

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TEN HISTORIC AMERICAN FLAGS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1968, 10 new postage stamps, each showing an historic U.S. flag, will be issued in first-day ceremonies at Pittsburgh, Pa., where the Allegheny Trails Council, Boy Scouts of America, will dedicate its Flag Plaza and program and service center. Nine of these 10 flags were used during the Revolution; the 10th flew over Fort McHenry during the War of 1812 and inspired our national anthem.

The earliest flags are traced back thousands of years. In the Bible, Numbers 2:2 tells how "Every man of the children of Israel shall pitch by his own standard, with the ensign of their father's house." They were used in India in 3500 B.C., by the Egyptian pharaohs in 1300 B.C., and by the Assyrian kings of the eighth and ninth centuries B.C.

The Greek city-states used distinctive signs such as the sphinx on their standards. The Mongols favored yak tails, and the famous nine-yak-tail standard of Genghis Khan was carried in the van of the Golden Horde as it drove into Europe in the 13th century A.D.

The Romans used gods, generals, or animals. In 100 B.C., the Roman legions were ordered to use only eagles and to this day the Roman eagle of classical antiquity is a symbol of strength and power. The eagle was also used by Napoleon and by Mussolini. A double eagle appeared on the banners of the Romanov Czars of Russia and on those of the House of Hapsburg; the Hohenzollerns used a single eagle. An eagle is also the national symbol of the United States and the figure of an eagle in flight appears on top of the Great Mace of the House of Representatives.

The first flag flown in what is now the United States was a square of white silk with a large red cross of St. George. Carried by John Cabot when he came to North America in 1497, it also flew in the ships that brought colonists to Jamestown in 1607 and to Massachusetts in 1620.

Our country is relatively young as a Nation but our flag is one of the oldest national standards in the world. Henry Ward Beecher once said:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of Liberty and men rejoiced in it.

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was first drawn up in the office of the Youth's Companion magazine in Boston, in 1892, and first used in public schools on Columbus Day, October 12, 1892. It received official recognition by Congress on June 22, 1942, and the phrase "under

God" was added by Congress on June 14, 1953. President Eisenhower said at that time that—

In this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith in America's heritage and future; in this way we shall constantly strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resource in peace and war.

FOR OUR CAUSE IT IS JUST

President Woodrow Wilson once said of the flag that—

It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation.

The character the American people have given their flag is unlike that of any other on earth. As a nation we are composed of all races, all creeds, all cultures, a giant national melting pot that has as its goal "liberty and justice for all." No country has ever set such a difficult goal to attain; no country has striven so hard to reach it. And no country has ever received so much unwarranted abuse for trying; our faults and failures are paraded by our enemies as the blackest sins known to mankind.

But we need not apologize to anyone, nor should we feel that we as a people have failed. As a nation, we are young; we are less than two centuries old, yet in that short span of time as national histories are measured we have developed for ourselves a standard of living and a degree of personal dignity and freedom that the world has never known before.

It is said of us that we are weak, and I would reply, Yes, and this weakness is the weakness of the strong: tolerance. But this same tolerance is that quality that has seen us pour our blood and treasure into war to defeat an enemy and then, when the guns have stopped, use even more of our treasure to show mercy and to restore this same enemy to a place among nations.

It is said of us that we are proud, and I would reply, Yes, we have pride; pride in the fact that we have never sought one foot of territorial gain from the most cruel wars in the world's history, and that we have voluntarily surrendered our control over and given freedom to more people than any other nation.

It is said of us that we are arrogant in our strength, and I would reply, Yes, if you wish to call arrogance that use of our strength which serves as a force against oppression, and a shield for those that are weaker.

This, then, is the character we Americans have given our flag. As President Woodrow Wilson also said:

And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it.

Upon these 10 flags are written some of the bravest, proudest, and most stirring moments in American history. Enshrined for all time in our national heritage and tradition, they are also inscribed upon the Stars and Stripes we fly today.

FIRST STARS AND STRIPES

June 14, 1777: The resolution submitted to the Second Continental Con-

gress by its Marine Committee was brief, and quickly approved:

Resolved, that the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

This means that now the American ships harassing British shipping had a national flag. Until that time, many had flown the flags of their colonies. To the British, this meant they were pirates, and as such they were hanged on the spot. But sailing under an authorized national flag would mean they would be treated as prisoners of war.

The design for the first Stars and Stripes was probably drawn by Francis Hopkinson, a member of the Marine Committee, an artist, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

There was no set arrangement for the stars, and the flag with the stars in a circle is commonly known as the "Betsy Ross Flag." On March 14, 1870, William J. Canby read a paper before the Pennsylvania Historical Society that asserted Betsy Ross, who had an upholstery shop on Arch Street, in Philadelphia, made the first Stars and Stripes. In 1857 Canby's aunt, a daughter of Betsy Ross by her third husband, had told Canby the story she had heard from her mother many times: In June 1776 George Washington and two others, representing a committee of the Congress, had shown her a sketch of a flag with stars and stripes and asked if she could make one. She did; the Congress approved and it was adopted.

There is no record of such a committee or of Congress adopting a flag before June 1777. However, today there is in existence an old voucher dated May 29, 1777, showing payment to Betsy Ross of 14 pounds and a few shillings for making some flags for the Pennsylvania navy.

We cannot know for sure who designed the first Stars and Stripes, or who made it, or where it first appeared. But we do know for sure that it became a symbol of freedom not only for the American colonists of that time, but for all oppressed peoples, and remains so down to the present day.

FIRST NAVY JACK

September 23, 1779: The first American Navy jack, the flag that flies at the bow of the ship, had first been raised in 1775. The famous standard, a field of seven red and six white stripes, with the rattlesnakes and the motto "Don't Tread on Me" had flown in some of the most decisive naval engagements of the entire war. Now, John Paul Jones had just completed a series of highly successful raids on British shipping and was headed back to America. "Don't Tread on Me" was about to be fulfilled once again in one of the most famous sea fights of all time.

Jones was in an old French ship, renamed *Bon Homme Richard* in honor of Benjamin Franklin and "Poor Richard's Almanack." With him were three other ships: *Alliance*, *Pallas*, and *Vengeance*. It was on September 23, 1779, off Scar-

borough, England, that they sighted the English Baltic merchant fleet, accompanied by *Serapis* and *Countess of Scarborough*.

"Without a respectable Navy—alas America," Jones had written in the early days of the war. "Respectable" meant "courageous" as well; by moonlight Jones closed with *Serapis* and for three and one half hours, yardarm to yardarm, the two ships hammered each other at point blank range. *Alliance* circled and blazed at both indiscriminately. The carnage was frightful; no official casualty count was ever given by either ship, but one of Jones' junior officers estimated the Americans lost 302.

Bon Homme Richard began to sink but *Serapis*, now on fire, struck her colors in surrender. Jones moved his crew to *Serapis*. *Pallas* had taken *Countess of Scarborough*, and all headed back to France, where Louis XVI gave Jones a gold-hilted sword and named him a Chevalier of France. In 1781 when Jones returned to America he received the grateful thanks of Congress.

George Washington wrote to Lafayette in 1781, saying:

It follows then as certain as night succeeds the day, that without a decisive Naval force we can do nothing definitive—and with it everything honourable and glorious.

Flying proudly at the bows of the American fleet, the rattlesnake flag saw events that helped bring an honorable and glorious victory to the new nation.

RHODE ISLAND FLAG

October 22, 1777, at 4:30 in the afternoon, the Hessian officer left Colonel von Donop's lines in front of Fort Mercer, at Red Bank, N.J., and advanced to the walls of the fort where Col. Christopher Greene and 400 Rhode Island Continentals waited. Their flag, a blue anchor set in a field of white and with the word "Hope" above it, and carrying 13 gold stars in a blue canton, had appeared earlier in the year at the battle of Trenton, and it would fly at the end of the war at Yorktown. Today, the men beneath it faced 2,000 Hessians who outnumbered the defenders 5 to 1.

The Hessian officer delivered his message:

The King of England orders his rebellious subjects to lay down their arms and they are warned that if they stand the battle, no quarter whatever will be given.

The impression this made on the Continentals was described by a writer of the time:

It only served to irritate the garrison and inspire them with more resolution.

Minutes later the first cannon shot whistled over the walls and two columns moved against the fort.

The first column aimed for the breastworks of the fort's northern wing. The Hessians swarmed over them only to find they were now facing one side of the main redoubt. From another direction, Von Donop himself was leading the second column. Greene had instructed his men to wait until the last moment and, when they did shoot, aim at the broad Hessian belts for targets.

Both columns were right at the walls of the fort, but neither had scaling lad-

ders. Only then did the American fire begin; torn front and flank with an avalanche of bullets and grapeshot, the Hessians went down in rows and heaps.

It may be doubted—

Wrote one witness—

Whether so few men in so small a space of time have ever delivered a deadlier fire.

The officers tried desperately to rally the men. Von Donop, foremost among them, was conspicuous by his uniform and his efforts. Within Fort Mercer, an unknown rifleman carefully aimed, squeezed the trigger, and Von Donop fell mortally wounded. The Hessians retreated. The Americans, with 14 dead and 23 wounded, had successfully stood off a force five times their size, and cost their enemy 371 killed, wounded, and captured.

PHILADELPHIA LIGHT HORSE FLAG

Late June, 1775: One of the most colorful and distinctive flags of the Revolutionary War fluttered over the small group of horsemen clattering across the New Jersey flats on their way to Cambridge, Mass. A blue decorative device was set in a yellow field; above this was a horse's head, and on either side was an Indian and an angel. A scroll beneath held the words "For These We Strive." The canton, in the upper left hand corner, carried one of the first sets of 13 stripes on any flag, and their blue and silver rippled and shone in the sun.

With Capt. Philip Markoe commanding, the Philadelphia Light Horse were escorting the first genuine American military staff ever assembled. George Washington was on his way to take command of his army, and the Philadelphia Light Horse rode with him on the first of their many missions.

Frequently acting as escorts, the Light Horse also carried dispatches and guarded prisoners and spies. They were considerably more than showpieces around headquarters; the metal helmets of one troop shown with frost on the bitter Christmas Eve in 1776 when the Americans advanced on Trenton. One week later, at Princeton, British General Mawhood sent the 16th Dragoons charging down on the American lines in a counterattack. The Philadelphia Light Horse rode to meet them; the British were thrown back in retreat.

The unit served with distinction throughout the war, and their high point came when, after Yorktown, they presented to the Continental Congress the British flags captured at that final, decisive battle.

THE FORT MOULTRIE FLAG

June 28, 1776: While Fort Sullivan had been named for the island on which it was constructed, guarding the channel leading to Charleston, S.C., from that day on it would be known as Fort Moultrie in honor of its commanding officer, Col. William Moultrie. Manning its defenses were 375 regulars and a handful of militia, and, above its palmetto log ramparts, hastily constructed at the approach of the British fleet, flew the first distinctive American flag displayed in the South. Blue with a white crescent in the upper corner and the word "Liberty" on the field, it matched the blue uni-

forms of the men and the silver crescents, inscribed with the words "Liberty or Death," that they wore on their caps.

British Adm. Peter Parker hoped for a quick and easy victory. Ten ships of war and thirty transports moved into position: land infantry to attack from Long Island, next to Sullivan's; sweep across the channel between the two, brush aside the American defenses and storm the fort itself, which would have been bombarded by the fleet in the meantime. The landing attempt failed, and the British infantry were repulsed by the American troops.

Cannon fire from the British fleet had little effect. The palmetto logs were green and spongy; round shot merely sank into them, and there were no vicious splinters to go whining in wicked arcs among the defenders. A greater threat even than the gunfire must have been the psychological one of seeing a long line of British ships bearing down, gun ports blazing. Powder ran low; Moultrie slowed the rate of fire until more could be brought up. A British cannonball carried away the flag; Sergeant Jasper of the Second dashed outside the ramparts and set it up again.

On board the British ships, the cool and precise aim of the American gunners was taking a heavy toll. Masts sagged and crashed, down and overboard; walls shook; round shot of all caliber swept across the decks.

No slaughterhouse could present so bad a sight as our ship—

Wrote a British officer on HMS *Bristol*. Adm. Peter Parker himself took a splinter that "ruined his britches quite torn off, his backside laid bare, his thigh and knee wounded."

It went on for 10 hours, then the American gunners beheld the British Navy in full retreat. The southern Colonies were saved from invasion for 2 years, and Parker had been repulsed in one of the most complete defensive victories won by Americans during the entire Revolutionary War.

WASHINGTON'S CRUISERS FLAG

George Washington needed a navy. There was a great deal of unescorted British shipping plying the sealanes, full of all sorts of stores and supplies, either only lightly armed or unescorted and not armed at all. It was plunder ripe for the taking and the struggling Continental Army badly needed the supplies.

Washington appointed Shipmaster Nicholson Broughton a captain in the army. Broughton was ordered to take command of a group of soldiers, and "proceed on board the schooner *Hannah*—lately fitted out and equipped with arms, ammunition, and provisions at the Continental expense." He was to cruise "against such vessels as may be found on the high seas or elsewhere, in the service of the ministerial army," and to take and seize all such vessels, laden with soldiers, army, ammunition, or provisions for or from said army."

Broughton put to sea on September 5, 1775, swooped down on the British ship *Unity*, full of naval stores and provisions, and brought it in. Washington sent out more ships; Congress took notice, and on October 5 authorized him to

ask Massachusetts for two armed vessels and send direct word to Connecticut and Rhode Island, asking them to send out their vessels, all to be "on the continental risque and pay."

October 20, 1775, and in Washington's headquarters, Col. Joseph Reed wrote to Col. John Glover and Stephen Moylan, in Salem:

Please to fix upon some particular Colour for a flag . . . What do you think of a Flag with a White Ground, a Tree in the Middle, the Motto (Appeal to Heaven).

By the end of October the flag was flying over the six schooners, "Washington's cruisers," that were ready for sea. Manley, in the *Lee*, hit the jackpot in the form of the British ordnance brig *Nancy*, taken right at the entrance to Boston Harbor, with her full cargo of 2,000 muskets, 100,000 flints, 30,000 round shot, and 30 tons of musket balls.

This was a tremendous morale booster for the Americans. "Such universal joy ran through the whole camp as if each grasped victory in his hand." A real prize was a 13-inch brass mortar. "Let's call it 'Congress,'" someone shouted, and as an eyewitness wrote:

Old Put mounted on the large mortar . . . with a bottle of rum in his hand, standing parson to christen.

His praise was in every mouth—

It was said of Manley, and on November 30, 1775, a happy George Washington wrote of the "glad tidings of the capture of the *Nancy* storeship from London." The haul from the *Nancy* alone would be worth a quarter-million dollars today and it was only one of many, contributing so much to the American cause, that were taken by Washington's little fleet.

BENNINGTON FLAG

August 11, 1777: Hessian Lt. Col. Friedrich Baum assembled his raiding party of soldiers and Indians at Fort Miller, Vt., and heard his instructions directly from British General "Gentleman Johnny" Burgoyne himself:

March to Bennington, a few miles south; there will be friendly Tories, with horses, cattle, wagons, and food. There is nothing but an unreliable American militia to stand in your way. Take along Philip Skene, American Tory and onetime Major in His Majesty's Army as a guide and interpreter.

Skene lost control of the Indians almost at once. They shot any loose horses they saw, instead of rounding them up, then turned their muskets on the cattle. Not for food; the Indians wanted cowbells, and they whooped happily to each other as they capered about the fields ringing the bells.

Then, reports began to filter in of 1,500 American militia massing near Bennington. Baum pushed on.

Early in the morning of August 15, back at Fort Miller, an aide woke Burgoyne: Baum wanted reinforcements, immediately. Another Hessian, Lieutenant Colonel von Breymann, was sent out through a driving rain that turned the roads into mud. His column made half a mile an hour.

Twenty miles ahead, the luckless Baum had run into one of the strangest American armies of the entire war; 2,000 strong under Gen. John Stark, they had

been raised for 2 months' service by John Langdon, speaker of the general court of New Hampshire. Formed to protect the State from any eastward move by General Burgoyne, they were supplemented by a few hundred men from western Massachusetts. Their flag, probably the first to be carried by American ground forces, and soon to be raised in victory, had seven white and six red stripes. In the field, eleven stars formed a semi-circle surrounding the figure of "76." There was also a star in both upper corners of the field.

Baum had foolishly placed his men on the crest of a steep, round hill that sloped so sharply an attacking force could come within a few yards of the defenders before they could be seen. Stark's men encircled the hill, and completely overwhelmed the Hessians.

Breymann ran across a few wounded men but their accounts were contradictory and incoherent. Philip Skene saw a group of armed farmers in a field. "Be ye King George's men?" The answer came in a volley of musket fire that killed Skene's horse and sent him dashing back to Breymann's lines.

More fields; more farmers; more rifle fire; cannon then opened up and Lieutenant Spangenberg, Breymann's gunnery officer, saw with horror that they were being fired upon by the very cannon Baum had taken with him a few days before. Spangenberg wheeled up his own artillery; American riflemen circled and picked off the gun crews where they stood. Breymann got a mile behind where Baum had made his last stand, then gave up. Hit in the leg himself, five bullet holes in his coat, he abandoned his guns—a fearful disgrace in the 18th century—and when he tallied up his losses found that out of the 550 he started with, 200 were casualties. Of the unfortunate Baum's force, only nine privates ever rejoined the British.

The Americans, a body of untrained, hastily organized farmers, had thoroughly and decisively whipped two forces of outstanding professionals. They captured four brass fieldpieces, 12 drums, 250 broadswords, four ammunition wagons and several hundred muskets and rifles, at a cost to themselves of 30 killed and 40 wounded. The victory was total and complete. It was the opening scene to the last act of Burgoyne's tragedy that was to end with his surrender at Saratoga within 6 months.

BUNKER HILL FLAG

June 17, 1775: The astonished British garrison in Boston looked across the Charles River to see a freshly-dug redoubt on the crest of Breed's Hill. The evening before there had been nothing, but Col. Israel Putnam's men had worked all night. The flag over the earthworks was blue, with a red cross set in a white canton and a pine tree in the upper left portion, flying over an estimated American force of 2,800 green and untried troops.

A few days before, when His Majesty's frigate *Cerberus* was entering Boston Harbor, British Gen. "Gentleman Johnny" Burgoyne had snorted contemptuously when told "10,000 country people" were keeping the British bottled up in the town.

What? Ten thousand peasants keep five thousand of the King's troops shut up? Well, let us get in, and we'll soon find elbow-room.

But on June 13 the American Committee of Safety, had given orders for fortification and defense of Bunker's Hill.

Breed's lay a little below Bunker's; to this day no one is sure why Colonel Putnam put his fortifications on Breed's, but the redoubt came under British artillery fire almost at once. As the morning wore on, barges and boats filled with British infantry and artillery. They crossed the Charles and grated ashore on the beach. Finally the line was formed and started up the hill towards Putnam and his men.

British regulars were moving against tired Americans who had worked all night and most of the day. Their ammunition supply was low; they had not been fed; they had no one person in overall command; no reinforcements had come to help them; they had been under intermittent artillery fire, and there was no indication they would receive any help from other Americans on Bunker's Hill, in the rear.

A living, bayonet-tipped wall of scarlet coats and white breeches moved up the hill. In the redoubt, a gray-haired farmer prayed aloud:

I thank thee, O Lord for sparing me to fight this day. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

The best shots were lying in the front ranks, while men behind them waited to pass up freshly-loaded muskets. No one knows who gave the command to fire; British sources say it was at less than 15 paces. The British lines shattered, and headed back to the beaches and waiting boats.

On the beach, the British commander, Sir William Howe, listened to veteran officers mutter dazedly that they had never faced such musketry before. Howe rallied the men; back they went again, with Howe among them, and once more the lines flamed. Once more retreat to the beach, where artillery officers cursed helplessly because ammunition for the extra cannon was too big to fit.

Yet a third time the British formed. On Breed's Hill, ammunition was almost gone; there were few if any bayonets and it would be rocks and clubbed muskets. The last attack hit the American lines. There was one, and perhaps there were two volleys, then the British infantry and grenadiers were inside the redoubt, bayonets poised. But, somehow, these green and untried troops, who had stood up three times to the best of the British Army and were now retreating only because their ammunition was gone, drew back in an orderly fashion that won the praise of the watching Burgoyne:

The retreat was no flight; it was even covered with bravery and military skill.

Sir William Howe had won an utterly useless peninsula. Of his 2,300 soldiers who had gone up the hill, 1,054 were killed or wounded. One-eighth of all British officers killed during the entire Revolutionary War died there; the Americans themselves lost around 500 killed, wounded, and missing. The real harm done to the British was the psychological damage inflicted on Sir William himself. By all accounts, he had

been a brilliant and daring innovator in the art of war, an advocate of the quick and deadly attack. But the sight of his lines broken apart in a bloody shambles that June day in Boston did something to him, and for the rest of his service in America his slow, hesitant manner let opportunity escape him again and again.

