, had reviewed the file on Adam Yarmolinsky, which reportedly contained a full F.B.I. field investigation report, a detailed report of Army Intelligence and other data. Loughton was unable to justify giving Adam Yarmolinsky a security clearance and, as an honest security officer refused to do so. His findings were "overruled" and a security clearance was given to Yarmolinsky by none other than Secretary McNamara himself.

In a letter concerning Yarmolinsky, written to the assistant editor of a religious magazine, Mr. John F. McNaughton, who was General Counsel of the Defense Department, wrote on Oct. 14, 1963: "As in the case of all employees of the Department of Defense who have access to classified information, Mr. Yarmolinsky's background was thoroughly investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation before he was employed. Mr. Yarmolinsky's record is one of strong and vigorous anticommunist activity.

"There is no evidence that Mr. Yarmolinsky's parents are communists.

"Secretary McNamara has personally reviewed the security file of Mr. Yarmolinsky, as he does in the case of others holding positions of trust and confidence in the Department of Defense. The Secretary has no question about his loyalty to the United States."

Mr. McNaughton, by following the fact that the FBI had thoroughly investigated Adam Yarmolinsky with the statement that his record is one of "vigorous anticommunist activity," creates the impression that this is what the FBI report showed. The truth of the matter is that the FBI reports were such that an honest security officer refused to grant him clearance.

Mr. McNaughton has since been promoted to the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense, and is Yarmolinsky's immediate superior now. Mr. Raymond A. Loughton was not only "upset" over being overruled by McNamara on Yarmolinsky, he actually found his future unattractive and managed to get out of the Defense Department. He went over to the State Department to become a trusted aide of Otto Otepka—that is until the Secretary of State and his subordinates decided to go after Otepka because he, too, was an honest and loyal security officer. Since an honest security officer was not wanted in the State Department any more than he was in the Department of Defense, Mr. Loughton was assigned to an obscure diplomatic outpost. He is now second assistant in the United States consulate at Guadalajara, Mexico.

Adam Yarmolinsky was born in New York City on November 17, 1922. His father, Avraham, was born in Russia and was the son of Bezaleel Yarmolinsky and the former Malka Nemoy. He was born at Haisin, Russia, on January 1, 1890, and came to the United States in 1913. Adam's mother was born in New York City, the daughter of Michael Deutsch and the former Miss Melanie Fisher. She is a writer who is still using her maiden name of Babette Deutsch. Both of Adam's parents are writers and Russian-English translators. They both have a record of affiliation with communists and communist-fronts, covering a period of thirty-five years. They live at 300 W. 108 Street, New York, N.Y.

Adam attended Harvard University, graduating with an A.B. Degree in 1943. While

at Harvard he established a record of being an ardent Marxist.

In a book entitled, "The Reuther Memorandum," by William E. Mallett, published by Liberty Lobby of Washington, D.C., we find the following (Page 25): "Adam Yarmolinsky is another Harvard red. While there he was Editor of a very red Marxist publication called 'The Yardling.' He has served as head of the Marxist Club. He has admitted attending meetings of the Young Communist League. His mother, Babette Deutsch, has a long and notorious Communist record, including participation in several violent street demonstrations in New York; his father also has such a record, and he is at least a pro-Communist, according to his own actions and statements. It is Yarmolinsky who was the actual author of the infamous Fulbright Memorandum." (This Memorandum resulted in the censorship and muzzling of the military.)

From 1943 to 1946 Yarmolinsky was in the U.S. Army Air Force and, while in the Army, came under investigation. There is a lengthy U.S. Army Intelligence report on this, the existence of which was established during the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearings on "Military Cold War Education."

Major General Edwin A. Walker, in sworn testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee stated (Page 1491): "The information I have on Mr. Yarmolinsky, he was questioned during an investigation when he was in the Army. He said, 'They—the Young Communist League—believed and I was inclined to believe that a so-called Communist government was a desirable end.'

"This information is available in the Army intelligence report. Yarmolinsky's mother, Babette Deutsch, belongs to many Communist fronts, joined an advertisement last spring to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"His father, Abraham Yarmolinsky, has had Communist connections on a grant from the Fund for the Republic. Adam Yarmolinsky himself interrogated only the attorneys for accused Communists and wrote a slanted report attacking Federal security operations. As a result he was made eventually executive secretary of the Ford Foundation, from which position he sought to attack and destroy Government security operations.