GRAND UNION FLAG

"The shot heard 'round the world" was fired near Concord Bridge on April 19, 1775, and the war with England was on. The rest of 1775 saw the capture of Ticonderoga by Ethan Allen. Seth Warner took Crown Point; George Washington became Commander in Chief 2 days before the Battle of Bunker Hill; the siege of Boston began in July; Montgomery took Montreal on November 12 and Benedict Arnold began the siege—later abandoned—of Quebec.

A hot war in every sense of the word, then, but ties to England, the mother country, remained strong. More than one American regiment still drank toasts to King George III; this practice did not end until it became known the King was hiring Hessian mercenaries.

Strange as it may seem, these ties were reflected in the Grand Union flag that was the first national ensign of the United States—as well as its first navy ensign. However, at the time of its adoption, late 1775, the colonists were not yet planning complete independence. This flag, with seven red and six white stripes, had in the canton the combined crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, the patron saints of England and Scotland respectively. It served as the flag of the Revolutionary War until June 14, 1777, when Congress replaced it with the first Stars and Stripes.

Sometimes called the "Congress Colors," the Grand Union flag was first raised as a Navy ensign by John Paul Jones, on the *Alfred*, in the Delaware River, on December 7, 1775.

I had the honor to hoist with my own hands the flag of freedom, the first time it was displayed on the Delaware—

He later wrote of the incident.

The Continental Army first flew the Grand Union flag on January 1, 1776, on Prospect Hill at Cambridge, Mass., where the Americans were besieging the British in Boston. George Washington was wrestling with the problem of getting men to stay on with the Army through 1776. General Orders No. 1, issued at Cambridge on January 1, 1776, had an optimistic sound:

This day is giving commencement to the new army which, in every point of View, is Continental. The General flatters himself, that a laudable spirit of emulation will now take place and pervade the whole of it.

The new army also had their new flag; the troops then "hoisted the union flag in compliment to the United Colonies."

The Army needed more than new organization and a new flag. Washington was to write to the Congress 3 days later, on January 4, 1776, that—

It is not in the pages of History perhaps to furnish a case like ours. To maintain a post within musket shot of the enemy for 6 months together, without powder, and at the same time to disband one Army and recruit another within that distance of 20-odd Brit-

ish regiments is more than probably ever was attempted.

But the Army held together. Within the year, the British had evacuated Boston. In December, Washington's famous Christmas Eve crossing of the Delaware resulted in the capture of Trenton, followed by the American victory at Princeton on January 3, 1777. There were difficult and trying days still ahead, but there also was strong and much-needed confidence that the little Continental Army would survive.

FORT M'HENRY FLAG

September 14, 1814: "Is the flag still there? Is the flag still there?" It was beginning to get light, but Dr. William Beanes was 65 years old and his eyesight was failing and he kept repeating the question to Francis Scott Key and John Skinner as the men stood on the deck of the cartel boat *Minden* and watched British shells exploding over and in Fort McHenry, which guarded the approaches to Baltimore on the Patapsco River. All night they had been unwilling guests of the British fleet while the long and heavy bombardment went on.

Dr. Beanes' concern for the flag was deeper than might normally be the case. A resident of Upper Marlboro, Md., he had taken part in arresting half a dozen stragglers from the British Army, when it returned to its transports after burning Washington. A party of British marines came after him, seized him, and he was imprisoned on a British ship facing charges of treason. The British accused him of being Scottish and announced he would be taken to Bermuda or Halifax for trial. Once in either place, his chances of proving his Maryland citizenship were gone forever and the best he could expect was the gallows.

On intercession of Francis Scott Key, a Washington attorney, and John Skinner, a Baltimore attorney who also acted as a prisoner-exchange agent, Beanes was grudgingly released by the British. A major factor in his release was the letters Key and Skinner delivered from wounded British soldiers now in American hospitals. One letter, from a Sergeant Hutchinson, stated flatly that he and his fellow wounded were getting much better treatment than might be expected for an invader who had just burned an enemy capital.

The three were not allowed to return to the mainland until the bombardment of Fort McHenry had been carried out and all night long they had watched as round after round poured into the fort. The flag remained; it hangs today in the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of History and Technology. Probably seen by more Americans than any other flag, it is a national treasure ranked with the original copies of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

It is a huge piece of bunting, 30 by 42 feet, but "through the perilous night" it was visible only by "the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air." The repeated questions of the doctor impressed themselves on Key's mind, resulting in the verses that became our national anthem.

As it waved then, it waves today: "O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

TV INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON POOR PEOPLE'S MEETING, RESURRECTION CITY, AND PROJECT GASOLINE

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD a transcript of questions asked of me during a TV interview on June 20, and of my answers thereto.

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

TEXT OF SENATOR BYRD'S TELEVISION INTERVIEW JUNE 20, 1968

Question. Senator Byrd, I understand that you recently met with a group of West Virginians in connection with the Resurrection City campaign. Tell us about that meeting.

Answer. Well, I was glad to hear their statements, as I am always glad to hear my constituents. Many of them had good points to raise. Some of them, of course, just wanted to make speeches and some of their statements were good statements. Some of their questions were incisive questions, so I think it was a good meeting.

Of course, many of the problems which they discussed are problems which are not under the jurisdiction of the federal government such as, for example, problems involving secondary roads. Many of these problems are under the jurisdiction of people at the local and county and state levels. But they had the opportunity to meet with their Senator and to express their viewpoints and I think this was all right.

The great majority of them conducted themselves very well, I had an opportunity to meet with the leader of the campaign in advance of the meeting and it was agreed that there would be certain individuals delegated as spokesmen so that everyone wouldn't be talking at the same time. So, we met for about three hours and I feel that there was a good exchange of viewpoints. I think that they went away appreciating the fact that Senator Byrd is the friend of the poor, that he does know about the problems of the poor, and that he cares about those problems. And I feel, as I have always felt, that there is much work to do.

Question. Well Senator Byrd, you've said several times that many of the people engaged in the Resurrection City campaign are not really poor. Why have you made that statement?

Answer. Well, because it is a fact.

A number of the people who have been involved in Resurrection City have been associated with gangs such as the Memphis gang, the Milwaukee gang, the Chicago gang. The leaders of the group, also, are staying in motels in the city. Some of the leaders haven't been over in Resurrection City. They have been staying in motels and I assume that these motels cost a good bit. So I would say that not all the poor are in Resurrection City.

And then a lot of the people who are so-called poor from Resurrection City are students from colleges and universities throughout the country. For example, I had three visit me the first part of the week. Two of them claimed they were from West Virginia. But, as it developed, they had only been in West Virginia a short while and they were associated with the Vista program there.

Now let's take these three individuals. One was the son of a doctor in Wyoming. This particular individual has a sister at the Uni-

versity of Arizona, another brother in college, and this particular individual is a junior in college. He is getting a degree in sociology and he is going to be given nine hours of college credit for observing Resurrection City. So he is a young man who is down here to further his own scholastic ambition. He's not poor. And another was a Vista worker in West Virginia who had one year at the University of Colorado and who is working with Resurrection City. He is a Vista worker, as I say.

Now if I want to hear the problems of poor people, I want to hear from poor people. So here are young people who are associated with this activity for kicks, for the experience, for college credits. This is just an example.

Question. Senator, what is going to happen with the reduction in expenditures in regard to project Gasoline which is located near Cresap, West Virginia?

Answer. The House of Representatives cut the budget estimate which was in the amount of \$2.4 million by \$400,000. As a member of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate I offered an amendment to restore the \$400,000 that had been cut by the House. This brings it back up to the budget estimated.

This is a very worthwhile project for West Virginia. The object is to produce high octane gasoline, at a price at which it can be sold in the commercial market, and make this gasoline from coal. This will broaden the coal markets for West Virginia. I think that Project Gasoline is a good project and I have been helpful in restoring the money.

INTERVIEWER. Thank you Senator Byrd.

A PLEA FOR SANITY

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, most of the time when I look into the pages of the New Leader I am trying to understand the thinking of the "other side" or the opposite point of view. However, once in a while I am surprised by finding an article which may deviate from what may be commonly thought of as the "liberal" refrain.

Mr. Gus Tyler has written his "Thinking Aloud" column along the lines of a speech I made in the Senate on June 13. I am sure we do not agree on many points, perhaps there are fundamental philosophical differences, but at least we agree on the need now for reason and calmness. There is no need to condemn the whole of American society out of hand of the actions of one or two individuals.

Unfortunately, I find that Mr. Tyler is quite correct in his finding that no matter who is in charge, or what their actions may be, too many liberals will never find themselves in any significant degree of agreement. He says:

Many liberals like to dislike. . . . Now that the Kennedy symbol is gone, new symbols will be found by those who need someone to hate. And men of "reason" will find reasons for their unreason.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

A PLEA FOR SANITY

(By Gus Tyler)

Permit me to enter a plea for sanity. I shall try to keep it pianissimo, to hold the decibels down in the crescendo of hysteria that has followed the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy.

Let's begin with Sirhan Bishara Sirhan, the presumed killer. He was not raised in the permissive environment of middle-class American suburbia; he was not a member of the Klan or the Rams; he was clearly neither the product nor symbol of American culture. As an explanation of what is wrong with America, he and his deed are almost irrelevant.

Yet a huge chunk of articulate America has seized upon the event to beat up on the civilization of the United States and, especially, on the other guy. One group of highly respected intellectuals sent a fierce telegram to President Johnson asserting that the cause of the assassination is "a national policy of massive violence at home and abroad directed by the highest authority in the nation and always against disadvantaged and relatively defenseless people." So they told off LBJ and pointed the finger at him. Should some new fanatic with a zip gun commit still another assassination in response to this indictment in order to eliminate that responsible "highest authority in the nation," the authors of the telegram would be shocked but not shamed. They would, if charged as co-conspirators, take refuge in the truth. But is their charge the truth?

If the upsurge of violence were limited to America, it would be logical to examine the peculiarities of this society to uncover the causes. At this hour, however, the winds of violence sweep the world. France is in shambles, although de Gaulle pulled out of Vietnam and Algeria as well. Tribal wars tear Africa apart. German youth and Italian students shake their nations. The Red Guard runs its bloody course over China. A native underworld out of Nairobi terrorized a whole nation. In the Near East, Israel and the UAR stand at sword's point; in Belgium, the Flemish and the Walloons prepare to riot; in Japan, the long dormant Etas disrupt the homogeneity of the islands; in Canada, the French seek separation; in Great Britain, the Scottish Nationalists reawaken. In the non-permissive empire of the Soviets, student and national rumblings come from Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia. In Latin America, guerrilla warfare pockmarks virtually every sovereignty. In the sub-continent of Asia, where the good Gandhi was assassinated before LBJ took office, the ancient rivalries of Indian, Pakistani and Sikh take their annual toll of thousands in uninterrupted sectarian slaughter. On the classic island of Cyprus, smoldering ethnic wars leap into flames.

Look where one will, there is no peace. And ironically, against this ugly fact, Sirhan Sirhan becomes relevant—not as a commentary on the United States but on the state of the world.

The earth explodes. The young rebel against the old, the colonial country sides against the imperial cities, the dark races against the whites, the poor versus the rich. Four revolutions run side by side, reinforcing one another. Cold war goes hot, non-violence goes violent, dissent turns to disorder, democracy falls into anarchy. To quote Yeats: "Things fly apart, the center will not hold." Persons and people are whirled in a gigantic centrifuge.

To pin all this on Vietnam or permissiveness, on mall order guns or Communist conspiracy, on calloused capitalists or stupid students, is to confuse symptom with cause. The riots run deeply.

The second years following World War II gave us a new and numerous generation that turned teen when the world turned in-between, when views and values were

changing; new nations were aborning; young revolutionaries were becoming presidents and premiers. Young men and young nations were growing up side by side in the agonizing syndrome of the adolescent tearing violently at the umbilical cords. Everywhere inter-generational struggle found social sustenance in class, racial and national struggles.

The ancient tie that binds—tradition—was torn easily as technology and the media turned dramatically neophilic. Whatever was new was good; whatever was old was bad. When Daniel Patrick Moynihan appeared before ADA to advocate "The Politics of Stability" (See NL, October 9, 1967), his associates suspended a premature hardening of the arteries. The pendulum of history was swinging from one prefix to another, from "con" to "dis," from consent, conformity and consensus, to dissent, disobedience, and disorder.

The zeitgeist of conflict entered everywhere: in the democracies of England, France, Germany and Italy and in the dictatorships of Poland and Red China; in the dark ghettos and in the ivy-clad groves of academe; in the Sinia Peninsula and in the Indo Chinese Peninsula; among liberal Democrats in the United States and among black terrorists in the Congo; in Dallas, Memphis and Los Angeles. Each little conflict spilled over, inciting, inspiring and imitating the others. Thanks to the media, where one picture is still worth a thousand words, the spillover was instantaneous, lighting prairie fires of conflict.

The ideologues added fuel. Herbert Marcuse lumped the U.S.A. and the USSR as industrial societies whose innately oppressive institutions had to be torn apart before men could breathe freely again. Franz Fanon saw violence as a force to liberate oppressed people from their rulers and to cleanse the souls of men. Regis Debray spelled out the technics of goading the Establishment into tighter tyranny as a prelude for the "final conflict" to utopianize the human race.

We were—we are—viewing "the tragedy of a world that somehow became one before it became whole," to quote Norman Cousins' apt phrase. "We are," he said, "at the end of the age of purely national or even regional problems." Now, if ever, the family of man must act like a family. Yet, most ironically, this is also the moment when men are turning away from the universal to the tribal. Nationalism and isolationism are rising. Universities are being torn apart according to their academic sub-cultures of trustees, teachers and students. Ghettos are turning to separatism. The Scots, the Flemish, the Walloons, the Biafrans, the Etas, the French Canadians, the New Left, the Old Left, the Hippies and the teeny-boppers are moving toward separating themselves out in distinct cultures, warring with words and weapons.

Consensus has become a dirty word. Reason is read as sophistry. Unity—above the tribal level—sounds like a mockery, some old-fashioned tripe voiced by a mealy-mouthed politician. Law resting on wide consent is immoral and the only true morality is the passion of the narrow new.

Here Sirhan Bishara Sirhan becomes all too relevant, like the mystic meaning of some scene in the Theater of the Absurd. Here is a loner seeking entrance into some Islamic heaven by avenging the insults and injuries inflicted upon his people. He is, in the depths of his tribal rage, part of one world—that is one before it is whole. He fantasizes the enemy: a prince in a royal family, reaching for power in the great and powerful nation that represents the world establishment to the young, the weak, the small, the angry ants.

In America today, he has a model by which to go: Dallas and Memphis. In this hubristic nation, the individual qua individual has long taken the law into his own hands. It is

part of a frontier heritage, pointed out Arthur M. Schlesinger (Sr. not Jr.), where settlers resorted to the swift "retribution of individual gunplay, or of mob action and lynch law, for from taking the law into one's hands when it did not function, it was but a step to taking the law into one's hands when it did not function as one wanted it to."

The assassination of Robert F. Kennedy was the act of a loner so far as the evidence reads. If it turns out to be part of a conspiracy (and what assassination has ever escaped that suspicion), then other personae may be added to the drama. But it will remain only a scene in a violent play that stalks the world as its stage.

At such a moment, a grave and solemn responsibility falls upon men of reason, especially if they are gifted with speech to influence the minds of their fellow men: It is to begin once more to restore the center that holds.

The conflict between authority and anarchy is as old as man. It is inherent in a species that yearns for freedom yet, as a social being, cannot live without organization. Over the centuries, social orders have swung from one extreme to the other. Out of tyranny has issued revolution, and out of these same revolutions have arisen new tyrannies.

A free society must assume mature minds that can live simultaneously with freedom and organization, open to dissent and closed to disorder, encouraging debate but discouraging destruction. Responsible leaders must be able to qualify differences and compromise conflict.

The death of Robert F. Kennedy should be a signal to rally around reason. It surely is not a cause for indulging in a new orgy of hate turned against the "sick society" or the momentary symbol of its "sickness." American society is no sicker than the world, and the symbol of our society is any transient who appears to have or to demand the trappings of authority. When President Johnson stepped aside last March 31, I wrote in the New Leader (April 8) that "hostility toward LBJ [will turn] into hostility toward RFK. Many dedicated liberals like to dislike." And so it was. Now that the Kennedy symbol is gone, new symbols will be found by those who need someone to hate. And men of "reason" will find reasons for their unreason.

Nor does reason demand that we indulge in a national carnival of meaculpism that grants license and logic to the unprogrammed angry-ones who would tear down social institutions slowly built up over generations. Too much of the breast beating is a public proclamation of self-righteousness, intended partly to indict others and partly to cop out of the hard struggle to move ahead with moderation.

Reason demands reason, a sifting of the passing from the perennial, of the trivial from the vital. Reason demands that we do not allow the mad act of a man to become the excuse for a nation to commit suicide.

OPPORTUNITY—NOT GUARANTEES

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions during the last week I met with groups of young people from Resurrection City. These youngsters came from Memphis and I was more than glad to meet with them to discuss the problem of poverty and lack of opportunity.

What disturbed me most about these visits was the conviction of these people that they should be guaranteed security and all the good things of life as well as

the essentials without acknowledging any responsibility on their own part to help themselves.

They repeatedly quoted slogans evidently well implanted in their consciences that "the country is rich enough to guarantee its abundance to everyone," and they expressed their intention to change our economic system so as to provide "from each according to his ability to each according to his need."

In our hours-long discussions I attempted to explain that opportunity is what all Americans should seek, not guarantees. I told them that I have worked for and will continue to work for programs that would increase opportunity for the disadvantaged such as programs for vocational education, apprenticeship training, and programs to establish day-care centers for working mothers so that their children would be well provided for while the mothers were trained and given jobs to enable them to get themselves off the welfare and into decent paying positions.

The delegates from Resurrection City sneered at such programs and declared they were not interested in blue-collar jobs because they might be replaced by machines someday. They demanded action that would place them in management jobs. They ignored any explanation that management positions are acquired through application to learning and work and moving up through the ranks.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the reaction of these young men and women. I am disturbed about the kind of leadership that is teaching them that they have no personal responsibility for their own success nor any responsibility to their community or the Nation. They are being told the big lie that a few greedy individuals own all the wealth in America and that all their problems will be solved as soon as they can force a divvying up of that wealth.

In addition to trying to make some of the poverty programs work, I think it is important that all those who are entrusted with positions of public trust begin to make it clear that there are no guarantees that will enable any person to live off the sweat and toil of his fellow citizens. As a nation we should continue to do our best to guarantee the greatest opportunity for the greatest number, but for those who refuse to accept the responsibility of responding to opportunity, there will be no guarantees.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF INDEPENDENCE TO LITHUANIA

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, on June 16, 1968, the Lithuanian-American Committee of Greater Boston held a mass meeting and adopted a resolution.

In view of the heroic efforts of the Lithuanian people to maintain their national and cultural identity and to secure the freedom of their homeland, I ask unanimous consent that the com-

plete text of their resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

The Committee for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuania's Independence in 1918, at a meeting held on June 16, 1968, at the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens' Association auditorium, 368 W. Broadway, South Boston, Mass., to commemorate the twenty-seventh anniversary of the ruthless deportations and massacres of the Lithuanian people by the Soviet Union, did unanimously adopt the following Resolution:

"Whereas, on June 14-20, 1941, the Soviets undertook to carry out the infamous Serov Instructions calling for the extermination of 700,000 Lithuanians and did in the period designated, massacre or deport 35,000 innocent men, women and children;

"Whereas, between 1944 and 1951 the Soviet Union deported an additional 570,000 Lithuanians to slow death in forced labor camps in Siberia;

"Whereas, the Genocide Convention, which declares the destruction of nations, racial and religious groups to be an international crime, has been ratified by sixty-nine nations, including the hypocritical Soviet Union; and

"Whereas, the United Nations General Assembly has designated 1968 as "International Human Rights Year", now it is the opportune time to have the United States ratify not only the convention on Slavery, Forced Labor, and Women's Political Rights, but also the Genocide Convention.

"Resolved, that we express our appreciation and gratitude to the Government of the United States for its firm stand in refusing to recognize the illegal Soviet armed occupation of Lithuania, and also, for the present resolute position of the United States against Communist aggression, wherever it may occur; and Be It Further

"Resolved, that we ask the United States Government to bring up the case of the Baltic Nations before the United Nations for the express purpose of demanding the complete withdrawal of Soviet Army units, police and administrative apparatus, as well as, the non-Lithuanian colonists brought into Lithuania since June 15, 1940; and that our Government insist that all Lithuanian citizens, forcibly deported into exile in Siberia and into the depths of Russia, during the last 28 years of occupation, be returned to their homeland, thus eliminating all obstacles to the restoration of Lithuania's independence and sovereignty, which were forcibly interrupted by Soviet Russian force.

"Be it also resolved, that this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, to the Senators and Congressmen from our Commonwealth, to Senator Fulbright, and to the Press.

"BOSTON, MASS.

"ANTHONY MATIOSKA,
Chairman.

"Secretary."

POVERTY OF THOUGHT

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been uttered during recent days concerning "poor people." It is true, of course, that there are many who fit this description, and many of us who sit to-

day in the Congress have ourselves experienced varying degrees of poverty and are more aware of the problems of the poor than we are given credit.

But, Mr. Speaker, there appear to be far more people experiencing poverty of thought than are undergoing economic poverty. These are truly "the poor people"—for whom no remedy exists through private or public educational or job training programs.

The Cobourg, Ontario, Canada, Sentinel-Star carried a recent article on those who are "poor" both in spirit and in thought.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial, reproduced in the June 21 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, is presented again here for the timely consideration of my colleagues and the many others who read the RECORD:

POVERTY OF THOUGHT

A country is surely going to the dogs when the politicians pound the political pulpit in pseudo speeches declaiming low-income Canadians as poor people.

Poor people are those who have money in the bank but poverty in the head.

Poor people are those who will never experience the happiness of fashioning something with their hands.

Poor people are those who do not delight in the everlasting beauty of a fawn and doe drinking from a quiet pool at the edge of a forest.

Poor people are those who have never learned the song of a bird, who do not know by sound what species it is when the bird is lost from sight behind large leaves on the limb of a basswood tree.

People who are bound by selfishness can never be rich in sharing human wealth with the neighbor next door.

So very poor are those people who walk by on the other side of the street; they have no helping hand involved in the world.

Poor are those people who resort to force whether on the picket line or on protest marches. Human brutality and human destruction of property are perhaps the worst forms of poverty that exist in the world. For, to be ruled by the mob is to sell the soul, to personally destroy one's God-given individuality.

Poor people are those who have not the carefree spirit, the untrammelled purpose, who do not travel the highway to the stars.

Poverty exists in the mind. No one is poor who has eyes to see and ears to hear.

NATIONAL GUILT

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 12, 1968, edition of the Washington, D.C., Daily News, contains an excellent article written by Henry J. Taylor on the subject of national guilt. He states that in the Los Angeles assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, as well as in the Dallas assassination of President John F. Kennedy, many are saying that we should blame ourselves.

Our Nation is being condemned, he says, as a place where society is sick. Mr. Taylor says that this concept of society's guilt is both damaging and dangerous to the United States. He states that rather

than being guilty in this regard, we are victims of those who pound home the preachment of individual rights instead of individual responsibility.

These advocates read an insidious poison whenever they automatically call criminal actions the default of society and dismiss the individual from responsibility. As tragic as these terrible occasions were, we must recognize that it is a false approach to condemn the American people as a whole.

Mr. Taylor believes that this is the Communist approach, in which the individual means nothing, and that the fault of the country is the fault of the system. He adds that some American politicians, some special interests, and even some churchmen who espouse this philosophy are opening the door for enemies or enemy countries abroad who are ready to chop this great country down to size.

Mr. President, 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:

WE ARE THE VICTIMS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In the Los Angeles horror, as in the Dallas horror, we are told that we must blame ourselves. Our nation is condemned as a place where society is sick. We are bombarded by the shout: "The guilt is ours," or "It is society's fault."

President Johnson made an important protest against this.

Is the "society's guilt" contention wrong-headedness or mischief, or a combination of both? Nothing could be more indefensible, or more damaging and dangerous to the United States.

We sorely want a more perfect union. We must strive to create a more perfect union. There is much we can do to make this land richer and better for all the people. But we are the victims of those who pound home the preachment of individual rights instead of individual responsibility.

An insidious and weakening poison is pumped into our structure by politicians, special interests and even by some churchmen whenever they automatically call criminality society's fault and dismiss the individual from responsibility.

We heard President Kennedy's assassination blamed on Dallas and on a "sick" American society." But it's hard to imagine anything more false than the indictment of American society because of Oswald, a man about as typical of American society as the man on the moon. How many people in the entire nation have a life record even similar to that of Lee Harvey Oswald?

Nevertheless, we note again that the ghastly Los Angeles crime is widely pronounced as our society's fault, even tho allegedly committed by an equally untypical Sirhan Bishara Sirhan.

Tragically for our country, this false approach is also the communist approach. Every bit of it is water on the Red Wheel. In the Red lexicon the system means everything. The individual means nothing. Any faults in other countries, therefore, are the faults of the systems. And that claim has helped mightily to make communism the biggest and crookedest confidence game in the world.

In addition, this false approach by American politicians, special interests and some churchmen opens the door for envious or enemy countries abroad to chop great America down to size. Accordingly, and predictably, the infamous Los Angeles shots,

like the Dallas and Memphis shots before them, presented an excuse for another wave of hypocrisy from over overseas.

Assassination horrors always have been a part of European national life, and these foreign critics of America know it.

Austrian Archduke Ferdinand, killed by the shot that exploded into World War I, is a simple recollection. But five chiefs of state and government also were assassinated in the 20 years before 1914: President M. Sadi-Carnot of France in 1894, Premier Canovas of Spain in 1897, Empress Elizabeth of Austria the next year, King Humbert of Italy two years later, and another Spanish premier Canalejas, in 1912. Fed up with assassination by Soviet agents in Britain, the Baldwin Government broke off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1927.

Instead of falsely blaming "society" and falling into the Red trap, one proper blame concerns retribution as a just deterrent. It has been horribly weakened.

Giuseppe Zangara was tried, found guilty and electrocuted (March 20, 1933) only 33 days after his Miami attempt to assassinate President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt. But our Supreme Court's continued twisting of the Constitution and the statutes is making a shambles of the criminal laws in our country.

The end result of this process pursued for sociological purposes can only be, as we see, more crime and the consequential loss of freedoms and security, which are the supposed goals of judicial lawmaking.

OPPOSITION TO GRANTING OF PERMITS TO USE PUBLIC LANDS FOR ENCAMPMENTS FOR DEMONSTRATORS

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the civil disobedience and other forms of unlawful conduct the Nation has witnessed in connection with the use of public lands within the District of Columbia by demonstrators has shocked the majority of our people.

As the RECORD will indicate, I was one of the first Members of the House of Representatives to voice my opposition to the granting of a permit to those who are causing so much disturbance in the Nation's Capital.

American Legion Post No. 243, Bessemer City, N.C., adopted a very fine resolution on June 17, 1968, expressing the opposition of the 275 members of the post to the granting of permits to use public lands for encampments for demonstrators.

As a combat veteran of World War II, I am very proud of my membership in the American Legion. This great patriotic organization has always supported sound constitutional principles of government and the highest ideals of citizenship.

I commend the members of American Legion Post No. 243 at Bessemer City, N.C., for their excellent resolution. With the thought that my colleagues in the Congress will wish to read it, I insert the resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION, JUNE 17, 1968

Resolved, that we the 275 members of American Legion Post #243, Bessemer City,

North Carolina, hereby formally protest, and make known that we are greatly displeased with the Director of the National Parks Service for having the audacity to issue permit to the so-called Poor Peoples March campaign to utilize our public lands and Shrines in our National Capital of Washington, D.C., and so defile and desecrate our public property and National Shrines to cause embarrassment to our National Government.

We, therefore, call upon our leaders of government to (1) Seek the dismissal of all parties responsible from the National Parks Service for having issued said permit, and (2) To cause the removal of all persons encamped upon public property, and our National Shrines in our Capital; and further that no public funds be used for the removal of the so-called Resurrection City, (3) That proper legislation be sought so as to protect our public lands, shrines, and institutions from abuse and desecration.

Adopted in solemn session on the eve of Memorial Day, 29 May 1968.

LET US PREPARE FOR PEACE

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, today I made some remarks in the course of debate on the deployment of the antiballistic missile. Much of the substance of what I said I owe to the pioneering thought of Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, the distinguished Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his speech at Rockefeller University on November 14, 1967, be inserted in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

LET US PREPARE FOR PEACE¹

(By Alvin M. Weinberg)

The distinguished English economist Barbara Ward, in her book *Spaceship Earth*, suggests that the material abundance made possible by the new technologies will change qualitatively the relations between nations. "May not the scientific and technological revolutions of our day produce a yet unguessed mutation in human attitudes? We have lived through the millennia on the basis of shortage. How will mankind react if relative plenty becomes the norm? In the past, conquest and imperialism, war and violence have had their roots deep in the fact of absolute shortage. The desire to take your neighbor's land, to lay hold of his resources, to overcome your inadequacies by making his life more inadequate still—have not these been, again and again, the bitter causes of aggression? And in so far as nations recognize the dearth and feel beset by the need for 'living space', they almost instinctively choose for leaders men who articulate these violent needs and envies. Prosperous people very rarely choose lunatics for rulers."²

Most nuclear scientists, by and large, believe in Professor Ward's optimism; they are sustained in their endeavors by her vision of an abundant, and hopefully a peaceful, world. The developments in nuclear energy,

notably those of the past few years, seem to be fulfilling Professor Ward's vision. Nuclear power, in 1952, was written off by a distinguished scientist with the prediction that in the 1960's the effort toward developing nuclear power would be abandoned.³ Today in Canada, in France, in the United States, in the United Kingdom nuclear power is a competitive source of energy. For example, in the United States we now have on order, in operation, or under construction close to 60 million kilowatts of nuclear power. This represents almost a quarter of all central electric power capacity in the United States, and this conversion to the atom shows no sign of abating.

But we are only at the beginning; we have still not fully exploited either the ubiquity or the intrinsic cheapness of nuclear energy. Because nuclear energy is not tied to cheap indigenous fossil fuels or to swiftly flowing rivers, it can be placed wherever energy is needed. Thus, for example, we can visualize large nuclear plants springing up in arid coastal deserts to energize large desalting plants. The technology for large-scale desalting is here, and the costs are reasonable even when the evaporators are energized by conventional reactors. The by-product electricity can be used to manufacture fertilizer and reduce metal ores and to light cities. Altogether we see this ubiquity and mobility of nuclear energy making possible a kind of nuclear powered agro-industrial complex that could give practical embodiment to Barbara Ward's notion of materials autarchy throughout the world. This general line of thinking underlies the proposal now before the United States Senate to deploy such nuclear complexes in the Middle East, and, in effect, provide a new framework of physical resources in which to seek a resolution for that region's desperate animosities.

This is not all. When highly advanced breeders are developed, then we can expect the cost of nuclear energy to fall significantly—perhaps to 1.5 mills/kwh, to 1 mill/kwh, and, with reactors of extremely large size, possibly to even less. At these prices we shall begin to substitute electrical energy for other raw materials. At 2 mills/kwh electrolytic magnesium from sea water will compete with aluminum from bauxite. At 1.5 mills/kwh iron ore will be reduced with electrolytic hydrogen, rather than with coke. Below 1 mill/kwh we shall perform massive heavy chemical processes electrically—such as converting coal to gasoline.

Thus, eventually, when the advanced breeders are developed, many, if not most, of our material wants will be satisfied by energy from fission. And, insofar as low-grade thorium and uranium ores are available everywhere, each region of the globe and each country will have its sources of very cheap, abundant energy. This energy will be converted into the water and the fertilizer and the food and the metals on which civilization depends. The world should become immeasurably richer than it is today. Neighbors would no longer scramble for each other's green pastures, and there would be a general easing of tension once want is eliminated.

THE PRECONDITIONS FOR PEACE

This vision of a Pax Atomica, of a world in which tensions have relaxed because scarcities of raw materials are no longer rational bases for conflict, is a golden vision, one to which all of us in the nuclear business are dedicated. And yet it is an incomplete picture of the peaceful world of the future. It neglects those sources of strife that are not rooted in geographic inequities or dis-

parities in natural endowments. There remains the strife that comes from ideological conflict and conflicts of interest, the strife that comes from the all but universal human ambition for influence or power. Our atomic powered utopia needs more than material well being, important as that may be, to stabilize the Pax Atomica and to prevent war.

But, even more, this vision ignores the present incredible nuclear confrontation between the super-powers. It has been customary to look to the hydrogen bomb and mutual deterrence as the means for prevention of war, for curbing the largely emotional drives that impel men in power to seek to maintain their positions or to extend their influence. And, a little surprisingly, the balance of terror has worked—not perfectly but still tolerably well. We have had wars since the atomic bomb was used in Hiroshima; but we have avoided all-out world war and we have avoided the thermonuclear holocaust.

Yet most of us are acutely uncomfortable with this balance of terror wherein the two super-powers hold as hostages 100,000,000 of each other's citizens. It is unprecedented in world history that the citizens of the strongest powers in the world can no longer be guaranteed by their state some measure of personal security, except insofar as the balance of terror dissuades the other side from striking. Somehow, one is appalled by the possible fragility of this metastable balance.

It is largely on this account, this nervousness about the stability of the balance of terror, that the world has wrestled mightily with arms control and disarmament. Moreover, the nuclear world of plenty is inconsistent with a world in which ever increasing pieces of the gross national product might go into maintaining the deterrent. It seems apparent that we must ultimately disarm; but how can we both disarm and maintain the deterrent; how can we get from here—a world filled with mutual apprehension, with ICBM's, with megaton warheads—to a world based on energy, self-sufficiency, mutual respect, and peace? How can we, as Amron Katz of the Rand Corporation says, make the world safe for disarmament?⁴

I believe, paradoxically, that a way may have been opened by the failure of the negotiations over deployment of anti-ballistic missiles. The deployment of ABM's on both sides has been deplored as the first step in the unending arms spiral that eventually will consume everything, including our vision of abundance. But suppose ABM's and other defensive measures turn out to be effective, and at the same time there is no escalation of offense in unending spiral. The knife-edge of delicately balanced terror would then be blunted. Perhaps then, as D. G. Brennan of the Hudson Institute has stressed so persuasively, we should not be so disturbed if the threat of ultimate, absolute, and total mutual destruction is not forever to be the basis for our world order.⁵

If there is even a remote possibility of achieving effective defense and at the same time limiting offense, should we not examine very much more carefully than we have the possibilities of an essentially defensive posture? Granted that active defense systems today are not perfect, they nevertheless seem to be much more effective than they were thought to be five years ago. And, by virtue of the development of the admittedly imperfect and light anti-ballistic missile system, we have already achieved a kind of de facto disarmament. Because space and weight in offensive rockets must be allocated to penetration aids, the total number of megatons

¹ For presentation at the Seventh Atoms for Peace Award Ceremony, Rockefeller University, New York (November 14, 1967).

² *Spaceship Earth*, pp. 50-51, Columbia University Press, New York (1966).

³ As stated in a report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, "Atomic Power and Private Enterprise", p. 330, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (December 1952).

⁴ "Make the World Safe for Disarmament", *War/Peace Report* (September 1962).

⁵ "New Thoughts on Missile Defense", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists XXIII*, 10-15 (June 1967).

each side can throw at the other ought to be reduced by the anti-ballistic missile. In this sense, the ABM has caused a kind of arms limitation, one of the few real arms limitations that we have achieved.

Moreover, passive defense, a subject about which we hear very little, may be much less impractical than is commonly believed to be the case. We at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory have been studying the question of civil defense for the past three years under the guidance of Dr. J. C. Breese and Professor E. P. Wigner, a former winner of the Atoms for Peace Award. The result of our studies suggests that underground, interconnected tunnels if used as shelters could significantly reduce the casualties caused by thermonuclear weapons. In this connection, I remind you that at least one distinguished city planner—Constantinos A. Doxiadis—holds that the mega-city of the future can survive only if it puts its transportation (including automobiles) and utilities underground. The mega-city will therefore, according to Doxiadis, be honeycombed with tunnels. Such tunnels would be the main elements of a passive defense system: that they might come rather as a matter of course as the city develops should not make them less useful for dual use as shelters.

But we are told all this is transitory: anti-ballistic missiles and civil defense will be followed by more ICBM's which will be followed by more ABM's and more civil defense in unending spiral. We shall go from 3,000 megatons to 30,000 megatons to 3,000,000 megatons—where does the crazy spiral stop? It is here that Dr. Brennan has injected a beautifully new and elegant idea into the discussion: Should not the world, in negotiating the next perilous stage of arms control, focus primarily on limiting offensive weapons, and at the same time encourage defensive systems?

All the predictions about deployment of anti-ballistic missiles and civil defense leading to unending escalation assume that offense will escalate indefinitely. But if the world agreed to, and enforced, a limit on the number of ICBM's we would stop the spiral of escalation. Such limitation on primary instruments of offense are not unprecedented. In the post World War I era capital ships of the three great naval powers were limited. Moreover, if defensive systems continue to improve, the capacity of the world to destroy its people and its lands will gradually deteriorate; and the number of hostages held on each side will be reduced—though certainly never to zero—so that nuclear war, even in a defensively oriented world, could never be regarded as a rational instrument of policy.

The difficulties of such a posture and such an agreement—to limit offense but leave defense unlimited—are formidable. Can one police a freeze on offense unless secrecy is relaxed? Will such an arrangement withstand pressure for abrogation by those who underestimate their own offense and overestimate the opposition's defense? Will strong defense tend to make each side more aggressive in the conduct of its foreign policy? But one must remember that the present balance of terror is not a lovely thing to contemplate nor is it a perfect antidote against thermonuclear war. As L. B. Sohn of Harvard told me, an existent posture need be only 50% foolproof; a newly proposed posture must be 98% effective. If we addressed as much time and energy to developing the details of a defensive posture in arms control as we have devoted either to developing offensive armaments, or even toward present arms control doctrines, is it not at least possible that we would be able to work out credible answers to many of the difficulties we now see in limiting offensive weapons?

There are two overriding reasons why we must eventually come to some such position. The first is that, much as some deplore it, both of the super-powers have decided to deploy anti-ballistic missiles. We are in grave danger of entering an unending arms spiral unless we enter into agreements to chop off the arms of the spiral at the top. This implies some limitation, possibly tacit, but preferably explicit, on, say, the total number of offensive missiles or on the total expenditure for offensive missiles.

There is another reason that seems to me even more compelling. Can we ever hope to achieve real arms control or disarmament from the present position of overwhelming offensive power and almost non-existent defense? Does anyone really believe, in the kind of hard untrusting world we live in, and that we shall have to live in during the next several decades, that either side will agree to a disarmed world unless it feels secure in its defensive systems? Can we realistically contemplate disarmament, with the possibility of clandestine sequestering of a few missiles without being reasonably certain that our defenses can handle sporadic and secret attacks.

But, in the main, our military technology has emphasized offense rather than defense, and our arms limitation technology has emphasized defense rather than offense, especially in the most recent discussions of the anti-ballistic missile. I submit that both postures may have been in error, and that the cause of peace will be better served by developing ways to strengthen defense and to limit offense.

I would therefore urge that the military communities of the world Prepare for Peace by developing defensive systems, rather than continuing to exert themselves primarily to improving offensive systems.

And I would urge that the arms limitation communities of the world Prepare for Peace by developing doctrines for limiting offense and techniques for enforcing such limitations rather than continuing to exert themselves primarily to limiting defensive systems.

It seems that herein we may find the missing elements in the world described by Barbara Ward. We shall have our cheap nuclear power and our agro-industrial complexes and our energy autarkies. But we shall need something other than the balance of terror to keep the peace in the long run. World government, or general and complete disarmament—these are mere words unless we see credible ways to go there from here. The energy-rich world, even with most of its material wants provided for it, will still be a world of nation-states, each with its own imperatives and traditions and glorious history—and its habits of violence. And this world will for a long time have its military establishment. Does not common sense dictate that a world whose military is preoccupied with defense rather than with offense is more rational than the bizarre and precarious world we now have, and that we would be contemplating with horror if we were not so tired of its grim counterpane?

So it may be time for us, in the tradition established by the creators of the Atoms for Peace Awards, to rethink our fundamental premises concerning the way to permanent peace. The men we honor today have served notably in establishing both the technology of nuclear abundance and the international climate for its exploitation. We pray that the kind of wisdom and ingenuity they and their colleagues have displayed will be equal to the task of devising the substitute for our present balance of terror that can carry man safely into his nuclear utopia before nuclear catastrophe demolishes his hopes and aspirations.

HOOSIER EDITOR REFLECTS ON NATIONAL TRAGEDY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the North Vernon, Ind., Plain Dealer.

The newspaper's editor, Mr. Richard Mayer, was in Florida on vacation when he heard of the death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

He responded with this poignant and thought-provoking editorial, which reads as follows:

ROBERT F. KENNEDY

We're sitting here on a Florida beach, looking out at the Gulf, and breaking into our vacation to write a few words about the late Robert F. Kennedy. It just seems to us that someone from Jennings should say something.

And what comes to our mind are those words (and we paraphrase them) "that if you are Irish, you know someday that the world will break your heart." These seem to be words that will forever be associated with the unfortunate Kennedy family. Three sons now dead, all who have died in a very literal sense in service of their country. One died on a mission that he need not have gone on in World War II. The other two—John and Robert—died when an assassin's bullet slammed into their brains.

Robert Kennedy raised a lot of hate in many people's hearts. He advocated change and new ideas, and these two things to some people who wrongly think "that things in general are settled forever" are hopelessly beyond them. And their response to them is blind, unthinking, animal hate.