"Yarmolinsky attended the American Youth Congress in 1941, solicited for the Spanish War Relief, an operation conducted by the Young Communist League. He worked in the law office of George Ball, presently in the State Department, now Under Secretary of State, and Ball in turn was associated with Philip Stern, who as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State was technically in charge of State Department censorship.

"He was on a team with Ted Sorensen and Sargent Shriver, who screened 75 attorneys selected for high positions in this administration, including Mr. Vance, Counsel for the Defense Department.

"He is known throughout the Defense Department as an operator. He did not indulge in name calling, but his connection with communism has certainly been close, and his activities have aided communism.

"It has been further reported that he was with the Fund for the Republic. He was an editor of a school paper called Yardling, and during an era when he was investigating security and finding that certain areas of the administration were too secure, that there were two people shortly thereafter left, that I believe went through Mexico and to Moscow.

"He declared that current subversion was just popular hysteria. He had admitted attending meetings of YCL, which is the Young Communist League, but denies that he became a member, but attended as a guest.

He collected money for the Spanish War Relief under Communist auspices."

After his Army service, Yarmolinsky went to Yale Law School where he graduated with an L.L.B. in 1948. He became a law clerk for U.S. Court of Appeals Judge Charles E. Clark, 1948-9; then associate in the law firm of Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby and Palmer 1949-50. He then became a law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed, 1950-51; then an associate in the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly and Ball 1951-55. This is the law firm that gave us Fowler Hamilton and George W. Ball; it is also the firm of Grenville Clark, that old one-worlder who thought up the idea of the Fulbright Memorandum which he wrote in a letter of "instruction" to President Kennedy immediately after his election to the Presidency. Yarmolinsky wrote the "instructions" concerning the military in final form for the Memorandum. Clearly, Gottlieb, etc. etc. is an international law firm with an office in Paris with three attorney partners there, and another office in Brussels with another partner. None of the partners in the offices in France and Belgium are admitted to the practice of law in those countries.

In 1955 Yarmolinsky became Director of the Washington, D.C. office of the Fund for the Republic and later became Secretary of the Foundation. In 1957 he became Public Affairs Editor for Doubleday & Co., Publishers, and left them in 1959 when for one year he was "consultant" to private foundations.

The publication "Focus" of Stockton, Calif., in their December 1965 issue concerning Yarmolinsky, stated: "Yarmolinsky's first governmental assignment was as a special assistant to McNamara to implement the Fulbright Memo to muzzle the military. He edited the speeches of four-star generals, such as deleting their references to the Communists as 'our enemy.' Later he became one of the authors of the Gesell Report which forced 'commissars' to be appointed at military bases to enforce unmerited promotions upon Negro personnel, etc., merely to demonstrate there was no discrimination in the Army.

"LBJ's Poverty Program received the touch of Adam's heavy hand, so much so that Johnson's strategists had to promise Congressmen that Yarmolinsky would not be connected with it. On loan from McNamara's office, Yarmolinsky went to the White House to formulate the plans that will give the Panama Canal to Panama in spite of the long-term treaty now in force. Last June Yarmolinsky headed a delegation known as 'The Yarmolinsky Group' which went to Santo Domingo to implement the State Department plans to strengthen the rebels."

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 11, p. 14352, Congressman Hébert, referring to Adam Yarmolinsky, stated "He has what I think is a satanic-like zeal to force these things (integration) upon an unwilling people..."

"I want to tell you something about Mr. Yarmolinsky. I would not repeat except I repeat it on good authorities. He was down in Florida and he ordered the troops integrated in certain hotels that the military had rented. He was informed that the Negroes did not want to be integrated. He said he did not give a damn whether they wanted to be integrated or not, that they would be integrated."

Adam Yarmolinsky's program of demoralizing the military was implemented through the Gesell Report and the Fulbright Memorandum. With regard to the Gesell Report Senator Goldwater pointed out in the Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 10, p. 13783, that, as a result of the Gesell Report, a team had been traveling around the country in the military bases in an effort to "get commanding officers to act in a way commanding officers have never acted before." He stated they had complete dossiers on business men pre-

pared in the Attorney General's office, using, among other things, income tax returns from the Internal Revenue Service. The purpose was to pressure business men into integration activities, using the dossiers as a threat of federal action against them. On Page 13783 Sen. Goldwater stated: "I have suggested this to the chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, Mr. Russell—that I would give my full support to a complete investigation into Mr. Fitt and Mr. Yarmolinsky and other persons in the Pentagon who are forcing Secretary McNamara—I am convinced against his will—to take this dangerous step."