We can not help but think at this moment about one North Vernon man who at the time of the violent death of Martin Luther King expressed satisfaction at the death. "Now I hope they get Bobby Kennedy next!" he publicly stated. Well "they" did. We suppose he is pleased at this moment, in that peculiar way hate operates. And if he isn't, there is another Kennedy son yet living. Or maybe, and this would be a target that he personally might have the courage to tackle himself, he and some of the other Kennedy haters could get together and push Ethel Kennedy down the stairs and kill that Kennedy now in her womb, six months removed from birth.

So, we too show symptoms of hate. We don't think the nation is sick, as many have said. But we don't think it is well either. There has been too much of this violence for us to get a perfect bill of health.

What has us the most disturbed at this moment is the question that has haunted us since Kennedy was shot. Can Nixon or Humphrey—the two likely candidates—either one bring this nation together again as it must be to survive. We may be doing them a rank injustice, but when we hear either one of them talking, it seems to us that they are not speaking about the way America is today, or what its problems are today, but what things were 20 years ago. And we feel that both—and they are brilliant men—are telling us not what they honestly feel, but rather what they think we want to hear and what will most enhance their chances for election. This is as fatal for a nation as it would be for a person to go to a doctor, and have the

doctor tell you not to worry and not to fret, and all the time the cancer cells within your system are multiplying. What Humphrey and Nixon are offering us, it seems to us, is the promise of two color TV sets instead of one in your home. That hardly seems enough!

And we wonder if either of these men can really capture and lead the young, the intellectuals of this nation. You can laugh (and show your ignorance) by saying this is not important, but it is. We are a young nation and we have developed an intellectual group whose influence is of increasing significance.

When Lincoln was killed, there were people who on the outside deplored the tragedy, but inwardly rejoiced. With Lincoln gone they were free to do as they saw fit. That was 100 years ago. Those sores still have not healed from the mistakes made then. In a similar way, there are people who are saying today, "I didn't kill Kennedy, don't blame me." And deep down, they are rejoicing. They think wrongly that the issues raised by Kennedy have been ended with his death.

For the first time in our life, we are sick about our nation. Perhaps we love it too deeply and expect too much from it. That's not an unknown experience in a love affair. But there are, as we see it, only two hopes. One of these is that either Nixon or Humphrey somehow, because of this latest tragedy, undergoes a metamorphosis of a kind and becomes not a person merely echoing what he thinks we the people feel but rather instead starts telling us what we should be hearing. There is a probability of this happening. You just can't tell, however a man has acted in the past or however he acts in a campaign, how he is going to respond to the duties of being a president.

There is a second hope and that is the large corporations in this nation. They are part of the establishment—perhaps the dominant part. They are the most enlightened of all and they can have a most profound influence if they choose to exercise it.

If these two hopes fall, we see, in our time, the very great possibility of a police state developing here that would stifle most of our rights and freedom. We just simply are people. We are not for to long going to stand for violence. But if our leaders do not turn our attention to solving the roots and causes of our violences, we are going to stop asking for a solution, but for just an end.

And there is always that man on horseback smoothly promising this end for us. A little of the black people's freedom is all he asks now as the initial payment. We will make the first payment and then once committed, it will be all too easy to make the next payment—which will be a little of our own freedom. And when the time comes for the third payment, who will really care?

So, we have buried another Kennedy. Ten children fatherless, and another child that will never know his or her father! What an appetite hate has. And we wonder if in this grave we have not also buried some of this nation.

Pray with us that what was not buried with Kennedy was the heart of this nation. And the youth and the intelligence, which we gloomily feel at this moment were!

NIX WILL OFFER COMPLETE MAIL-ORDER GUN CONTROL AMENDMENT

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, I would like to announce that the hearing

on mail-order gun control scheduled by my subcommittee for June 24, has been postponed and reset for July 2.

The subject of the hearings will be on what I believe to be a loophole in H.R. 17735—that is, intrastate shipments by U.S. mail of firearms. In addition, our courageous Postmaster General, Marvin Watson, has issued regulations which will help in this matter. They are being challenged, of course, by the National Rifle Association. I believe that it is necessary to discuss this matter as well.

We are all in favor of law and order. Many Members of Congress have taken the first step toward a revived interest in law and order amid howls of protest. Why? Because law and order requires that all of us give up some convenience; that those who never violate the law give up some luxury, some discretion for the general good.

There have been discussions in the House and the Senate of bills which would allow individual States to remove themselves from coverage by an act of their State legislatures. Even these bills have been attacked by enemies of gun control. The National Rifle Association will not compromise. They will not reason, they will only delay.

Since delay is the main weapon of the N.R.A., I will offer the Nix bill, H.R. 17949, as an amendment on the Floor of the House. I will explain and defend the Nix amendment by statements on the Floor of the House. The hearings on July 2 and thereafter will, I think, substantiate the position of those who believe we must regulate the firearms traffic. The hearings will support the action of the Postmaster General in issuing new postal regulations in support of local law enforcement.

The following newspaper articles will be useful, I believe, to many Members, and I include them in the RECORD:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 23, 1968]

NIX WILL SEEK TO PLUG HOLES IN GUN CURBS (By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, June 22.—A Philadelphia Congressman announced Saturday he will seek House approval of an amendment designed to plug a loophole in pending gun control legislation.

Rep. Robert N. C. Nix (D.) noted that a bill reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee on Thursday forbids mail order sales of rifles and shotguns only if those mail order transactions across State lines.

This is also true of the prohibition against mail order sales of handguns that was a part of the newly enacted anti-crime legislation just signed into law by President Johnson, according to Nix.

LOOPHOLE CITED

The result is that mail order gun sales conducted exclusively within a State would not be covered by the pending legislation, and mail order houses already are planning to exploit this loophole by decentralizing their operations, the Congressman said.

To prevent this, Nix has introduced a bill that would ban all mail order gun sales, intra-State as well as those crossing State lines. His postal operations subcommittee will hold a one-day hearing on the measure on July 2, in time for him to offer an amendment to the Administration bill on the House floor.

Timothy May, general counsel of the Post Office Department, will be the leadoff witness.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 15, 1968]

ORDER AND LIBERTY

It is of no small significance that that fastidious guardian of individual freedom, the American Civil Liberties Union, has now announced its support of effective gun control. The ACLU has long recognized that the Second Amendment posed no constitutional barrier to congressional action in this area. On Thursday, its board of directors declared that "effective implementation of constitutional rights requires strict gun-control legislation and enforcement."

There is an inescapable logic in this stand. Order and liberty are warp and woof of the same fabric. The one is indispensable to the other. Where order is absent, liberty is drained of content. The unchecked proliferation of firearms has so imperiled order as to entail a vital loss of liberty. The political process is impaired by the fear of assassination; the right of citizens to walk the streets is curtailed by the fear of armed footpads. It is elementary realism for the ACLU to press for control of firearms as an essential means of maintaining the order that is indispensable to the enjoyment of freedom.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 13, 1968]

NEW POST OFFICE RULES: POLICE MUST BE TOLD BEFORE GUN DELIVERIES

WASHINGTON, June 12.—The post office on Wednesday ruled that all guns shipped parcel post must be labeled "firearms" and that they would not be delivered until the addressee's police chief, was notified.

Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson issued the directive as the Senate received bills to ban all mail order sales of shotguns and rifles and to register all guns and license every gun owner in the United States.

Harold W. Glassen, president of the one-million-member National Rifle Association, said that as a lawyer he considered Watson's order unconstitutional.

He also said the bills to register guns and license owners corroborated the NRA's long-held belief that proponents of tight gun controls seek to ultimately confiscate all privately owned firearms.

Watson, speaking to the National Press Club, said that effective immediately "firearms shipped through the mails must be clearly labeled with the word 'firearms.' If the shipment is not so labeled, it will not be accepted in the mails."

A Post Office department spokesman pointed out, however, that the government had no enforcement powers and if a mailer did not label the package there was nothing the department could do about it.

Watson 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."

Present law prohibits pistols and revolvers from being shipped through the mails—they must be shipped via express—and a bill now awaiting the President's signature would prevent all mail order hand guns sales.

Watson also ruled sawed-off rifles and shotguns as nonmailable. He said a long gun must be at least 26 inches in overall length to be accepted by parcel post, and also ruled out any weapon "that retains the characteristics of a concealable weapon."

Glassen said that "no such authority exists" permitting Watson to withhold delivery until police were notified, he said most states have no laws regarding sales of rifles and shotguns, and would thus be powerless to act even if they considered the recipient unqualified for gun ownership.

SOME RULES SOUGHT

He told a news conference that news media generally pictured the NRA as opposing all

gun controls while it had constantly worked to prevent firearms from getting into the hands of "the criminal, the juvenile, the mental misfit, the dope addict, the habitual drunkard."

By the end of the day, the administration's bill to ban mail order sales of long guns had 27 cosponsors in the Senate, including several who voted against such controls last month.

The proposed mail order ban on rifles and shotguns, rejected by the Senate 53 to 29 last month but introduced again Wednesday, was given a "better" chance of passage since the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

Approval of the registration and licensing measure—the most restrictive gun control law yet to be proposed—was given even less chance of approval.

COMPLEMENTS LAW

The proposed prohibition on mail order sales of long arms would complement legislation already passed by Congress—and awaiting President Johnson's signature—which outlaws the mail order sale of pistols and revolvers. It was introduced by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D., Conn.), who has long sought tighter gun laws.

The licensing and registration bill was introduced by Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D., Md.), who conceded it had no chance of approval unless there was "a tremendous grassroots outpouring" of demands for stricter gun controls.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News
June 13, 1968]

NRA MAY TAKE POST OFFICE ORDER TO COURT: GUN LABELING CHALLENGED

(By Dan Thomasson)

The powerful National Rifle Association today challenged Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson's authority to force the labeling of all firearms shipped thru the mails.

And Franklin Orth, executive director of the anti-gun control NRA, said his one-million-member organization may test Mr. Watson's order in the courts.

Mr. Watson announced yesterday that effective immediately, all guns sent thru the mails must be clearly marked "firearms" before they are delivered. He also ordered all postmasters to notify the addressee's police chief before making delivery. He spoke at the National Press Club.

CONCEALABLE

The Postmaster General also classified sawed-off shotguns and short-barreled rifles as "concealable" weapons—barring them from the mails. And he asked all commercial express companies to help local law officers keep abreast of the mounting traffic in guns.

While Mr. Watson's order carries no penalties for violations, reputable gun firms are expected to comply with the labeling requirements. This, coupled with Post Office notification to local police, would enable them to determine if gun buyers have violated local or state gun-control laws.

Mr. Watson's action came as the Johnson Administration stepped up its drive in Congress for stronger gun controls. The president has asked for legislation extending a recently passed ban on mail-order sale of handguns to rifles and shotguns and restricting the sale of ammunition. Bills requiring a certificate of approval to buy a gun and to set up a compulsory system of registration for all firearms also have been introduced.

DEMAND ACTION

The new drive for stronger gun controls was picking up steam today as the public continued to demand action in the wake of the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.), who has opposed strict controls on rifles and shotguns, now says he believes

Congress will pass some version of the Administration's proposal this year. He said he has been "reassessing" his stand against stronger firearms legislation.

Ironically, while Harold W. Glassen of Michigan, president of the NRA, was berating the Administration's new efforts, Michigan Sens. Philip Hart (D.) and Robert Griffin (R.) were reevaluating their previous opposition to tougher gun controls.

Sen. Griffin reportedly told state-wide television audiences he has changed his mind about gun control since the assassinations of Sen. Kennedy and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

By the end of the day yesterday, 27 cosponsors had been signed up, including three Senators who voted against such controls last month when a similar measure was beaten 53 to 29.

Mr. Glassen charged that Americans are "behaving like children" in the emotional aftermath of the Kennedy slaying and reacting as the German people did in the 1930s to the Nazi propaganda mill.

He said legislation will not prevent political assassination and that 200 million guns in the U.S. should not be blamed for what one gun did, any more than 200 million Americans should be blamed for the shooting of Sen. Kennedy by one man and Dr. King by another.

He accused Sen. Joseph Tydings (D., Md.) and other gun-control proponents of a "syndicated" attempt to "deceive" the public into abrogating the Constitutional right to keep and bear arms. Sen. Tydings had asked Americans to wire Congress in favor of gun legislation.

Mr. Orth later conceded the NRA had urged its members to "express their views" about gun legislation to their congressmen and senators.

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1968]

STRICT GUN CONTROL PRACTICED ABROAD

(By Albin Krebs)

Proponents of stricter gun-control legislation have asserted that of all the civilized nations of the world, only the United States gives its citizens the "right to bear arms."

In Britain, France, Spain, Belgium, the Soviet Union, Italy, West Germany, Switzerland and many Asian countries, the ownership of firearms is considered a privilege rather than a right, and the privilege is subject to strict legislation.

This fact was noted by President Johnson last week when, in the aftermath of the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, he called again for strict controls on private ownership of guns.

"Each year in this country, guns are involved in more than 6,500 murders," he said. "This compares with 30 in England, 99 in Canada, 68 in West Germany and 37 in Japan." In addition, guns in private hands, estimated to number 50 million to 200 million, were responsible for 10,000 suicides and 2,600 accidental deaths last year.

The President noted bitterly that in the United States, firearms—handguns, rifles and shotguns—are as easy to obtain as "baskets of fruit or cartons of cigarettes." A survey by The New York Times disclosed that this is anything but the case elsewhere.

BRITISH REQUIRE CERTIFICATE

Nobody in Britain may have a firearm by right, according to a spokesman for the Home Office, and anyone who wants one even for hunting must go through a complicated procedure of applying for a certificate before he may even purchase one.

Britain's Firearms Act of 1937 requires that a person who wants to buy a gun must obtain a certificate from the police chief in the area in which he lives. The police chief "must satisfy himself that applicant is not by reason of a criminal record prohibited

from possessing a firearm and is not in any other way likely to endanger the public safety or peace."

A dealer, after seeing the applicant's certificate, must register all transactions involving guns and ammunition, giving the serial number of the weapon, and pass on the information to the local police station. Failure to do so subjects the gun dealer to six months imprisonment.

The purchase of guns by mail order, which would be severely curtailed in proposed legislation in the United States, is permitted in Britain, but with the same restrictions that apply to personal purchases. It is illegal to pawn firearms in Britain. In this country, most states allow the pawning of weapons with little or no controls.

Proposed gun control laws considered by Congress in the last three years would adopt some of the British provisions, such as a requirement that guns sold be registered with the Treasury Department. Opponents of the legislation, led by the National Rifle Association, an organization of gun-fanciers and sportsmen, have maintained that this would result in troublesome red tape.

French gun laws are strict and unambiguous. They stipulate that arms purchasers must be over 21. Mail order sales are banned and all gun sales must be registered. To obtain a permit to buy a gun, the applicant must undergo a background investigation that is long and thorough. It can take as long as six weeks.

In France only the police and licensed guards are permitted to carry loaded firearms. Private persons with properly registered revolvers cannot carry them on their persons under any circumstances.

NO STOPPING ON WAY TO HUNT

A Frenchman on his way to a firing range or a pheasant hunt, if he is carrying a gun, cannot even stop for a glass of wine along the way. He must go direct, and his gun must be carried in a box or carrying case, in the trunk and not the glove compartment of his car. Both the clip and firing bolt of the gun must be removed.

Gun-control laws in Italy are similar to those in France. As in France, the applicant must be at least 21 years old, and a certificate of police clearance and registration of the weapon are required.

In Spain, the procedures make it even more difficult to buy a gun. An applicant must tell the director general of security why he wants one, and the director general may deny the request without giving a reason.

FIFTY CARTRIDGES AT A TIME

After the Spaniard gets a purchase permit and buys his gun, he must register it with the nearest post of the Civil Guard, the gendarmerie of Spain, which issues him a "guia," or guide, which must be carried with the license when the weapon is used. Only 50 cartridges for the weapon may be bought at one time, and all purchases of ammunition are entered in the guia.

Crimes in which shooting is involved are said to be rare in Spain.

The Soviet Union's crime rate is unrelated to gun ownership. Private ownership of rifles and revolvers is punishable by as much as two years imprisonment, and press reports indicate that knives are the weapons most often used in homicides.

In most of the Soviet Union, hunters may buy shotguns, but in the far north and Siberia, rifles may be bought with a special permit. They must be registered with the police.

In West Germany, there has been only one case of attempted political murder since World War II. That was the attempt on the life of Rudi Dutschke, the extremist student leader, eight weeks ago.

"Well-reputed and trustworthy citizens" may buy hand guns in West Germany, but

only if they cite plausible reasons such as a "dangerous" profession or isolated, "dangerous" living quarters, according to the German Firearms Law of 1938.

For pistols, the law also demands a purchase permit and another permit just to carry the weapons outside one's own premises. Rifles may be bought by permit, with the stipulation that the permit be renewed every three years. Purchase permits are retained by the gun dealer, whose records are regularly inspected by the police.

ONE WEAPON EXEMPT

Belgium's laws are strict, but several murders have been carried out with a .22 rifle that is made in Belgium by Fabrique Nationale d'Armes de Guerre. The weapon is exempted from the otherwise tough restrictions on firearms possession, and this is generally attributed to the influence of the manufacturer, the huge Société Générale group of enterprises, a holding company that controls about a third of Belgian industrial activity.

For all pistols and rifles other than the .22 a buyer must obtain a permit signed by the Belgian equivalent of a district attorney, after local police have conducted a thorough investigation of the applicant which takes one or two months. No weapons are sold through mail order houses.

In Belgium, which has a population of 9.3 million, there were only 71 murders in 1965. The figure also includes murders committed with weapons other than firearms.

In Switzerland murder is not a significant problem even though about 500,000 Swiss in a total population of six million have rifles. So many own the latest model of automatic weapon, kept in perfect working order in a closet at home, along with 24 rounds of ammunition.

LONG TRADITION IN SWITZERLAND

Switzerland's long tradition of arms in the home, consecrated by military law, directs that members of its citizen militia keep their uniforms, rifles, and field packs at home so that they may spring to the defense of the country. All able-bodied males, between 20 and 50 have this obligation.

But a spokesman for the Swiss Defense Department said that although no statistics are kept, the misuse of army rifles in citizens' care is rare. Revolvers, pistols and other handguns may be purchased only with a permit.

In the Far East most nations have followed the example of Japan in drafting unusually strict gun control laws. In Japan, where no one except police officers is permitted to own a revolver, there were only 37 firearms murders last year. In the United States, almost twice Japan's population, there were 6,500 firearms homicides last year.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 23, 1968]

GUN CURBS ARE STRICTER IN MANY NATIONS THAN IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States is not unique in the world community for its lack of effective nationwide controls over ownership and use of guns.

In Africa, wars and guerrilla movements make gun control impossible in several nations; in parts of Latin America, political assassination by gunfire has been recurrent for generations; in Australia there are so many loopholes to the laws of the various states—and no federal law—that a would-be murderer or assassin would have no trouble obtaining a weapon for himself; in West Germany there is no federal gun control, although the eleven states have strict laws which are very similar.

But, according to a survey by Washington Post Foreign Service correspondents and special correspondents, in most of the world's

technologically-advanced nations and where there is no international tension or civil war, gun control is far stricter than in America. This is particularly true in Japan, the Soviet Union and throughout Europe.

GUNS A PRIVILEGE

Other aspects of gun control found in the Washington Post survey were:

Constitutions and laws in the countries surveyed are aimed generally at regulatory control of all firearms—both rifles and hand guns. In some countries police or military forces are not able to enforce strict laws.

Ownership and use of guns is treated as a privilege granted to citizens for a specific reason—most often for hunting. In Japan, whalers and athletic umpires may be given gun permits, as well as policemen, hunters (rifles only) and researchers. In Britain, there are exceptions for dealers, auctioneers, theaters and shooting galleries.

In none of the countries surveyed was there an attitude among citizens that they should have the right to bear arms, and there was no evidence of popular resentment against gun control laws.

ARMS SMUGGLING

Restrictions on the availability of firearms tends to save lives.

The availability and the smuggling of arms—which are manufactured chiefly in the United States, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union—makes gun control difficult in areas of unrest.

In many countries, national gun control has been built up amid frequent periods of political instability and military dictatorship—as in the case of Peru, for example—and it therefore has historically been in the interest of the government to know who has guns and where they are. John M. Goshko reported from Lima.

Gun control in Britain dates back a century, and the last piece of gun legislation in The Netherlands was passed in 1919. It strictly forbade Dutchmen to possess, import, export, or transport weapons—with exceptions, including sportsmen.

SOVIET UNION

In the Soviet Union and the East European countries the police strictly control all concealable guns while hunting rifles are restricted to sportsmen enrolled in appropriate organizations. In the vast rural areas of the Soviet Union there are doubtless many peasants and hunters who own rifles illegally, many of the weapons dating from prewar and wartime days.

But, reported Anatole Shub from Moscow, the lack of political assassinations or famous private crimes of violence and bank robberies during the last 20 years indicates that arms in urban areas are under the tightest controls.

JAPAN

The microscopic amount of crime committed with guns in Japan must be the envy of the world, Richard Halloran reported from Tokyo. Pistols are forbidden, except to police and marksmen under strict supervision, rifles and shotguns are allowed for hunting and target shooting, but again under rigid controls. In 1967, there were only seven murders committed with pistols and 38 with rifles or shotguns.

Most of Japan's 2111 murders that year were crimes of passion committed by hand or with clubs or knives. There were only 11 armed robberies in 1967 for the entire nation.

Even in areas of war or great tension—Cyprus, Israel, Panama and France during the workers' and students' uprising—there was no evidence of enthusiasm by the people to bear and use arms except in actual battle.

CYPRUS

Alfred Friendly reported from the Cypriot capital of Nicosia that the island is "stiff with musketry," probably a higher per capita

rate than any other place on earth—attributable mainly to the bitter intercommunal struggle between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

Experts estimate that there are enough small arms in Cyprus to equip every able-bodied man on the island, Friendly reported. Shootings—almost all of them intercommunal—have been chronic and constant since 1963.

And yet, Friendly adds, excluding the intercommunal fighting, shootings (as well as knifings) are rare to the point of nonexistence.

The situation in Cyprus also emphasizes another aspect of worldwide gun control. Gun laws, mostly dating from the British colonial period, are strict. A person may import and possess pistols only on showing an express need and only when a license is granted, which assertedly is seldom. Shotguns must also be licensed.

In fact, however, the United Nations has noted 1025 shooting incidents during the last 24 months, almost all "random or accidental discharges of weapons." The guns pour into the island, despite the laws, from Greek and Turkish army forces. In addition a large gun supply was amassed during the anti-British liberation period of the 1950s.

There are other nations where huge arms supplies are available, contrary to strict laws on the books.

PANAMA

Panama has a turbulent history with many political shootings. The newly-elected President, Arnulfo Arias, has himself been shot four times. Though gun carrying laws are strict, reported special correspondent Maryann Gorishek from Panama City, there are so many exceptions to the rules that it is relatively easy to get a permit to carry a gun and many private citizens have them.

Many politicians carry guns at all times, and one newsman is often seen carrying a briefcase which holds a folding-stock carbine.

But, she reports, gun felonies and shootings are relatively rare except in riots or in election years. Most violent crimes in Panama are carried out with machetes, knives and clubs.

Goshko reported from Lima that the use of knives is fairly common throughout South America.

In recent years, the rise of guerrilla activity has been accompanied by a sizeable quantity of automatic weapons being illegally brought into Latin America.

In Africa, almost every country requires licensing or registration of guns, but the regulations are ignored in many rural areas. In the Congo's interior, parts of Ethiopia, in war-torn areas of Nigeria and in the Sudan guns are uncontrolled, Anthony Astrachan reported from Nairobi, Kenya.

KENYA

Wherever governments are firmly in control, he reported, guns are regulated—nowhere more stringently than in East Africa.

Kenya's firearms regulations were passed in 1953 while still a British colony at the beginning of the Mau Mau emergency, and there have been no substantive changes since independence. Nobody may have firearms or ammunition in Kenya without a valid certificate.

Permits are not granted to anyone of "intemperate habits or unsound mind, or to be for any reason unfitted to be entrusted with such a firearm." In 1967 Kenya had 508 murders and attempted murders and seven manslaughter cases—roughly one homicide for every 20,000 of Kenya's 10 million citizens. There were also 2347 robberies.

The government refuses to say how many of these crimes involved firearms, but it is known to be less than 1 per cent of the total. Gun control laws in Tanzania and Uganda are as tough or tougher than in Kenya.

SCANDINAVIA

In the Scandinavian countries the only interest in firearms is a sporting one. For this reason, reported special correspondent Roland Huntford from Stockholm, licensing regulations—while strict—are not considered irksome.

Firearms regulations are broadly similar in Norway, Sweden and Finland. Hunting and target shooting alone are recognized as grounds for possession of firearms. The only pistols available to the general public are specialized long-barreled single-shot types used in olympic competitions. Revolvers and automatic pistols are virtually unobtainable.

Even if a Swede has a gun, he prefers to do murder with some other instrument. In 1966 there were 65 convictions for murder and manslaughter in the country. Of these, nine were for crimes using firearms and dynamite. The annual murder rate is about 0.9 per thousand people. In Finland, with a population of 4.5 million, there are about 80 homicides of all descriptions per year. In Norway, there are about 50 murders and manslaughters annually among a population of 3.9 million, with not more than four or five carried out by firearms.

Hunting is popular in other European countries. A survey last year indicated that two million hunting rifles and shotguns were registered in France, one million in Italy, and 25,000 weapons each in Belgium and The Netherlands. In Germany it is a sport of the upper class.

FRANCE

Control of firearms is fairly strict in France—very tight on pistols and revolvers but more relaxed for rifles with hunting one of the favorite national pastimes. Donald H. Louchheim reported from Paris. According to the Interior Ministry, permission to carry firearms is restricted at the moment to less than 10,000 non-government employes (out of a population of 50 million).

The penalty for carrying an unauthorized handgun or for being in possession of an unauthorized firearm of any kind in France is one to three years in prison and a maximum fine of \$720. Anyone over 21 years of age can buy a rifle or shotgun, but only to keep in his home. If he wants to hunt, he must get a license. Foreign residents in France have great difficulty obtaining such licenses.

Deaths by shooting average about 500 a year, or one per 100,000 people. Death by stabbing is at approximately the same rate.

However, in the recent rioting in Paris which lasted more than a month, only two shots were fired. An irate resident tired of the noisy demonstrations outside his window and fired off two rounds from his hunting rifle. Two demonstrators were injured.

WEST GERMANY

In West Germany, a law is being drafted for submission to the eleven state legislatures, which would provide uniform gun control throughout the Federal Republic. Already the states' laws are similar, and no weapons can be purchased without a permit from local police. Purchase of weapons by mail order is impossible. A person may be granted a gun permit only if he is reliable, legally accountable for his actions, not previously convicted and can prove need of a weapon.

As a result of strict laws only 32 persons received weapons purchase licenses, and only 84 were given weapons permits in the Bonn Area in 1967. Murder by gunshot in West Germany is negligible.

HOLLAND

In Holland with a population of 12.5 million, only 15 crimes were recorded last year in which a shooting took place.

BELGIUM

Hunting guns and the .22 rifle are responsible for most murders by shooting in Bel-

gium, and periodic attempts have been made by some members in Parliament to subject the sale of these weapons to stricter control. But their efforts have met with failure, reported special correspondent Robert Mauthner from Brussels. Latest statistics show there were 71 murders in Belgium in 1965 in a population of 9.5 million, but there were no statistics on types of weapons used.

Arms manufacturers and rifle clubs do exercise a certain amount of pressure on Parliament in Belgium. The Fabrique Nationale, in particular, has a considerable influence because of its importance to the Belgian economy as a major exporter of arms and war materiel. All efforts to impose legal restrictions on the sale of its .22 rifle have proved unsuccessful. Laws covering pistols and revolvers, however, are very strict.

ITALY

In Italy, gun control laws forbid the selling or otherwise turning over of firearms to anybody without a license or a special purchase permit granted by local police. Regulations apply to all weapons, including hunting rifles.

According to Prof. Franco Ferrarotti, who teaches sociology at the University of Rome, the existing legislation "has a remarkable deterrent effect on the average citizen who dislikes going through the procedure required for legally purchasing a gun and does not know how to get it through illegal channels."

The overall violent death figure in Italy was just over 4 per thousand population in 1967. More detailed information from 1964 shows there were 319 murders by gunshot that year. Taking into consideration non-deadly attacks and other acts of personal violence, however, it appears that the Italians' favorite weapon is still the "arma bianca" (the "white weapon," a term encompassing knives, axes and other cutting weapons), reported special correspondent Leo J. Wollenborg from Rome.

BRITAIN

The basic law covering firearms in Britain, passed in 1937, consolidated other regulations dating back a century. The firearms act was amended last year to include shotguns, which as of May 1, 1968, also had to be registered.

The British law makes no distinction between rifles and pistols, although it does make it easier to own shotguns. The burden of proof for showing a need for firearms rests on the citizen for pistols and rifles, but in the case of shotguns the police must show why a shotgun should not be permitted, Karl E. Mayer reported from London.

The best estimate is that there are about 220,000 licensed weapons in Britain. Provisional figures for England and Wales (population 48 million) for 1967 showed a total of 2,331 indictable offenses involving firearms. Of the total, 791 involved cases in which firearms actually were fired or used to threaten a victim, 351 involve wounding by shooting, and 45 involve killing by shooting.

All British police are unarmed, except in very rare cases—such as pursuit of armed men. Because the police are unarmed criminals are generally unarmed.

GREECE

In Greece, the law permits general ownership of hunting guns without permits, but requires an annual or semi-annual license. The owner must be a member of a gun club, and cannot carry a gun during closed hunting seasons nor outside hunting areas. Handguns are permitted under strict control of local police. They are in practical terms limited to night watchmen, guards, payroll custodians and persons whose lives or families have been threatened.

The latest figures for murders in Greece—the great majority by firearms—are 101 in 1960, 113 in 1961, 95 in 1962, and 91 in 1963. Most are crimes of passion and armed robberies are very rare. The Greek population is about 8.5 million.

One problem in Greece, reported Friendly from Athens, is that plenty of guns are probably stashed away in the country—acquired during the civil war in the late 1940's. The government claims these weapons were surrendered, but observers expected there are many secret arsenals.

ISRAEL

Political tension and communal warfare in Palestine even before the establishment of the state of Israel led to the imposition of strict controls on the sale of firearms and other weapons there. Some laws restricting the carrying of guns were in effect 50 years ago under the Ottoman Empire.

Many Israeli civilians have obtained permits to carry pistols, because of the many border incidents. In addition, since most Israelis are in the reserves, there is widespread knowledge of the use of firearms. However, the Israelis do not take their guns home with them and must return weapons to their army units when they are released from service. More than 40,000 licenses for handguns and shotguns are issued annually by Israeli officials for self-defense and hunting purposes. Permits have to be renewed each year.

In a population of about 2.6 million (not including occupied areas) in 1967 there were 29 murder cases, of which ten involved firearms, special correspondent Yuval Elizur reported from Jerusalem.

CANADA

Canadians are heavily armed with hunting weapons but not with sidearms, special correspondent Gerald Waring reported from Ottawa. There were 281 murders in Canada last year, giving a rate of 1.6 per 100,000 persons over seven years old. Of the total, 140 murders were committed by firearms, for a shooting murder rate of 0.8 per 100,000.

All guns must be registered in Canada, and as of last year registrations totaled 513,176, including the armed forces and police.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau has been heavily guarded during the present election campaign. The Liberal government introduced a bill in the last Parliament to increase gun controls, and presumably the bill would be introduced if the Liberals win the June 25 election.

INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC

As for international gun traffic, the Soviet Union is the world's largest arms supplier, responsible—according to one estimate—for 40 per cent of the total international arms trade, with Eastern Europe and North Vietnam its main customers.

Sue Masterman reported from The Hague that the Dutch are responsible for the bulk of actual weapons transportation around the world. Little Dutch coasters do most of the gun-running from Europe to Asia and Africa she reported.

Guns in circulation in South America are of European manufacture primarily, according to police. The Italian Beretta seems to be an especially favored gun in Peru, for example. Some of the guns in Latin America are of U.S. manufacture (acquired through surplus channels), but most apparently come from Czechoslovakia. This is largely because Cuba, which does most of the arms smuggling for the growing guerrilla operations in Latin America, can obtain Czech weapons easily, Goshko reported from Lima. In addition, he reported, the Latin guerrillas think that the Czech automatic weapons are the best there are—particularly light submachine guns.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 13, 1968]

STORY OF THE GUN: HOW WEAPON WAS TRACED
(By Mary Ellen Leary)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., June 13.—Luck and California's gun-registration law are credited by California authorities for the quick trace

made on the gun that killed Sen. Robert F. Kennedy last week in Los Angeles.

It took just 75 seconds after a policeman gave the gun's serial number to his district office for Los Angeles police headquarters to learn who first bought the .22 caliber eight-shot Iver Johnson revolver Aug. 10, 1965 during the panic that followed the Watts riots.

Nine hours later, by mid-day June 5, police had the complete history of the gun. The trace began with Alhambra resident Albert Leslie Hertz who bought it at a Pasadena sporting goods store for his wife's protection. A year ago, she gave it to her married daughter, Mrs. Dana Westlake. Last Christmas Mrs. Westlake decided she "didn't want it around the house" and gave it to a mechanically minded young neighbor, George Erhard. And only a few weeks ago, Mr. Erhard sold it to a fellow worker at a Pasadena department store. That fellow worker, known as "Joe," was Munir Sirhan, older brother of Sirhan Sirhan.

MORE THAN LUCK

But more than luck concocted the system which made the record available.

This lies in police reliance on California's famed CII—Criminal Identification and Investigation Bureau. This central state information agency, part of the attorney general's office, is next only to the FBI in extensive record-keeping.

It is so heavily used that Los Angeles maintains a "hot line" to its computer center at Sacramento and averages 250 to 300 requests daily to identify guns, criminals, stolen property or "M.O." (mode of operation).

The query concerning the gun used in the Kennedy assassination was fed into the computer at 3 a.m. and the answer reported seconds later to the waiting policeman.

Among all the files this office handles, its most complete are the three million computer-tape records it has on concealable guns.

IN TRIPLICATE

California licenses all persons who sell handguns and requires each merchant to fill out in triplicate a "register" form for every sale, with one copy to local police and another to the CII. The purchaser may not take possession of the gun for five days after. Within that time police and the CII check out the purchaser's name, address and general description, including age and color. No fingerprinting or documented proof of identity is required prior to purchase, however.

No similar registry is kept for shotguns or rifles. Anyone over 18 may walk out of a store carrying these the moment after purchase.

"Post facto—after the crime—California has one of the best systems in existence," said Chief Deputy Attorney General Charles O'Brien. "But even this has big holes in it.

"If this gun had come from out-of-state or had been bought by mail order we'd have had no record. If it had been bought originally under a false name, we could never have traced it.

"But before the fact—before the crime—when it comes to limiting gun traffic or effective registration of gun ownership California laws are pathetically weak."

Mr. O'Brien said California law lags behind nine states which require fingerprinted registration and far behind New York's Sullivan Act.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 13, 1968]

STRICT GUN CONTROL URGED BY TATE AT MAYORS MEETING

CHICAGO, June 12.—Mayor James H. J. Tate urged Congress on Wednesday to enact strict gun-control legislation and said the matter was most urgent because of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Tate called on the U.S. Conference of Mayors to support his resolution, both in the

Resolutions Committee and at a general meeting here later this week.

RIZZO TESTIFIES

The Mayor was backed up by Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo, who flew to the conference to testify on the effectiveness of the city's 1965 ordinance requiring registration of firearms.

"By the passage of this ordinance, we have proven that gun control works," Rizzo said.

Rizzo also said that Pennsylvania was "set" to enact strict gun control measures. But he called on the enactment of similar laws by all of the State's municipalities as well as adjoining States.

REJECTED 299

Tate said that since the enactment of the Philadelphia ordinance the city has rejected 299 questionable permits for firearms. He said they had included 22 persons convicted of assault and battery, 13 convicted of robbery, seven for mental instability, and one charged with murder.

The mayor said the ordinance had been prompted by the shooting of a police lieutenant who had ejected a woman from a tavern.

Rizzo also said that since the ordinance went into effect the number of murders in the city has declined by 17 percent.

NOT ONLY REASON

"Of course gun control is not the only reason," Rizzo said. "But it is a substantial part of the reason. It is pretty obvious that it will make it tough to get a gun."

Attending the meeting with Tate were City Managing Director Fred T. Corleto, his deputy, Joseph J. Gaffigan; Federal Coordinator Patrick H. McLaughlin; Development Coordinator Philip P. Kalodner; Deputy Managing Director Richard L. Olanoff, in charge of manpower, and Gordon Cavanaugh, in charge of housing; Charles W. Bowser and Anthony P. Zecca, deputies to the mayor, and Patrick J. Stanton, the mayor's press secretary.

The mayor moved to get approval of his resolution shortly after the conference got under way because of the action of the House Judiciary Committee on Tuesday. The committee tied 15-15 to release proposal by President Johnson for stiff gun controls, thus holding up swift floor action on the bill.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 8, 1968]

CRIME CONTROL, GUN CONTROL

The swift Congressional completion of the bill, which contains gun controls weaker than the Administration and both Senators Kennedy asked, was probably a kind of post-mortem salute to the martyred Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Whether some of its provisions—such as those permitting wiretapping and electronic bugging under local court authority—will survive testing by the United States Supreme Court remains moot.

But at least the gun controls are some kind of start toward reason in distribution of lethal weapons in this Nation. Mail-order sale of concealable handguns will be forbidden by law, and over-the-counter sale of such weapons to non-residents of a State in which a gun dealer is located.

Obviously, neither of these provisions could have spared Senator Kennedy's life—nor, for that matter, the life of his late brother, President John F. Kennedy, who was slain with a mail-order rifle. Rifles and shotguns may still be ordered by mail.

We do not believe the present bill is too promising, except, perhaps, in its allocation of \$400 million to States and larger communities to help combat organized crime and riots. Even that is little enough, considering the need.

But there is at least implicit recognition that many guns of all descriptions go to the

wrong kind of people, those most likely to misuse them: fanatics, addicts, mentally disturbed persons, alcoholics. We hope this start toward curbing the trade will be followed by more forthright and far-reaching legislation that will really make the assassination of public figures and private individuals more difficult.

President Johnson's prompt appeal for more realistic legislation should be heeded by Congress. The "Safe Streets" bill is not enough.

America continues to shock the world by its resort to violence for little or no reason. The least most Americans should expect is that a turn away from such a reputation will now be undertaken in all earnest. We have long since outgrown "Billy the Kid" and it is high time we proved it.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 12, 1968]

CRACKDOWN ON GUNS

It is a strange argument that the nation and the states should have weak gun laws because there's no "cure-all" against the criminal misuse of firearms and no way to prevent political assassination by the mere passage of laws.

When will congressmen and Pennsylvania legislators understand that the public is tired of gun laxity that aids and abets violent men in bringing death and injury to citizens in their homes, in places of business, on the streets; in turning public disorders into small wars; in jeopardizing the lives of law enforcement officers?

No one argues that better gun laws will be a magic solution, but they can make it less convenient for criminals and irresponsibles to acquire firearms. They can help police to track weapons used in crime. Strictly enforced, they can put the criminal, the delinquent, and the violent on notice that America has stopped playing in its condemnation of gunplay.

Voters in favor of more adequate gun legislation, which would certainly include extending the mail-order ban and gun registration, should let Congress and the Pennsylvania legislature know how they feel. In the meantime, it is encouraging that District Attorney Specter has ordered prosecutors here to press for stern penalties against those convicted of violating present gun laws. The appeal of Council President D'Ortona to Philadelphia citizens to turn in unwanted guns, no questions asked, offers a chance to get rid of these weapons without embarrassment. Both Police Commissioner Rizzo and Mr. Specter back this voluntary move.

No one wants to deprive the hunters of their sport in woods and fields but it is time for law-abiding America to show that it wants and demands realistic controls over the possession of firearms.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

Tougher gun controls face high hurdles, despite the burst of mail to Congress.

Proponents see a need for quick action while memory of the Kennedy assassination is still fresh, but the early flow of letters already begins to taper off at some Senate offices. Delays loom. Senate backers of strong measures acknowledge they can't move ahead without holding public hearings; they'll start next week. Proposals for gun registration will meet strong opposition.

There's a better chance for fast action to ban mail-order sales of rifles and shotguns. The House Judiciary Committee may approve the measure next week. Mansfield prods Chairman Eastland for action by the Senate Judiciary Committee, though Dirksen and Hruska could slow down any effort.

Senate backers of the mail-order ban consider an end-run around the committee. They'd attach an amendment to some unrelated bill on the Senate floor.

THE COTTON CRISIS: RELATION OF EXPORTS TO BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, one of the brighter spots in our international trade picture is the favorable contribution of American agriculture to our balance of payments. Even though agricultural shipments represent only 22 percent of our total exports, they account for over 50 percent of our favorable trade balance.

During calendar year 1967, agricultural exports exceeded agricultural imports by \$585 million, which more than offset the commercial trade deficit of \$400 million that year. Between 1961 and 1967, agricultural exports contributed some \$32 billion in income to our international balance of payments.

One of our most important export commodities is cotton. During those years when competitive sales in world trade resulted in exports of 5 to 6 million bales, cotton earned \$500 to \$800 million per year for our trade balance. One of the problems facing American cotton exports at present is the depleted stocks of quality cotton in the United States due to a number of factors. This is tending to reduce export income to this country and is encouraging foreign countries to expand their cotton production to meet world demand. There are, however, many other factors involved in this situation.

It is essential that we do everything reasonably possible to develop and retain our cotton markets abroad. In this connection, two important cotton trade missions have traveled abroad recently to seek to expand export markets for U.S. cotton. One of these groups visited the major cotton markets of Europe during the period March 21 through April 10, 1968. The other visited some of the more important markets in the Far East during the period April 19 through May 6, 1968.