Why Yarmolinsky should be able to "force" McNamara to do something against his will we do not know. Perhaps it is not really against his will as he is listed as a founding member of the Fund for the Republic (we wonder which one) and founding members donate a thousand dollars a year or more to this left-wing foundation. McNamara is also a sponsor for the occult Temple of Understanding, a spiritual United Nations to be built on the banks of the Potomac.

A study entitled, "Education for Freedom and World Understanding" was published by the U.S. Office of Education at taxpayers' expense (naturally) resulting from a conference held in Washington, D.C., March 26-28, 1962. It was to "educate educators," and was a (not so) subtle pitch for world government. On page 20 of the publication we read: (There should be) "resistance to proposals which would block the importation and circulation of printed matter from Communist or other sources or otherwise restrict access to educational materials on purely ideological grounds." Also—"Special loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits (regarding communist membership and activities) should be opposed." Among the conference participants, as shown on page 62, was Adam Yarmolinsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

On March 24, 1945 Yarmolinsky married Miss Harriet Leslie Rypins and they live today at 701 Bulls Neck Road, McLean, Virginia. For mail Yarmolinsky uses Box 438, Route 2, McLean, Virginia. His home telephone is 893-9053. At the Pentagon Building he took the place of Peter Solbert in Office 4E863.

On April 22, 1964 the "Washington Post" reported that Adam Yarmolinsky suffered severe head cuts Monday night in an auto accident on the George Washington Parkway. On June 28, 1965 the "Washington Star" in an article by Betty Beale stated, referring to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, "There is no doubt but that he recently saved the life of his assistant, Adam Yarmolinsky, when the latter crashed into a parked car on a Virginia road, cut his throat from ear to ear and lost so much blood he had no blood pressure at all upon arriving at the nearest hospital. Contacted at once, Bob McNamara had two topflight surgeons and quantities of blood rushed from Walter Reed, and he, himself, stayed at the hospital all night in case anything else was needed."

The circumstances of the accident were not made public. Mr. McNamara's devotion to Yarmolinsky obviously goes far beyond the call of duty—one wonders how many others in the Defense Department would cause McNamara to stay up all night worrying about their health. Or was McNamara there just in case Yarmolinsky might want to make a "death-bed" statement?

Another little known activity of Yarmolinsky has been a role he has played in the State Department. There is a Review Board made up of foreign service officers on duty in Washington which reviews important matters involving the foreign service career employees of the State Department. Acting as an "adviser" to this Review Board at their unpublicized meetings at the State Department has been Adam Yarmolinsky.

As a result of his investigations made for the Fund for the Republic regarding the U.S.

Loyalty-Security programs, Yarmolinsky was able to get a great deal of information. There were at least fifty cases wherein he had been able to get at the files of the defense attorneys and obtain data concerning actual security risks. Since many of these were communist-type risks (his studies and investigations were sympathetic to them), he could have obtained much information regarding others still in government, prominent people not in government, politicians and foundation people. This information could be used to insure "cooperation" of those involved.

Adam Yarmolinsky had an advisory committee in connection with his "Case Studies in Personnel Security." On this committee was Roger D. Fisher who was with the law firm of Covington & Burling, Washington, D.C. This is Dean Acheson's law firm and the one where identified communist Donald Hiss, brother of Alger, still works. Also on the advisory committee were Leon Lipson of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly and Ball (a firm Yarmolinsky had been associated with) and Herbert L. Packer, another Washington lawyer. It is interesting to note that the Gesell Report Committee, on which Yarmolinsky was an influence, was headed by Gerhard A. Gesell, also of Dean Acheson's law firm, which has represented communist countries.

Adam Yarmolinsky has been a close associate of W. H. (Ping) Ferry of the Fund for the Republic who is notorious for his attacks on the FBI.