I am including a copy of the reports on the results of these missions. They should be of special interest to everyone in this country concerned with the production, marketing, and export of cotton. It is urgent that continuous strong efforts be made to improve our cotton export situation.

REPORT OF COTTON TRADE MISSION TO EUROPE, MARCH 21 THROUGH APRIL 10, 1968

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF MISSION

The Cotton Trade Mission to Europe was composed of government specialists and cotton industry representatives, similar in makeup to seven other commodity teams which in recent months have visited foreign markets to help expand sales of U.S. agricultural commodities. The Mission met with cotton importers and users in the cotton market centers of the U.K., Netherlands, West Germany, Italy, and France. These five countries usually account for dollar sales of about one-fourth of total U.S. cotton exports, which were valued at an annual average of \$150 million in the 1960-66 period.

Discussions and a frank exchange of views were held on the U.S. and world cotton situations and outlook, and the situations in

the fiber import markets and textile industries in Europe. Team members also visited port facilities in Bremen, Germany, and Le Havre, France, and observed textile mills in operation at several locations.

EXPORT OUTLOOK PROMISING IF U.S. SUPPLIES ADEQUATE AND PRICES COMPETITIVE

The outlook for U.S. cotton exports to Western Europe is promising, provided adequate supplies of desired qualities are available at competitive prices and on a continuing basis. Otherwise, the U.S. cotton will continue to lose export markets to other growths of cotton as well as manmade fibers. The European trade believes that while U.S. cotton production in 1968 will fall short of meeting U.S. domestic and export requirements, the longer term prospects for sales to them are good if the U.S. produces at least 14 to 15 million bales annually. The Europeans would like to believe that the United States is serious about its desire to recapture a large share of the European cotton market, but are skeptical about the ability and willingness of U.S. farmers to grow large quantities of cotton for export at competitive world prices. The Europeans indicated a desire for a more consistent long-term legislative program for U.S. cotton that would provide continuity of supplies available for export at competitive prices.

ATTITUDE FRIENDLY TO U.S. COTTON

Importers and spinners have a friendly and receptive attitude toward U.S. cotton and look to the United States for leadership in world raw cotton trade. This was evidenced by the warm manner in which the Europeans received the U.S. Mission and the keen interest they took in the ensuing discussions. Other factors being equal, the Europeans prefer to deal with U.S. cotton shippers because of good business relations and reliable performance over a long period of time. Many stated that while they often receive similar cotton trade missions from other countries, this was the first of its kind from the United States. They expressed the hope that such visits could be made annually to permit an exchange of views and have from U.S. Government and trade representatives first-hand information on U.S. cotton programs and changes in cotton varieties, production practices, ginning improvements, etc. Subsequent visits would be particularly useful following substantive developments in the U.S. and/or world cotton matters.

QUALITY OF EXPORT SHIPMENTS HAS DECLINED

European buyers maintain that the quality of export shipments of U.S. cotton for the past two years has not compared favorably with qualities formerly shipped. This is due in large part to the fact that considerable quantities were shipped from CCC stocks comprised of cotton from many different areas of growth in the United States and from several crop years, while supplies of longer staples were not available in quantity and prices were rising. In Holland, for example, some importers and users expressed keen disappointment at lack of availability of California cotton; they added that cheaper African cottons had not proved to be completely satisfactory as a substitute. Consistency of quality within lots exported from the United States has declined.

In former years the Europeans have been willing to pay a moderate premium for U.S. cotton over similar qualities of other growths; therefore, they have expected fewer problems from U.S. cotton, but quality-price problems have increased. One way that U.S. cotton producers can achieve a more competitive price in the export market is to improve the quality of the cotton that they market.

EUROPEAN MILL NEEDS SHIFTING TO LONGER, STRONGER COTTONS

European buyers and users pointed out that there is an increasing shift to use of the longer, stronger cottons, 1-1/16" and above,

by the European textile industry. This is due in part to (a) more production of blended fabrics (especially cotton-polyester); (b) the shift to production of finer quality textiles with the increases in imports of lower quality textiles; and (c) the faster operation of textile machinery. The Europeans indicated that the U.S. cotton producer and exporter should make greater efforts to take the quality requirements of European mills into account.

IDENTIFICATION OF U.S. COTTON BY VARIETY AND LOCALITY

A wide-spread recommendation in Europe was that the United States should take steps to merchandise its cotton with identification of individual bales by variety and locality of growth. Uniformity of quality is highly significant to the spinner. European buyers indicated that uniformity in most foreign growths is more consistent because of fewer varieties and more uniform growing conditions, while there are many varieties in the United States, and they are grown in many localities under widely different conditions. Identification by variety and locality would facilitate merchandising of U.S. cotton on an industrial or end-use basis, particularly with respect to uniformity requirements.

COMPETITION IS INTENSE

U.S. cotton faces intense competition in European markets from other growths of cotton and from manmade fibers. In the United Kingdom, for example, manmade fibers are continuing to make rapid inroads into the fabric markets due to (a) the fact that the U.K. is a non-cotton producing country; (b) integration of the textile industry; and (c) devaluation of the British pound, which was favorable to manmade fiber production and exports while cotton imports actually became more costly.

Price increases for cotton and price declines for manmade fibers have intensified already strong competition. Production of blended fabrics having a high percentage of manmade and a low percentage of cotton is increasing in all European countries visited.

The strong competition from other growths of cotton is evident in the drop in the percentage of imports by European countries from the United States and the increase in imports from other countries. The European cotton trade believes that the United States does not realize the international character of the European markets with broad sources of supply at practically all times. The view was expressed that U.S. cotton will have a more difficult time reestablishing itself in these markets because of new relationships for cotton supply established with many countries in the Near East, Africa, Latin America, and Asia during recent shortages of U.S. cotton. At the same time, however, it was apparent that many European buyers were not completely comfortable with their new trading relationships with other exporting countries, and therefore were hopeful that they could return to doing business with their U.S. friends at an early date.

COTTON PROMOTION HELPS

The cotton market development activities of research and promotion under the International Institute for Cotton program in Western Europe should be continued and expanded. The team reviewed the Institute's program in the Netherlands and France as well as the international promotion campaigns such as that on cotton leisure wear. These activities were found to be of excellent quality and unquestionably are helping cotton in the tough competition it is getting from the manmade fibers.

Consideration should be given to the idea advanced in Europe that promotion of cotton products be continued at the retail level, and simultaneously promotion of the advantages and potentials of U.S. cotton should be done at the importer and manufacturer levels. This could be done by having sales

and technical representatives available to the European import trade and manufacturers.

Several European textile industry sources indicated that the potential for cotton in blends with other fibers should be given careful consideration and study in the planning of research and promotion for cotton. In the U.K. and the Netherlands, the view was expressed that promotion should be done on blends having a low content of synthetics, to counteract the capture of markets by high percentage synthetic blends.

ACCELERATED RESEARCH ON COTTON

The program of research on cotton products should be accelerated to help cotton meet manmade fiber competition. Such research should include exploration of the properties of the cotton fiber itself, improvements through chemical means and any other avenues including the combination with other fibers that would bring out cotton's desirable qualities and lead to expanded markets for cotton.

CREDIT APPEARS ADEQUATE IN EUROPE

The Mission discussed with the Europeans the possibility of enhancing U.S. cotton exports through more attractive credit arrangements than have been available in the past. However, almost without exception credit facilities and terms presently available in Europe appear adequate and consequently little interest was expressed in such a possibility.

TEXTILE MILL ACTIVITY IS IN CYCLICAL SLUMP

Textile mill activity in Europe in recent months has been in a cyclical downturn. This reflects in part a slow down in general economic activity in response to deflationary measures taken in many countries. Moreover, increased imports of low-priced cotton textiles have reduced mill consumption in that part of the world. It appeared to the Mission that only in West Germany and possibly the Netherlands was any degree of optimism expressed for increased business and textile activity in the near future. The other countries in Western Europe may be able to maintain, and in some cases even slightly increase the current level of textile mill activity in 1968 over the 1967 level. However, the impact of recent currency devaluations, the development of foreign trade in textiles, and government measures to stabilize the economy may affect the present outlook, particularly for those countries in the EFTA trade bloc.

Other factors which may have an adverse effect on cotton mill consumption are the limited supplies and high prices of longer staple cottons. Trade circles report a renewed interest by spinners in manmade fibers, particularly the non-cellulosics, claiming that manmade fiber-cotton blends help in reducing raw material costs and in manufacturing the yarn and fabric qualities required by their customers.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY CHANGES WILL AFFECT COTTON MERCHANDISING AND USE

The textile industries in Europe are undergoing a difficult period of modernization, adjustment, and consolidation. This is an important factor in the long run potential for sale of U.S. cotton to European markets including those in EEC. The textile industries in these countries are having a difficult time adjusting to highly competitive conditions, the need for substantial capital outlays, and labor problems. Plants in Italy, Netherlands, France, and the United Kingdom are in need of further modernization. However, apparently only in the U.K. and the Netherlands has direct assistance for this purpose been offered by the governments. Coincidentally with modernization, there is a broad recognition that a need exists within the EEC for vertical integration of the textile industry in order to meet the competitive demands placed on the industry by the phasing out of tariffs within EEC. Added to this is the fact that the manmade fiber in-

terests have purchased a sizable portion of the textile industry in some countries.

In the opinion of the team, modernization and integration will be important factors to consider in the merchandising of cotton to these countries in the future. The reduction in operating units will lead to more efficiency in operation, including the acquisition of raw materials. These trends, which appear to be inevitable, may make the sale of U.S. cotton more difficult. There will be fewer buying entities. More sophisticated and exacting requirements on cotton character and quality will be dictated by modernization of plants.

APPLICATION OF UNIVERSAL STANDARDS AND CENTRAL ARBITRATION

In several of the European markets visited, the thought was expressed by the Europeans that, to the extent practical, a uniform system for determining quality should be applied in the merchandising of cotton, including that from most foreign producing countries. Representatives in one market suggested that one arbitration center should be established in Europe (there are currently 7) in order to insure uniform application of arbitration guidelines. Although these points are not unanimously agreed to in Europe, the Mission feels that further study should be given to these ideas by representatives in the merchandising trade from all countries.

MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN COTTON SALES TEAM

Grover C. Chappell, Staff Economist of the Secretary's Office, Team Leader; J. H. Stevenson, Foreign Agricultural Service; Robert D. Pugh, Portland, Arkansas, President of Cotton Council International, and Kenneth E. Frick, Arvin, California, Producer Representative; Quinton B. Perry, Greenwood, Mississippi, Cooperative Representative; and Rice B. Ober, Los Angeles, California, President, American Cotton Shippers Association, Exporter Representative.

REPORT OF COTTON SALES MISSION TO THE FAR EAST, APRIL 19 THROUGH MAY 6, 1968

SUMMARY

The Cotton Sales Mission to the Far East, including representatives of the Government, farmers, cooperatives, shippers, and the National Cotton Council of America, was considered successful. The Sales Mission visited Japan, South Korea, Republic of China, Hong Kong, and India. In each country the Mission visited with local government officials, local buyers, and mill owners and operators. The 5 countries visited normally purchase approximately 2.5 million bales of U.S. cotton annually, about 60 to 70 percent of which is for dollars and the remainder under P.L. 480. Prospects for increasing exports to those countries are considered good provided adequate supplies at competitive prices of all staples and qualities are available. There is a trend in all countries towards use of longer staples. Concern was expressed about the future of the U.S. cotton program which expires in 1969 and, as a result, there were misgivings as to what the program would be in years ahead. Each country emphasized the need for a stable program for American producers to provide a continuing supply at competitive prices. Expansion of credit in all countries other than Hong Kong through the Export-Import Bank and the Commodity Credit Corporation would materially help exports to those countries because of their high internal interest rates. The addition of agricultural attaches with their specialized training to the U.S. Embassy Staffs in South Korea and the Republic of China would aid substantially in encouraging the use of U.S. agricultural commodities. Status of agricultural officers in Hong Kong and Bombay should be upgraded to make them more effective. Some complaints were received from some areas, particularly India, on quality of cotton received. All countries were pleased that a sales mission was visiting with

them and suggested that visits be made on at least an annual basis. Detailed recommendations are shown at the conclusion of this report.

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF MISSION

The Cotton Sales Mission's principal objective was to help expand exports of U.S. cotton by determining the problems and opportunities for such exports. The Mission was led by a Government official and included representatives of U.S. cotton farmers, cooperative government officials, cotton importers, cotton Council of America. The Mission met with government officials, cotton importers, cotton spinners, and others in Japan, South Korea, Republic of China, Hong Kong, and India. These countries normally purchase about \$250 million worth of cotton from the U.S. each year, and over half of it is sold for cash dollars. Exports to those countries normally constitute 50 to 60 percent of our total cotton exports, and four of them are among our top importers. The Mission was composed of Horace D. Godfrey, Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, team leader; Carl C. Campbell, National Cotton Council, Washington, D.C., industry association representative; G. C. Cortright, Rolling Fork, Mississippi, and Claud W. Ayres, Vernon, Texas, producer representatives; Roy B. Davis, Lubbock, Texas, cooperative representative and Robert D. McCallum, Memphis, Tennessee, cotton shipper.

EXPORT OUTLOOK

Except for India, all countries were generally optimistic about the current textile situation. Indications are that the total imports of cotton by these countries will hold up or increase. If use of American cotton is to increase in these markets it must be competitive in price, quality, and availability on a continuing basis.

Representatives of the importers and the mills in all the countries expressed some concern about the availability of cotton from the U.S. in the future. Realizing that the authority for the present cotton program expires in 1969 and that supplies and competitive prices depend on our domestic program, they were uneasy over U.S. cotton programs for the future. The Mission informed them that the U.S. is in the cotton business to stay and plans to expand production sufficiently to produce enough cotton to supply both domestic and export demand and intends to be competitive in price, quality, and availability on a continuous basis. Representatives of all countries expressed the hope that the U.S. cotton program would be implemented in a realistic manner in the future so that they could depend upon the U.S. as a reliable source of supply for their requirements of cotton.

QUALITY OF U.S. SHIPMENTS

Although most shipments of U.S. cotton are satisfactory, the people in all the countries visited complained to a degree about quality of some U.S. shipments; this was particularly true in India. They emphasized that the occasional receipt of cotton below quality contracted from some shippers reflected on the whole U.S. cotton exporting industry. Dissatisfaction was expressed about lack of uniform lots and qualities in some shipments. The Mission explained that this should improve since future shipments will come mainly from current crops instead of from cotton purchased from CCC stocks. The Mission pointed out that if the foreign buyers purchase from reliable U.S. exporters and refrain from buying on price alone and attempting to "beat U.S. prices down" that they will have less problems with the quality of the U.S. cotton they purchase.

BALE PACKAGING

All countries visited complained about the inadequacy of the packaging of U.S. cotton

and said that the U.S. should do everything possible to improve the American product in this respect. The Mission explained that some steps have already been taken to improve the packaging of American cotton and that the U.S. would continue to work on the problem. The Mission pointed out that the sampling and handling procedures in foreign ports are responsible to a large degree for the poor appearance of the American bale when it arrives at foreign mills. This was evident in visits to ports, warehouses and mills.

FUTURE REQUIREMENTS OF COTTON

Importers and mill spokesmen in all of the countries stated that in the future they will require longer staple cotton since the trend is towards finer and finer yarns. However, all countries except India indicated a continuing need of short staple cotton from the U.S., and some expressed concern about future availability of such cotton from the U.S. in view of varietal changes in those areas which traditionally produce short staple cotton. The Mission assured them that the U.S. cotton program is geared to produce the types of cotton that the market demands and that the U.S. will be in a position to supply their future requirements regardless of the types of cotton they require.

COMPETITION FROM OTHER COTTON

All countries indicated their desire and intentions to continue to import cotton from countries other than the U.S. because of price advantages, quality considerations, reciprocal trade considerations, etc. However, they pointed out that when U.S. cotton is competitive they are favorably inclined towards our product because of the satisfactory contracting terms, their experience with American cotton, and their established trading relationships with U.S. exporters.

MANMADE FIBER COMPETITION

In all the countries visited, indications are that man-made fibers are making every possible effort to improve their marketing position. The people in some countries pointed out that the most important thing that cotton interests could do would be to develop a good 100% cotton durable press finish, since cotton-polyester blends seem to be taking over the market in uses that require easy-care finishes.

In all the countries, importers and mill operators pointed out that the recent high prices for U.S. medium and long staple cotton have adversely affected our competitive position vis-a-vis man-made fibers. They indicated that a reasonable and stable cotton price would aid U.S. cotton materially in maintaining and improving cotton's position in the international fiber market.

COTTON CREDITS

Japan has used Export-Import Bank credits and CCC credit extensively to finance her imports of U.S. cotton. The Japanese expressed the hope that Ex-Im and CCC credits for cotton would continue to be authorized at favorable interest rates. In addition, the Japanese recommended that the interest rate for CCC credit be set at a firm figure for the term of such credits. The Koreans recommended that CCC credit be authorized for up to three years, and indicated a desire to obtain Ex-Im credit to cover a portion of their Usual Marketing Requirement cotton. The Taiwanese and the Indians expressed some interest in Ex-Im credit for part of their cotton requirements and indicated that they would investigate the possibilities of such credit. In view of the ready availability of credit in Hong Kong at reasonable interest rates and in view of the exchange risks involved in U.S. Dollar credits, Hong Kong importers are not interested in Ex-Im or CCC credit at the present time.

Indications are that credit to finance cotton purchases can be used effectively to im-

prove the competitive position of U.S. cotton in many of these markets, since interest rates in most of these importing countries are significantly higher than interest rates in the U.S. This is particularly true when the credit arrangements require that the credit be extended to the cotton spinners.

Korea specifically requested that procedure be provided for payment on up to 180-day time drafts under P.L. 480.

COTTON PROMOTION AND RESEARCH

In Tokyo, the Mission was briefed by IIC's Director for Japan on the cooperative cotton market development program which the International Institute for Cotton is carrying out there in collaboration with the Japan Cotton Promotion Institute. The program is concentrated in consumer advertising in fashion and women's magazines. The advertising was quite impressive and appeared to be materially assisting cotton in its competitive battle with man-made fibers in Japan.

In Bombay, two members of the Mission were briefed by the staff of the Textiles Committee on the cooperative economic and market program in India which is being carried out by Cotton Council International in collaboration with the Textiles Committee. The program appears to be developing consumer preference and end-use information about the Indian textile market which will be valuable to both Indian and the U.S.

PUBLIC LAW 480

Importers and other representatives in Japan, Republic of China, and Hong Kong recommended that the P.L. 480 program for third-country processing of cotton be continued, and expressed particular interest in another project for Indonesia.

In Korea, Republic of China, and India the trade and government spokesmen said that the rigid contracting and shipping provisions of P.L. 480 purchase authorizations caused problems for them. They requested that in the future the contracting and shipping periods be longer and more flexible than in the past. In addition, they recommended that the purchase authorizations be issued far enough ahead of time to permit them to realistically plan the procurement of the cotton authorized. Also, Korea and Republic of China requested that their Usual Marketing Requirement be reviewed in each case as they consider it unrealistic and too rigid.

U.S. TRADE POLICY

The people in all the countries visited expressed concern about the protectionist sentiment that has built up in the U.S. and urged that this country continue to follow a liberalized trade policy, since this is best for the mutual interests of all concerned. The Mission pointed out that the Administration is still generally committed to a liberal trade policy, but that from time to time the U.S. might find it necessary to temporarily take restrictive actions on imports in order to avoid serious injury to a significant U.S. industry or for balance of payments reasons. Some countries strongly suggested that quotas under the Long Term Textile Agreement should take into consideration the use of U.S. cotton.

SERVICING OF TRADE

Exports of U.S. cotton and other agricultural commodities to Korea and Republic of China could possibly be increased if agricultural attaches were assigned to the American Embassies in those countries. Although economic counselors in both embassies furnish some assistance on agriculture the Mission believes that the best interests of the U.S. could be served by full-time agricultural attaches who are fully familiar with U.S. agricultural commodities and their availability for export. Further, the Mission believes that agricultural officers attached to consulates should have consular privileges (diplomatic

status) to increase their effectiveness and stature with importers and local government.

Agricultural attaches and officers serving in posts of importance to American cotton should before assignment, or while on home leave, be given an opportunity to thoroughly review American cotton policy, trade practices, and current production practices and techniques. The U.S. cotton trade could assist further in increasing cotton exports by maintaining closer liaison with buyers in foreign countries. Plans by the National Cotton Council to station a representative in the Far East should materially improve contacts with buyers of U.S. cotton in that area.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The per capital consumption of cotton will increase in the Far East as the various countries develop economically. This should afford American cotton a bigger marketing opportunity provided American cotton is competitive in price, quality, and availability on a continuing basis. The U.S. should make every effort to capitalize on the expanding marketing opportunities that will develop.