Yarmolinsky has admitted under oath that he looked with favor on a "so-called communist government." His sinister influence has reached into many areas of the Defense Department, the State Department, the Poverty Corps, the U.S. Office of Education, the Panama Canal sell-out, the communist revolution in the Dominican Republic. He has even had his eye on J. Edgar Hoover's job as head of the FBI. Yarmolinsky would change our security systems to allow more like himself to hold key government positions. He would restrict or abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has done more than any other person to demoralize the military with his civilian commissars.

Yarmolinsky is not an elected official, he is not even an appointed official requiring confirmation. He has been forced upon the American people, his influence changing and undermining a strong America. What is the reason a person with a background which is "dubious" (to put it as kindly as possible) is selected for such important positions? God save us from him!

[From the Staten Island (N.Y.) Herald of Freedom, Nov. 8, 1963]

IS ADAM YARMOLINSKY A SECURITY RISK?

"In carrying on the activities referred to" (overthrow of existing governments by any available means including force if necessary and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships) "Communist organizations are organized on a secret conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations commonly known as Communist fronts."—from the Internal Security Act of 1950 known as the Communist Control Law.

For over a year now and recently more intensified have been rumors or perhaps deliberately leaked stories (trial balloons) to the effect that Adam Yarmolinsky will soon replace J. Edgar Hoover as head of the FBI. One female Chicago columnist went so far as to say that Mr. Hoover approves of such a successor. This is not true as Mr. Hoover has repeatedly stated that he desires to continue to serve America. No denial has been made by Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General whose dictatorial policies and interference are well known. A champion of "Civil Rights" for Negroes, he overlooks the civil rights of all Americans who are being threatened by the International Communist Conspiracy operating within the United States.

What constitutes a security risk? Experts state it depends upon the sensitivity of the position and the background of the individual. Graduates of our service academies have been refused commission as officers if even one of their parents is Communist or has a history of being pro-Communist. Civilians have been dismissed from ordinary defense plant jobs for belonging to the German American Bund. The FBI reports truthfully on the background of U.S. government officials and employees but is not allowed to make its findings public. Thus a department head can set up a loyalty review board of his own selection and approve security risks in spite of derogatory FBI reports.

We believe that there is more than ample evidence available to clearly indicate to any open-minded American that Adam Yarmolinsky should not be permitted to head the FBI, in fact should not be Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, in fact should not be employed by our government at all. We present the following information concerning the Yarmolinskys which is publicly known.

Adam's father, Avraham Yarmolinsky, was born in Russia in 1890 and came to the United States in 1913. He was educated in the Neurological Institute of St. Petersburg in Russia, the University of Neuchatel in Switzerland, the City College of New York and Columbia University in New York City. He married Babette Deutsch on April 28, 1921. He taught Russian at C.C.N.Y. and for many years was in charge of the Slavonic Division of the New York Public Library. His interest in the Communist Conspiracy goes back to its early days in the United States when he became affiliated with the John Reed Clubs of the United States, named after one of the founders of the Communist Party U.S.A., whose ashes are now interred in a place of honor inside the Kremlin Wall in Moscow. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the John Reed Clubs as "An organization whose affiliation with the Communist Party is clear beyond dispute."

On May 19, 1930 there appeared an advertisement in the N.Y. Times signed by Avraham Yarmolinsky and many others including a long list of Communists. The ad protested attacks on Communists which they called "red-baiting." The sponsor of the ad was the John Reed Club, an Affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers. Yarmolinsky's name appears on Page 559 of the Dies Committee Report, Vol. I. The Report states, "All the John Reed Club leaders are engaged in revolutionary activities." (Page 561)

Avraham Yarmolinsky was on the Board of Directors of the American Russian Institute, cited as "A Communist controlled organization which was intimately linked with the Institute of Pacific Relations" by the Senate Judiciary Committee Report #2050, I.P.R., July 2, 1952. The Attorney General of the United States cited it as Communist to the Loyalty Review Board on April 27, 1949.

Avraham Yarmolinsky was an Adviser for the American Pushkin Committee, cited as a Communist front, and became Vice Chairman of their Executive Committee. Serving with him were W. E. B. DuBois, Corliss Lamont, Paul Robeson, Rockwell Kent and others now publicly identified as Communists. Yarmolinsky was a writer and translator of books and poems from Russian into English for the International Publishers, cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "the official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States and a medium through extensive Soviet propaganda is subsidized in the United States." It was also cited by the Attorney General of the United States as the Communist Party's Publishing House.