2. The types of cotton required by these countries are changing as their textile industries develop. The U.S. should constantly study the situation and try to produce the types of cotton desired by the importing countries.

3. More flexible P.L. 480 procedures could facilitate the export of American cotton. A review of P.L. 480 procedures should be made to adapt them to needs of the countries involved and thereby maximize U.S. cotton exports. P.L. 480 has helped American cotton to some degree to maintain and expand its markets in certain countries in the Far East. P.L. 480 shipments should be continued to those countries where the program results in increased imports of U.S. cotton.

4. Export-Import Bank credits and/or CCC credit for cotton purchases do materially help American cotton maintain and improve its position in certain markets in Asia. Additional use of credit should be utilized by the U.S. in order to expand exports of U.S. cotton.

5. Cutting the costs of producing cotton and improving the characteristics of cotton and finishes for cotton will materially assist American cotton to compete with cottons of other growth and with man-made fibers. The American cotton industry should make every effort to improve its competitive position through research and development.

6. Vigorous market development efforts can improve the marketing opportunities for American cotton. The USDA and the American cotton industry should continue to strongly support the programs of the International Institute for Cotton and Cotton Council International.

7. Some American shippers are alleged on occasion not to ship equal to contract quality. Such shipments generally hurt the reputation of American cotton. American shippers should refrain from selling except at prices that will enable them to ship contract quality.

8. The foreign importers and mills welcome the opportunity to talk face-to-face with representatives of the American cotton industry. Consideration should be given to sending cotton sales missions to important cotton importing countries periodically.

9. If foreign mills know the characteristics of new varieties of American cotton, they can plan to purchase and use it. Consideration should be given to providing a few bales of each important new variety that is developed to all significant importing countries so that they can test and evaluate it and see how it processes. This is considered to be an effective way to promote new varieties which look promising.

10. Cotton importers and spinners in countries visited would be more favorably inclined toward purchasing U.S. cotton if they

knew more about how American cotton is bred, grown, harvested, ginned, and merchandised. Consideration should be given to sponsoring a visit to the U.S. next September-October by representatives of importing firms and mills in certain countries of the Far East.

11. Indications are that the U.S. Maid of Cotton is effective in promoting cotton fashions in the Far East. Consideration should be given to organizing a tour of the Far East by the 1969 Maid of Cotton.

12. Since trade relationships are an important part of the exportation of any agricultural commodity, the Sales Mission believes that agricultural attaches should be assigned to Korea and Republic of China and that all agricultural officers should be given consulate privileges. The Mission also believes that increased efforts should be made by American shippers and national cotton organizations to improve relationships with cotton importing countries.

REPORT TO HOUSE GOP CONFERENCE ON NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is being circulated to the House Republican conference:

Memo to House Republican Conference. From Representative CRAIG HOSMER Republican of California, chairman, Conference Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

Subject: The Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). The recently negotiated NPT binds nuclear "haves" to refrain from spreading nuclear weapons to the "have-nots," and binds the latter neither to receive nor make them.

The US, UK and USSR will sign it. France and Red China will not. Several countries capable of going nuclear won't sign, and even some non-candidates for the Nuclear Club will hold out.

As an inducement to non-nuclears to sign up, the US, UK and USSR have joined in a nebulous procedure at the UN, supposedly offering them hope of help if they are victims of actual or threatened nuclear aggression. What the latter amounts to is unclear. Likewise is the nature and degree of "help" to be triggered and the additional world policeman duties, if any, it imposes on the U.S.

As a further inducement, the same three nuclear "haves" promise to make peaceful nuclear explosive devices and techniques generally available on a non-profit basis. The UK is not known to have a Plowshare capability, that of the USSR is unknown, and the US program still requires considerable development.

Pres. Johnson wants the NPT signed and ratified quickly. If he persists, it means Congress won't adjourn by the August target date because Senate ratification can't come that quickly.

The NPT contains no inspection verification provisions relating to the pledges not to "give" or "receive" nuclear weapons. To police promises not to go nuclear, it calls on signatories (individually or in groups) to make separate agreements with the International Atomic Energy for that Agency to conduct inspections.

Presently IAEA has little skill in this area and budgets only around \$½ million a year for inspection. Adequate inspection eventually will cost several hundred million dollars annually. The NPT is silent on means for financing inspection costs.

The NPT has received widespread support

from editorial writers. The *New York Times* ballyhooed it as an action that "turned back the Domsday Clock." However, a few publications have tagged it a meaningless symbol which disregards underlying political realities. The *Wall Street Journal* likened it to the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, described as "a letter to Santa Claus."

It is respectfully suggested to Members of the House that the NPT is less than its more emotional proponents claim. Also, that during its negotiation, the Soviet Union has proceeded with a large build up of its strategic missile and undersea forces. Thus, there are reasons for restraint in public statements regarding it.

STEEL IMPORT QUOTAS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Ways and Means Committee currently is holding hearings on a variety of tariff and trade proposals. One of the proposals being discussed is the possibility of quotas on steel imports. Early in the month, the committee heard testimony presented by Dr. Walter Adams, professor of economics and director of the program on industrial structures in the Atlantic community, Michigan State University. Dr. Adams is opposed to import quota legislation, and spoke at some length about the steel industry. I found his statement interesting, and would like to insert it in the RECORD now:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Public policy in America has traditionally favored competition and feared monopoly. As a people, we have always believed "that possession of unchallenged economic power deadens initiative, discourages thrift and depresses energy; that immunity from competition is a narcotic, and rivalry is a stimulant, to industrial progress; that the spur of constant stress is necessary to counteract an inevitable disposition to let well enough alone." (Judge Learned Hand in *U.S. v. Alcoa*, 148 F.2d. 416 (1959).)

The very essence of capitalism, according to the late Professor Schumpeter, is the "perennial gale of creative destruction"—"the competition from the new commodity, the new technology, the new source of supply, the new type of organization"—which strikes at established power positions, vested interests, and entrenched privilege. Such competition is not only the harbinger of economic progress, but also the built-in safeguard against the vices of monopoly and privilege.

Competitive capitalism results in undoubted public benefits. But those subject to its gale of creative destruction do not perceive it as a gentle and beneficent force. To insulate themselves against it, and immunize themselves from it, they try to build storm shelters for their protection. And, since private shelters in the form of cartels and monopolies are either unlawful, unfeasible, or inadequate, they ask the government to build public shelters for them. They try to manipulate the state to preserve their vested rights against the newcomer, the innovator, the foreigner. They want the state to short-circuit the discipline of the competitive market—to vitiate the central regulatory mechanism of a free economy.

One type of storm shelter which would be monopolists demand of their government are barriers to foreign competition—in the form of tariffs, import quotas, "anti-dumping" laws, and other restrictions. Instinctively, they recognize the rough validity of the Manchester maxim that "free interna-

tional trade is the best antimonopoly policy and the best guarantee for the maintenance of a healthy degree of free competition." They also understand that government help is virtually indispensable if they are to achieve their monopolistic goals.

Economic history provides many examples of the high costs which society pays for cooperating with such monopolistic schemes. One of the most dramatic examples is the impact of French malthusianism which fostered cartels and monopolies at home, and built barriers to competition from abroad. As we demonstrate in some detail in Appendix I, the French economy paid the price of stagnation and retardation for this policy which persisted, almost uninterrupted, from the Revolution to the post-World War II era. It is significant that, in the early 1950's, the French themselves, seeking the causes of their stagnation, concluded that the high cost-price structure, low productivity, and general inefficiency of French industry were in large measure due to the corrosive system of protectionism. Thus, the French Commission on National Accounts concluded that "in effect, in the shelter of our frontier which foreign merchandise finds it difficult to cross . . . a structure is developed which is no longer stimulated to maximum productivity . . . It is in the structure which it has established that the almost complete cloistering of the French market must be judged. The true long-term cost of abusive protectionism is the low productivity of the economy." Noting that, on the average, French prices were a good ten to fifteen percent above world prices, René Mayer, a premier with close business connections, told the Chamber of Deputies: "The essential cause—I say it with moderation, but with conviction—of our high prices is the system of protectionism, that growing protectionism of which we cannot rid ourselves, the survival of unproductive enterprises, the private cartelization which one day legislation . . . must definitely destroy." Other statesmen saw in the vigorous competition induced by the Common Market the only hope for reversing the stagnation of French industry, and providing the necessary stimulus to modernization, progress, and growth. Competitive entrepreneurship, they felt, was the only road to survival in a competitive world.

It is both ironic and tragic that the Congress is now asked to embrace a comprehensive and pervasive policy of economic malthusianism—the very policy which has produced such deleterious results in France and elsewhere, and which the most progressive industrial nations are now abandoning. Illustrative of the rationale for (what *Barron's* calls) the "protection racket" is the steel industry's clamor for import quotas. Some of its arguments border on the ludicrous. Thus, Roger Blough alleges that "obviously there are many things in life that should and must be protected. For example, millions of our people—and a number of government agencies—are laudably striving to protect certain vanishing forms of wildlife that are threatened with extinction; and one may reasonably wonder, I suppose, how far down the road to oblivion some of our major industries must go before they are deemed to merit similar concern." Other steel executives are more specific in their claims of gloom and doom: Imports, they say, represent "more than 70,000 steelworker jobs alone, and many thousands of jobs in supporting industries;" imports are a threat to the national security because "a first-class power with global responsibilities cannot afford to rely on overseas sources of steel thousands of miles away;" imports are a serious drain on the U.S. balance of payments; imports are the inevitable consequence of the world's highest wage structure which makes it impossible for America to compete with foreign-made products in world markets; and finally, imports must be severely restricted in order to give the

American steel industry time to modernize so that it can meet foreign competition.

These arguments, we submit, are spurious and deceptive. As we demonstrate in the appendices to this statement, steel employment is not correlated with imports but with rising productivity—both in the United States and in leading steel producing nations like the European Coal and Steel Community. The level of U.S. steel prices is uncompetitive not because of high labor costs, but because of an insensitive, monopolistic, and suicidal pricing policy, on the one hand, and technological lethargy, on the other. The balance-of-payments deficit, reflected in rising imports and lagging exports, is indeed a stark reality, but this again is explained by the industry's non-competitive behavior. (According to the calculations of Professor Egon Sohmen, an international steel authority, the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits during the early 1960's could have been eliminated, if the steel industry had priced its products to assure operations at full capacity, and if it had exported the additional steel produced at world market prices. Moreover, says Sohmen, "if steel prices in the United States had uniformly been at the lower world-market levels, many important American industries using steel (the automobile or the machinery industries, to name only a few) could have reduced their prices. This would have entailed a rise of exports of these industries and a fall of competing imports, further improving the United States trade balance.") Finally, as the record of the last 15 years conclusively shows, technological progress will not come about by shielding the steel industry from foreign competition, but by subjecting the industry to the regulatory discipline and competitive compulsions which such rivalry provides. In short, a strong steel industry, with a viable national defense posture, is a competitive industry—not an industry operating in its monopoloid and lethargic manner under the umbrella of government protectionism.

Despite its poor performance in the past, however, there are signs that the industry has begun to respond to import competition, and that it can prosper without the crutch of government aid. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, "The steel industry, long plagued by heavy modernization costs and rising imports, nonetheless seems poised on the brink of a spectacular long-term surge in profits." The modernization program, induced by import competition, is beginning to pay off. The new oxygen furnaces at Republic's Cleveland plant have shaved \$10 per ton from previous production costs. National's continuous casting machine at the Weirton plant "will save an estimated \$2 a ton in operating costs, which would mean an annual saving of \$6 million, or nearly 6% of National's pretax profit of \$105 million last year." McLouth, "a leader in new steel technology, is likely to be earning \$27 million by 1970, up from \$10.8 million last year." In addition, of course, the price increases announced last year on 70% of all steel mill products "will yield more than \$350 million annually"—i.e. roughly twice the \$170 million increase in labor costs effective last August. Finally, as an Allegheny Ludlum spokesman observed, the steel industry "can take a hell of a lot more business without adding more people." Its rising productivity is reflected in the fact that in the first quarter of 1968, the industry produced 37 million tons with an average employment of 432,000 people, whereas in the first quarter of 1965, the output was 35 million tons with an employment of 463,000 people. (*Wall Street Journal*, May 31, 1968, p. 6.) This is hardly the time, therefore, to impose import quotas, or to short-circuit the market forces which have compelled the steel giants to modernize and increase efficiency.

In conclusion, we note that even if (steel) import quotas could be justified in theory, which they cannot, they would still be an

unwise policy in practice. In a chess game, it is foolhardy to assume that our opponent will play dead—that our moves will not be met by countermoves which neutralize a seemingly brilliant forward thrust. Trade restrictions by the United States will inevitably and predictably invite massive retaliation, leading to a further loss of export sales and an aggravation of the balance-of-payments crisis. Let us remember that a large volume of American steel is exported in the form of machinery, metal fabrications, vehicles, aircraft, and similar products, and that the dollar value of these exports is 10 times larger than the dollar value of steel imports. Let us also remember that some 2.9 million jobs in the United States are attributable to exports—accounting for 20 percent of the employment in engines and turbines, 24.9 percent in construction machinery, 16.9 percent in special machinery, 15.6 percent in chemicals, 13.8 percent in plastics, 12.1 percent in office machinery, etc. Is it in our national self-interest to penalize these progressive, competitive, and aggressive export industries in order to protect some inefficient, lethargic, monopolistic giants? We submit, Mr. Chairman, that this would be a bad trade-off.

Import quotas for such industries as steel are, therefore, unwise and self-defeating. Aside from their deleterious effect on world trade, they are against the best interests of the United States—the employment of our workers, the efficiency and competitiveness of our industries, the stabilization of our balance-of-payments position, and our industrial strength for national defense.

CONGRATULATIONS—GRADS

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, at this season, with the many graduates of high schools, colleges, and universities, there are many commencement addresses giving worthwhile advice to the graduating students. An employer, Snider Lumber Co., published an advertisement in the *Marshall, Tex., News Messenger* of May 29, giving some of the best advice I have ever seen, I include the text of "An Open Letter to a Graduate" in the Extensions of Remarks as a part of my remarks:

AN OPEN LETTER TO A GRADUATE

Today you came to me for a job. From the look of your shoulders as you walked out, I suspected you've been turned down before, and maybe you believe by now that kids out of high school can't find work.

But, I hired a teenager today. You saw him. He was the one with polished shoes and a necktie. What was so special about him? Not experience, neither of you had any. It was his attitude put him on the payroll instead of you. Attitude, son. A-t-t-i-t-u-d-e. He wanted that job badly enough to shuck the leather jacket, get a haircut, and look in the phone book to find out what the company makes. He did his best to impress me. That's where he edged you out.

You see, people who hire people aren't "with" a lot of things. We know more about Bing than about Ringo, and we have Stone-Age ideas about who owes whom a living. Maybe that makes us prehistoric, but there's nothing wrong with the checks we sign.

Ever hear of "empathy"? It's the trick of seeing the other fellow's side of things. I couldn't have cared less that you're behind in your car payments. That's your problem and our affluent society's. What I needed was

someone who'd go out in the plant, keep his eyes open, and work for me like he'd work for himself. If you have even the vaguest idea of what I'm trying to say, let it show the next thing you ask for a job. You'll be head and shoulders over the rest.

You know, men have always had to get a job like you get a girl: Case the situation, wear a clean shirt, and try to appear reasonably willing. Maybe jobs aren't as plentiful right now, but a lot of us can remember when master craftsmen walked the streets. By comparison you don't know the meaning of "scarce".

You may not believe it, but all around you employers are looking for young men and women smart enough to go after a job in the old-fashioned way. When they find one they can't wait to unload some of their worries on him.

For both our sakes, get eager, will you?
SALES DIVISION,
Snider Lumber Co.

TAX BILL

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am against the tax package as it now stands. I am for fiscal restraint. I am for slamming the brakes on the pell-mell spending policies of our Government. But I can not vote for the package at the expense of the already over burdened taxpayer.

At no time, Mr. Speaker, has this body been told just where the administration plans to cut \$6 billion from Federal spending. At no time has this body been given any assurance that the tax moneys received will be used for reducing the budget and not used for spending on some new program or more foreign aid giveaway.

If you take all the money we give away through our foreign aid program and other related items, cut this money out for at least 1 year, it will help reduce our budget deficit no end and give this country a fighting chance to get back on its financial feet. Surely those countries that we have been supporting for the past 20 years can stand 1 year on their own feet without our support.

And take the matter of interest. Pray tell, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with asking those countries that we loan money to pay us back at the same interest rates we must pay to borrow the money.

It just does not make sound business sense for this country to borrow a said amount of money, pay 5 to 6 percent interest on it, then turn around and loan it to a foreign country for 2 percent interest for the 10-year grace period and then only ask for 2½ percent interest until the loan is repaid.

Yet, here we are today asking the taxpayer not only to make up the difference in what these foreign countries pay us back in interest but to bail out our Government for its present financial failure.

The taxpayer is asked to live up to his financial obligations. He is asked to live within his means. It is time the administration does the same thing.

And until it does, I cannot honestly ask the taxpayer to shoulder the burden.

THE HEAT IS ON

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article from the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Digest as printed in the Rural Electric Newsletter.

The editorial enlarges on the advice that I have been offering to farmers for several years—the need to unite on common grounds in order to intensify and strengthen their voice in a largely urbanized Congress.

In a capitalistic economy, such as ours, the Nation can and will be shortchanged by lack of concentrated attention to the problems that affect 90 percent of our new wealth, and from an industry which employes over 40 percent of the total working population directly and through related agri-business industries. The editorial follows:

THE HEAT IS ON

There are many indications that farmers, beginning now, will have to band together far more closely than they have in the past. More and more voices are warning farmers to do this, or else.

What are these indications? There are many, and farm leaders, cooperative officials, economists and others are pointing out several that are outstanding.

There is, for example, the fact that the number of farmers is declining. Their voting strength is down, and many legislators represent urban areas that contain no farmers at all, and they couldn't care less about rural areas. This is to be deplored, but it is true.

There is also the fact that farm prices are related to what processors, distributors, merchandisers, and exporters are willing to pay for farm products. Farm prices are not related to what it costs to produce the products. The buyers quite naturally will pay as little as they can for farm products.

There is, too, the fact that some large corporate interests are buying up farmlands to diversify their operations. Many family farmers are in a weak position when the big buyer raps on the door with an attractive offer.

We could go on to list many other factors that indicate strongly to farmers their need to band together, to be more aggressive in uniting their strength.

A member of Congress from Indiana, a Democrat who has consistently voted for farm programs in the past, summed up the present attitude of many legislators when he said: "I am serving notice that many Members will oppose continuation of this multi-billion-dollar boondoggle when we must deal with difficult fiscal and monetary problems, discontent, riots and untold poverty in urban areas where 71 percent of our population resides."

That is blunt and cruel languages for farm families, who have a depression of their own going. But it is the way some members of Congress are thinking.

The actual fact is that USDA is spending almost \$1-billion a year on domestic food programs, and is doing more than ever before to feed more people in this country. But this fact is disregarded.

The point that farmers must keep in mind is that some members of Congress are willing to sacrifice farm programs in order to help meet some of these other needs.

Thus the heat is put on farmers to get together and protect their own interest much more closely. Farm bargaining legislation, if and when it comes, will help. But right now,

farmers have the machinery in their cooperatives to pull together their economic strength. It is a fact that every dollar and every bushel works for you longer and better when it goes—The Co-op Way.

AMERICAN TOWN WHERE NO ONE VOTES

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, a man with a number instead of a name has written a strong case for exercising the voting privilege. He lives in "Jacktown," the nickname for Southern Michigan Prison.

The message, in the form of an editorial published by In Review, is powerful. At this point I wish to include it in the RECORD:

AMERICAN TOWN WHERE NO ONE VOTES

As another presidential election day approaches, probably never before was so much at stake in America. But most of my 3,700 townsmen apparently are chronic misfits who couldn't care less. My town is "Jacktown"—Southern Michigan Prison, near Jackson.

Now, in the morning chow line, a young murderer and a middle-aged burglar came close to blows in an argument on the merits of the Republican Party. An alert guard breaks it up just in time.

The burglar is serving his fifth term in my town. I know him well. So, after he cools off, I needle him a bit, saying, "I take it you'd vote Democratic."

He scowls and says, "Hey man—I never voted in my life. I've got sense enough to know no matter who gets elected, the best John Q. Public's gonna get is the worst of it. The hell with votin'!"

That's seditious philosophy, isn't it? "The hell with votin'!" means down with democracy, your country, your government and, consequently, every home (where government really begins) in the land.

Yet, I have been guilty of comparable "sedition". It came out disguised something like this: "Didn't get around to voting; had too many other things to do on election day." The reflection lures me into deep concern and holds me down with this hard and heavy fact: I have been stripped of my voting rights for many elections to come.

I begin to wonder how my neighbors feel about not being allowed to vote. Later, I question nearly 300 of them. Almost 90% merely shrug or otherwise indicate lack of concern. Eighty individuals admit that they'd never voted! (Could the deeds that landed us here be germane to such disregard for democracy?) Consider three responses to: "Did you vote regularly when you were free?"