Adam's mother, Babette Deutsch, was born in New York City in 1895 and graduated from

Barnard College. She lectured in English at Columbia University and through the years has been an author, poet and translator of books from Russian to English, working with her husband. She has always been known under her maiden name. Her affiliation with Communist causes began long ago and has continued right up to the present.

She was active in the Communist revolutionary John Reed Clubs along with her husband, and was an early foe of Congressional Committees investigating Un-American Activities. (See Page 939, Appendix IX, 1944.)

Babette Deutsch was a member of the Non Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as shown on Page 130 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations. Her name is listed on Page 1375 of the Committee Report (1944.) On the Committee with her were John Howard Lawson, Maxwell Stewart, Langston Hughes and Louise Thompson who have been identified as Communists.

Mrs. Yarmolinsky was a writer for "Soviet Russia Today," cited as a Communist-controlled publication by the Senate Judiciary Committee (Senate Report #2050, July 2, 1952, Pages 96 and 146.) She was a sponsor for the American Student Union, cited as a "Communist front which was the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists in 1935. The Young Communist League took credit for the creation of the organization." (from Guide to Subversive Organizations, Page 31.) Sponsors with Babette Deutsch included Anna Louise Strong who now works for the International Communist Conspiracy as an "Open Communist."

Babette Deutsch was a sponsor for and a Committee Member of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, cited as Communist by the Attorney General of the United States to the Loyalty Review Board, April 27, 1949. It was described as a "Communist front formed to oppose the deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member and leader of the disastrous San Francisco General Strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party." (from the Guide to Subversive Organizations 1961 Edition, Page 43.) On the Committee with Mrs. Yarmolinsky were Paul Robeson, Rockwell Kent, John Howard Lawson and other well-known Communists.

Babette Deutsch was a sponsor for the Writers and Artists Committee for Medical Aid to Spain, a cited Communist front as shown in Appendix IX, Page 1765 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. On the Committee with her, providing aid for the Communists in Spain were Lankston Hughes, Rockwell Kent, et al.

Mrs. Yarmolinsky worked with her husband translating Russian books for the International Publishers, official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States. As late as 1961 she openly advocated the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Babette Deutsch was a sponsor for the "Peace Patriots" who were promoting "Universal Total Disarmament" at the Geneva Conference of 1932. (The Peace-Mongers now have succeeded.) Mrs. Yarmolinsky was on the National Committee to Aid the Striking Miners, along with Communists (Rev.) Elliott White (who was a stockholder in the "Daily Worker") and Robert Dunn. She has received awards from "The Nation" and the Ford Foundation.

Son Adam, who would like us to think he is not a chip off the old block, is a graduate of Harvard and while there was Editor of a student paper called "Yardling" described as "left-wing." He has admitted attending meetings of the Young Communist League, cited by the Attorney General of the United

States as a "subversive Communist organization which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" to the Loyalty Review Board on September 21, 1948.

A U. S. Army Intelligence Report referred to in sworn testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee states that Yarmolinsky, while being questioned during an investigation while he was in the United States Army, stated "The Young Communist League believed and I was inclined to believe that a so-called Communist government was a desired end." Sworn testimony and Army Intelligence Reports show Adam Yarmolinsky attended the American Youth Congress in 1941, as shown in hearings before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate "Military Cold War Education," Page 1491.

The American Youth Congress was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as "Communist and Subversive" to the Loyalty Review Board, December 4, 1947. Another U. S. Attorney General previously cited it as follows: "It originated in 1934 and has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth." (Congressional Record 9/24/42, Page 7685.)

Adam Yarmolinsky solicited funds for the Spanish War Relief on behalf of the subversive Communist organization, the Young Communist League. This was for aid to the Communists in Spain. (from Senate Armed Services Committee Hearings and U.S. Army Intelligence Reports referred to therein.)

Adam Yarmolinsky had been affiliated with George Ball (who attended the mysterious Bilderberg Conferences and who is a member of the State Department,) but left law practice to work for the Fund for the Republic. In this post he supervised a study of U. S. Loyalty-Security Programs (in which he must have had a deep personal interest.) He recruited certain lawyers to work on a part-time basis. They contacted lawyers who had advised or represented government employees charged with disloyalty or being security risks.

The defense lawyers were asked to provide (and did so) "statements of charges" made against accused security risks, their defense and transcripts of the hearings. The study covered 350 cases and the project cost the Fund for the Republic \$192,710.00. The Study was critical of our government's Loyalty and Security Program for getting rid of these security risks.

Adam Yarmolinsky became Secretary of the Fund for the Republic, whose activities have made us wonder what Republic they are working for and why. This collection of left-wingers paid \$34,613.00 for a study of a "Community Under Pressure from Right Wing Pressure Groups." Other studies include "Foreign Political Propaganda Restraints," "Alleged Obscene Material Seizures," "Anti-Communism and Employment Policies in Radio and T.V." Grants were made on "Segregation and Other Negro Problems in the South"—\$445,000.00 to one group and \$118,954.00 to another. The Vice President of the Fund for the Republic, W. H. Ferry, made an irresponsible, unwarranted and vicious public attack on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. He will probably be happier with it when it is reorganized and reoriented under his friend Adam.

A. F. Canwell, former Chairman of the Washington State Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, has referred to Adam Yarmolinsky's parents as two top U.S. Communists. But Secretary of Defense McNamara stated he had reviewed the security file of Adam Yarmolinsky before appointing him and found that "Mr. Yarmolinsky's record is one of strong and active anti-Communist activity." (Human Events 4/21/62, Page 295.) Mr. Yarmolinsky must be doing this work underground, he is keeping it so quiet.

The Director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Francis J. McNamara, in a letter to Congressman Walter Rogers of Texas, dated October 15, 1963, stated—and we quote exactly:

"DEAR MR. ROGERS: In response to your request of October 1, a search of the public records, files and publications of this committee has disclosed no information showing Adam Yarmolinsky to have been a member or sponsor of any organization or enterprise which has been cited as subversive by this committee or any other Federal authority. Moreover, there is no reference to his name in any of the published hearings and reports of this committee.

"In response to certain accusations which had been made against him during a Senate hearing, Mr. Yarmolinsky gave a statement to the press which was published on April 5, 1962. According to the account which appeared in the Washington Evening Star (pp. 1 and 3), he acknowledged that he had attended some Young Communist League Meetings—against the advice of his parents—when he was a junior in high school, because he was 'curious.' He was quoted as saying: 'I went to a couple of meetings and saw what it was, and I didn't go again.' His statement said: 'It happens that I have a public record as an anti-Communist * * * My whole public record goes in the opposite direction from these charges.' He added that his record 'includes a 1946 fight against Communist efforts to "move in" on the American Veterans Committee,' which led to his being 'attacked by the Daily Worker, called a Red-baiter and all the rest.'

"With kind regards, I am
"Sincerely yours,

"FRANCIS J. McNAMARA."

One must wonder why Mr. McNamara did not bring out the facts contained in this report since they are either all in the files of the Committee he works for, or easily available to him. An uninformed person, reading his letter, would come to the conclusion that Adam Yarmolinsky is an anti-Communist. If he were, he would not be working for the Kennedy Administration.

How anyone could examine the history of the Communist-front affiliations of the Yarmolinskys and conclude that Adam is an anti-Communist is beyond understanding. However, one must remember that Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser and other Communist espionage agents were allowed to remain in their jobs and even promoted many years after the FBI had notified all concerned that they were security risks. Maybe they were even known as "anti-Communists" too.

Adam Yarmolinsky, together with Ted Sorenson and Sargent Shriver, screened seventy-five attorneys for high posts in the Kennedy Administration. The young men who work with Yarmolinsky in the Defense Department are known as the "Whiz Kids" and Yarmolinsky's "Commissars." They are responsible for the demoralization of our military service and our no-win policy.

Joseph O. Hanson, Jr., a National Security Affairs Adviser, employed by the U.S.I.A., speaking at the International Arms Control Symposium at the University of Michigan in December 1962, stated, "The emergence of a growing group of disarmament experts in Congress is a deeply significant political

phenomenon. Perhaps the most striking is the establishment in the Department of Defense of a permanent office devoted to arms control, accompanied by a doctrine weaving disarmament and arms control factors into the fabric of United States military policy." Yes, now we know what we have suspected for some time: that our present military policy is not to defend the United States.

When charges were made against Adam Yarmolinsky in sworn testimony during the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearings, instead of asking to appear in person to refute the charges under oath, Mr. Yarmolinsky took cover and gave out a statement to the newspapers which don't require sworn affidavits.

If the Senate Internal Security Committee or the Senate Armed Services Committee would question Avraham Yarmolinsky, Babette Deutsch Yarmolinsky and Adam Yarmolinsky under oath, they will find the facts outlined here to be absolutely accurate and they will soon be able to judge which Adam Yarmolinsky is—an anti-Communist or a security risk.

ANOTHER FOOLISH OPINION BY THE SUPREME COURT IN THE FIELD OF CRIMINAL LAW

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the decision of the Utah Supreme Court in the case of Dyett against Turner, decided March 22, 1968. The prevailing opinion in that case, written by Associate Justice A. H. Ellett, discussed at length the attitude of the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to certain aspects of the criminal law and, in clear and forceful language, criticized that attitude. I personally was impressed by the opinion and considered it worthy of the attention of my colleagues. My own view is that the Supreme Court has gone too far in its efforts to protect the rights of criminals, with the result that the rights of the rest of us have been placed in jeopardy. The other day the High Court handed down another decision that gives comfort to the criminal—and which should engender outrage on the part of the law-abiding citizen. The Washington Evening Star editorial of yesterday—June 11, 1968—put some of that outrage in words. I wholeheartedly agree with the opinion expressed in the editorial. With decisions like that in the Harrison case, it is little wonder that the Congress, in a time of unprecedented crime and violence in this country, feels called upon to give direction to the Supreme Court. I certainly hope the President signs the crime bill,

and that the Supreme Court finally pulls back from its extremist position in the field of criminal law.

The editorial follows:

JUDICIAL TRAVESTY

The Supreme Court has just come forward with a powerful argument in support of the proposition that President Johnson should sign the newly enacted crime bill.

In a ruling which displays an amazing disregard for the right of the public—if there is any such right—to be protected against criminals, a majority of the justices have voted to overturn the *third* murder conviction of a Washington man, Eddie M. Harrison.

Harrison's first conviction was reversed by the Court of Appeals because his lawyer was not in fact a member of the bar. The second conviction was reversed by the Court of Appeals on the ground that a confession used as evidence was obtained in violation of the Mallory Rule—the requirement that a suspect be arraigned without unnecessary delay. At the second trial, however, Harrison, while properly represented by counsel, took the stand and gave an explanation of the killing which implicated him. He was found guilty by the jury.

At the third trial the confession, of course, was not used. But Harrison's own testimony at the second trial was read to the jury, and he again was convicted. The Court of Appeals affirmed. But the Supreme Court, without ascertaining whether, in fact, the Mallory Rule had been violated, reversed.

This brought outraged protests from the three dissenters. Justice Black thought the majority's reasoning was wholly illogical and completely unreasonable. He agreed with Justice White that "holdings like this" make it far more difficult to protect society "against those who have made it impossible to live today in safety."

Justice Harlan said "there is no suggestion that the testimony in question, given on the stand with the advice of counsel, was somehow unreliable."

Justice White said this decision "has emanated from the court's fuzzy ideology which is difficult to relate to any provision of the Constitution and which excludes from the trial evidence of the highest relevance and probity." He went on to say that "criminal trials will simply become less effective in protecting society," and he pointed out that by the time of the third trial "prosecution witnesses were dead or unavailable." This will be even more true of a fourth trial—if there is one. There may not be a fourth trial, however. For the prosecution, discouraged by its encounters with judge-made roadblocks, may decide simply to release Harrison—a chilling prospect for this community.

What does all of this have to do with the new crime bill? Simply this: That legislation modifies the Mallory Rule to permit questioning of a criminal suspect for a period of up to six hours. It also undertakes to modify other Supreme Court decisions, to permit wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping in certain types of cases, restricts the sale of hand guns, and authorizes major financial assistance to police departments.

If the President's repeated calls for a war on crime mean anything, he will sign this bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 13, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles Spence Hubbard, First United Methodist Church, Wilson, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we acknowledge that You are the hope of this world. Be now our

hope in this great place of decision. Let it now be a place of prayer. We confess to You our sins—our anxieties and doubts, our follies, and failures. Engrave in our hearts this song of faith: "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?"

Grant these, Thy servants, the light to know truth from untruth, the clean from the unclean, the enduring from the transient. Help this Congress to lead our bewildered and confused Nation toward common humility and penitence, that we may rededicate ourselves under law and