Gambling syndicate underling (age 33, serving 5-10 years): "The organization always saw to it that I voted; even told me who and what to vote for."

Alcoholic (doing 1-2 for non-support): "They'd let me off work in time to make it to the polls, all right. But I'd stop at a buddy's house to talk the election over. There'd be a bottle or two around. And somehow, before I considered all the issues and candidates and decided who'd get my vote, it was too late or I was too loaded to care any more."

Vote fraud fall-guy (age 72, serving 1½-2 years): "Election days was gravy days for me. I always voted. Got five bucks a ballot. Sometimes I made as much as fifty-five or sixty dollars."

As for me—well, occasionally it is difficult to face the mirror of patriotism and like what

you see. Instead of voting, I have gone hunting and fishing; attended to personal matters of assorted kinds. But the future will offer opportunities to prove my determination never again to skip a chance to vote.

In the meantime, what about you?

Like many other sheer blessings in our full-fashioned freedom, the privilege of voting just can't completely be appreciated until it is lost. I know. So I must agree with the immigrant who said: "Americans can't adequately appreciate their system of government because they don't understand what it ain't."

However, our Star Spangled Banner waves best when every thread is intact. Similarly, the government it represents needs every vote.

But nobody votes in my town, Nobody may. What could be worse, patriotically?

Your town, where every adult may vote . . . and you don't.

Whose business is it if wisdom takes wing, if honesty dies, if money is king? The other guy's?

Whose business is it if politics sour, if graft calls the plays, if greed has its hour? L.B.J.'s?

Whose business is it if races despair, if blacks battle whites, if hate fouls the air? The Civil Rights?

Whose business is it if vandals destroy, if a mad gunman draws, if crime lures a boy? The law's?

Whose business is it if apathy thrives, if "So what?" ism rules, if weirditis survives? The schools'?

Whose business is it if draft cards are burned, if some kook decries what wise men have learned? The F.B.I.'s?

Whose business is it if big mouths hold sway, if a ne'er-do-well damns The American Way? Uncle Sam's?

Whose business is it if Liberty's Train non-stops most stations as Peace waits in vain? The United Nations'?

Whose business is it if markets grow cold, if goods beget losses, if companies fold? The boss's?

Whose business is it—whose to open doors, whose to win or to lose? The business is yours, that's whose.

By PETE (87776) SIMER.

I THINK I HAVE SOME RIGHTS, TOO

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for some time the Warner & Swasey Co. of Cleveland, Ohio, manufacturers of machine tools and construction equipment, has devoted much of its advertising budget to portraying philosophies constructive to the Nation and its people.

In the June 24, 1968, edition of Newsweek is a page advertisement that deserves the attention of all Americans, and it is a pleasure to bring the message to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I hope public officials will heed this message, for it puts in concise terms the desires of a good part of our citizens:

I THINK I HAVE SOME RIGHTS, TOO

The right to walk the streets of my home town in safety. But courts and parole boards have so pampered criminals and hampered police that crime is skyrocketing into anarchy.

I have the right to expect my taxes to be prudently used for my country—not squandered on buying votes of pressure groups nor perpetuating useless bureaus.

I have the right to save my own money by doing without—save for a secure future; not to have it stolen by inflation created by wasteful government.

I have the right to start my own legitimate business and if I have ability, see it prosper; not succumb to greedy union bosses who, for their own power and profit, can close me out with an unreasonable, even illegal, strike.

I have the right and desire as a decent American to be sure no honest man goes hungry, but I also have the right to insist he do everything he can to earn his own living.

This nation was founded by men who rose up in anger against the bossism of Taxation without Representation, and established a country where the majority rules (not pressure groups)—the majority of law-abiding, hard-working, tax-paying citizens.

This great nation has come dangerously close to mob rule supplanting majority rule. Any official who supports or tolerates it is untrue to his country and should be treated accordingly.

THEORY OF COLLECTIVE GUILT IS NONSENSE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are many in our country as well as abroad who would charge all 200 million Americans with collective guilt in the deaths of President John F. Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy. My newsletter for the week of June 9-15, 1968, answered this charge and refuted it for the completely false allegation that it is:

THEORY OF COLLECTIVE GUILT IS NONSENSE

Reeling under the terrible shock of assassination of three major public figures within the last five years, the American people must now prepare to defend themselves against something else almost as reprehensible, tragic and senseless: the charge of collective guilt, aimed at our entire society, people and nation. The 18th-century British statesman Edmund Burke once said "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." Burke was right, but there are plenty willing to try, and from home and abroad the accusations are being hurled at us again.

The Communist bloc, whose history is written in the blood of millions, lost no time. The Soviet Union said the United States is where "man is wolf to man." Hungary said "telescopic rifles and short-range firearms carry the ultimate ratio in political controversies." North Vietnam says this shows "the dirty face and tactics of U.S. politicians who will not hesitate to spill blood in order to even the score."

From France, where Paris saw the Reign of Terror during the Revolution in 1793-1794 and "Bloody Week" during the Commune of 1871, whose people so hated their Premier in 1936 that the phrase "Better Hitler than Blum!" also became a national slogan, and which just two weeks ago was closer to anarchy and civil war than any other country in the Western World has been for years, a leading newspaper commented that "America dreamed of a government of judges, but she suffers the law of violent people."

From the United Nations, which could not exist for one instant without the money and

backing of the United States, where the cowardice of its Secretary General is credited by many with leading to the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, where the favorite indoor sport seems to be passing resolutions calling for armed action against Southern Rhodesia, while ignoring Nasser's use of poison gas against Arab tribesmen in Yemen, there was much concern about the American "cult of violence."

And from our own vocal crop of self-styled thinkers and opinion molders who are the first to praise civil disobedience of any form, who are the first to bestow the accolade of "honest dissent" upon college riots, who are the first to make apologies for the pernicious doctrine of "disobedience of unjust laws," but who do not have the intellectual courage to admit that if anyone has encouraged a climate of permissiveness, if anyone has given someone encouragement to take the law into their own hands, they are guilty, they have already begun their chant of doom.

One prominent historian has charged the United States is a land of "violent people with a violent history, and the instinct for violence has seeped into the bloodstream of national life."

Were 200 million pairs of American hands touching the rifles that killed President Kennedy and Martin Luther King, the pistol that killed Senator Robert Kennedy? No!

Lee Harvey Oswald, killer of President Kennedy, social misfit, avowed Marxist, supporter of Fidel Castro, indoctrinated and brainwashed with no one knows what during his voluntary stay in the Soviet Union;

The killer of Martin Luther King, by many indications a cold-blooded professional who coolly and carefully planned his every move before, during and after the slaying; a killer for hire and for pay, who sees human lives only in the amount of dollars to be gained when the life is snuffed out;

Sirhan Bishara Sirhan, killer of Senator Robert Kennedy; Jordanian immigrant, from a broken home, described by those who know him as emotional, resenting authority; fervently pro-Arab, hating anything remotely pro-Israeli; notes found in his home and believed to be his refer to the need to kill Robert Kennedy before June 5, 1968, and the same notes are full of pro-Communist, anti-U.S. writings, with references to favoring Communism of all sorts.

Could any three men have been more outside the mainstream of American life? Could any three men lay less of a claim to being part of a people, part of a nation, that has poured out its blood and treasure abroad with no thought of any grain save to help those who are victims of aggression, to help those less fortunate than themselves? Could these three men claim any sort of kinship with no thought of any gain save to help country, above all others in the world, the source of refuge, the land of hope, for millions of oppressed?

When a prominent figure is struck down in so brutal a fashion, with his work unfinished and his hopes unrealized, and only his memory remaining to his fellow countrymen, we must remember that he loved his country, and its people, and had dedicated his public career to that which he honestly felt was best for both. At such a time, all America extends its sympathy and its prayers to his widow and to his children.

But at the same time we must not allow ourselves to forget that he who died would want his country to remain strong, proud and free. He would be immeasurably saddened if he knew that, in an hour of national mourning and sadness, his countrymen in their grief turned upon themselves as a people, and weakened themselves as a nation. To do this would mean we would fall what would certainly have been his last wish, and we would also do a great disservice to his memory.

CONSTRUCTION AND THE ECONOMY

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, with the Nation creeping closer and closer to economic chaos, something must be done to stop the spiraling inflation. One factor contributing to this spiral has been the excessive wage demands of labor unions on the construction industry. Mr. Winton M. Blount, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and himself a construction executive in his native State of Alabama, recently addressed himself to this problem in a speech before the National Labor Conference of Associated General Contractors in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Blount's speech printed in the RECORD.

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

CONSTRUCTION AND THE ECONOMY

(By Winton M. Blount, President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the National Labor Conference, Associated General Contractors, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1968)

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 American 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 per cent.

The excessive demand which in 1965 initiated the 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 not 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 8.8 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 nickle 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 know 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 trouble 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 associations 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 that 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 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 Saturdays—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 re-assembling 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, gentlemen, 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.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the new attention being focused on the proposal that the voting age be lowered, I would like, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, to include a thoughtful discussion by a constituent, Mr. Joseph A. McMillan of Lynwood, Calif. I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues for the depth of thought which Mr. McMillan brings to the subject:

THE POWER OF THE VOTE—SHOULD 18 YEAR OLDS HAVE IT?

(By Joseph A. McMillan)

The intent of this article is not to deprive young people of their rights but to draw a parallel between one man's opinion and that of the President of these United States who insists that 18 year olds have the privilege of voting.

The issue here is not one of intelligence or right, but of maturity and experience in the ways of citizenship.

It has been said, "If they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to vote," and while there is no discounting the debt which our country owes to all of the young patriots past and present, there is in fact very little relationship between the ability to fight and the ability to vote.

The teenager who enters the armed forces of our country does so because he wishes to obey the law of the land, because he believes in the greatness of our system, or for reasons of his own.

The power to determine no matter how great his intelligence is not left to his discretion, it is governed by the tactical arts of military expediency and unquestioned authority of superior officers. True, he has a great responsibility and a great courage, and he makes substantial and sometimes supreme sacrifices to the land of his birth. But his decision is not his own but that of others charged with the responsibility to lead.

The real danger to our way of life by immature decisions at the ballot box is compounded by the fact that most young people are idealists whose concepts of an Utopian world are not realistic when weighed in the light of human frailty.

In a world where only small percentages of the electorate exercise the privilege of franchise, in a world where selfish interests exercise power for their own ends, in a world where growing legions of those who produce nothing pay nothing are being organized to overcome the will of the apathetic many in a world where fiscal responsibility is at its worst, where politicians would perpetuate themselves in office at any cost, in a world where militant minorities are becoming the policy makers, is it wise to add the voice of the untried and inexperienced?

Teen agers, unfortunately, are called upon to fight because they are the more physically fit, more durable, more readily molded to a pattern, and generally (not always, of course) have less of life's responsibilities to leave at home.

Some day, God granting, we may replace war and violence and greed with reason. Some day we may eliminate the poverty and ill health and ignorance in the world and even then there will be teen agers good, bad

and indifferent as there will be parents of the same pattern.

Teenagers are at a critical period of their young lives where the transition from adolescence to maturity is taking place. It is a confusing time at best. A time of adjustment and of seeking direction. It is not a time to make earth shaking decisions outside their own sphere.

At eighteen young men should be in school, and an increasing majority are wisely taking advantage of the opportunity to prepare for a better job and a better future through education.

If eighteen is the beginning period for higher education and preparation for the future, it is then the age before earning a livelihood, raising a family, pursuing a career, buying a home, paying taxes. Then it is the waiting period—the probationary time just before assuming all of the responsibilities one is to be called on to accept.

If most eighteen year olds are not established in the careers of a life time, if they are not permanently members of the work force, if in fact at this time they are producing nothing, adding nothing to the payment of government cost and they are to vote, they will be overriding the will of those who make their education possible.

A teenager in this chaotic world of the 20th century has enough problems of adjustment without being subject to the pressures exerted by vote seeking politicians who dangle the baubles of something for nothing before the eyes of the unsuspecting, the gullible, and the inexperienced.

Our teenagers are the most advanced and sophisticated in the world. They are the equal or superior to their counterpart in other nations, but they are still teenagers and a few years will mellow their thinking, sharpen their wit, and condition them to make decisions tempered by experience and maturity.

STAND AGAINST RACISM APPLAUDED

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in this time of continuing unrest among the minorities of our country to finally gain full rights of citizenship in our land, it is important that the press do its share in combating racism of every kind.

I would like to share with you an editorial which appeared in the June 20, 1968, edition of the Sun, supplement to the San Antonio News-Express:

STAND AGAINST RACISM APPLAUDED

Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez' stand against racism in any form, at a crucial time in the history of the United States and the world as well, is most commendable.

To kindle the divisive fire of racism, whether for personal or political gain is criminal in the face of the dangers facing this nation.

We stand behind Congressman Gonzalez in his efforts for unity and condemnation of racial intolerance, which allowed to persist could present an unsurmountable problem to the United States.

Racism in reverse by those who themselves feel they have been victims of that ill is certainly not the answer to the problem, but rather a search for a formula through which all ethnic groups which have contributed to this nation's greatness may live in peace and harmony.

We urge for a spirit of goodwill and understanding among all Americans, because

only through unity can we remain as the stalwart defenders of the basic freedoms of man.

VIETNAM CLAIMS LIVES OF THREE MARYLANDERS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. James L. Jennings, Pfc. Bernard J. Snead, Jr. and Sp4c. Dallas A. West, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE FROM STATE DIE IN VIETNAM WAR

Two Baltimoreans and an Edgewater (Md.) youth have died in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Pfc. James L. Jennings, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jacob E. Jennings, of 521 North Calhoun street.

Pfc. Bernard J. Snead, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard J. Snead, of 3904 Cranston avenue.

Spec. 4 Dallas A. West, son of Mr. and Mrs. George H. West, of Route 3, Edgewater, Md. Private West, who was 20, died June 13 from wounds he received while on a patrol several days earlier.

He was graduated from Edmondson High School in June, 1966, and was drafted into the Army in November, 1967. After basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., he was sent to Vietnam in April.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Edward and Graham Jennings; and five sisters, Mary L. Jennings, Flora Jennings, Barbara Jennings, Yvonne Jennings and Delores Jennings, all of Baltimore.

MACHINEGUNNERS

Private Snead, who was 21, had been in Vietnam since November, 1967, and was a squad leader and machine gunner assigned to A Company, 1st Battalion, 4th Marine Division.

He was killed June 11 when he stepped on a land mine while on patrol in Quang Tri province.

According to his mother, Mrs. Christine Snead, her son was told by his company commander just a few days before he was killed that he would be promoted to lance corporal.

A native of Baltimore, he also was a graduate of Edmondson High School, where he played varsity soccer for two years. He had enlisted in the Marines several months after his graduation in June, 1966.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Anthony and Milton Snead, and three sisters, Mildred Snead, Casandra Snead and Mrs. Bernadine Whitehead, all of Baltimore.

Specialist West, who was 20, was killed while on patrol less than two months before he was scheduled to leave Vietnam.

He had enlisted in the Army a month after he was graduated from Annapolis High School in June 1966, and was sent to Vietnam in August, 1967.

WAS A RIFLEMAN

He was a rifleman assigned to the 25th Army Division.

Born in Pine Forest, Fla., he moved to Edgewater when he was a youngster.

In letters home to his parents, he wrote that he was very disturbed over the burning

of draft cards and was distressed about the death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Besides his parents, he is survived by eight brothers, George H. West, Jr., of Edgewater; Robert F. West, of Dayton, Ohio; Merle T. West, of Buffalo; M.Sgt. Donald F. West, stationed at Fort Bragg; Daniel J. West, of Youngstown, Ohio; Martin West, of Edgewater; Airman 1c. David L. West, stationed in Orlando, Fla., and Melvin D. West, of Hyattsville, Md.; a sister, Mrs. Delia R. Davis, of Edgewater; and two half-sisters, Mrs. Betty Wright, of Kayjon, Cal., and Mrs. Florence C. Morrison, of Sharpsville, Pa.

IMPORTS AND OUR STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government negotiators did not adequately serve the United States in the years of negotiations which have produced tariff adjustments. As a result, there are clearly visible adverse impacts on the American economy. One major industry which faces complications from foreign sources and which was unfortunately ignored by our governmental tariff negotiators is the steel industry.

In the fifties, steel imports from foreign nations ranged in the 1- to 2-million-ton level annually. The trend changed in 1959 and the steady increase started. Students of international trade were shocked in 1965 when, for the first time in our history, imports for a single year exceeded 10 million tons.

But, as events subsequently proved, even this high figure was not to be the ceiling. In 1966, imports increased again, this time to nearly 11 million tons. In 1967, they rose to 11½ million tons.

Where are they now? Figures that once we thought of only as an annual volume are now used to describe monthly inflow. An all-time monthly record of 1½ million tons of foreign steel came into this country last November. December, January, February, and March each had more than 1 million tons of steel imports. These are the cold weather months when the Great Lakes freeze over; the St. Lawrence Seaway shuts down, and imports are supposed to fall. But now the pipelines of steel from abroad are so swollen that they continued to flood our shores in the winter months.

The latest blow may be found in Commerce's April figures—a new, all-time record of 1,480,000 tons. Do we realize how much steel this is? In the decade prior to 1959 when the current trend started, the imports for only three full years exceeded the total that came into this country in April alone.

In the first 4 months of this year, nearly 5 million tons of foreign steel has come into the United States. This is a new record. It represents an increase of 50 percent over imports for the similar period of last year. Trade sources estimate that foreign steel will continue to come in

at this rate, at least, through the balance of this year. Consequently, imports for the full year of 1968 should total at least 15 million tons, also a record.

There are those who argue that our Government should not interfere in this trade because any steps to impede the flow of foreign steel into our land is "protectionist" and would only cause retaliation among foreign countries. I say look at the rules of international trade. Examine the reasons why this foreign steel can so easily compete in our land with our product. Examine the help that foreign steel companies get from their own governments. Examine the openness of foreign markets to our products. Examine the policies of foreign nations in their relationship to acquiring dollars and what they must do to get them.

If the import groups that argue in our land for free trade would first establish free entry into their own lands, if their companies would operate as independently of government help as ours do, if their steel companies would abide by the same minimum wage standards for interstate commerce that our companies do, then we could compete with them.

However, the way the game is now rigged, our international balance of trade in steel costs us a deficit of more than a billion dollars last year. It may cost us a billion and a half this year. This country has too many responsibilities throughout the world as well as at home to tolerate deficits of this nature indefinitely. They threaten our economy; they threaten our national defense; and they threaten the future of many of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the points I have emphasized, it is obvious that Congress, and more specifically, the Ways and Means Committee, must give priority to the problems affecting the steel industry and other areas. It is obvious that the administrators will do nothing.

I recognize that this session of Congress is entering its final 5 weeks and if Congress is to provide the necessary legislation, we must move without delay. "Free trade" is a wonderful theory to which I prescribe to in principle. However, we as a Nation should not place our major industries in a position where artificial factors give foreign competition visible advantages. American industrial capacity is a cornerstone of our national greatness. American wage earners, consumers, investors and, in fact, all citizens have a vital stake in maintaining an economic situation within which our major industries such as steel can honestly compete.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 154th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

PROPOSED BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON NATO REFORM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the NATO ministers meet today in Iceland it is timely to call attention to a proposal for basic reform of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Anticipating this meeting, the House Republican Task Force on Western Alliances, of which I am chairman, issued a statement expressing "bitter disappointment" with the much-heralded "Harmel exercise" and calling for a "blue ribbon commission" apart from the existing North Atlantic Treaty Organization to help organize an international conference on NATO problems.

Members of the task force joining me in sponsoring the statement are: Representatives BURKE, CRAMER, ESCH, HALPERN, LLOYD, PIRNIE, ROTH, WHALEN, and WINN. The text of the statement follows:

STATEMENT ON A BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON NATO REFORM

Beset by domestic turmoil, the nations of NATO forget their long-and-widely-recognized interdependence, and fail to deal effectively with common problems. Local disorder is turning inward the concern of the people and their national governments.

The British are struggling to recover financial stability. Massive strikes and student rebellion have shaken France. Germans, threatened with a new Berlin crisis, are troubled in trying to reconcile increasing need for national self-defense with past history of its misuse. The long-accepted accommodation between the center and left-leaning parties in Italy is coming apart. Violent crimes, riots, and costly stalemate in Vietnam have caused deep divisions in the United States. Greece is struggling to maintain democratic traditions. Other members openly question the usefulness of NATO.

Meanwhile some areas of Eastern Europe are becoming more independent of Moscow and thus better able to reciprocate to attractive initiatives from a united West.

The once-hopeful Harmel Exercise—NATO's self-examination undertaken by its Council a year and a half ago—has proven a bitter disappointment.

Proposed by Pierre Harmel, the Belgian Foreign Minister, in the aftermath of French withdrawal from NATO's US dominated military command, this study recommended significant change.

Heralded as a blueprint to alter the basic nature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and reform the alliance to face new diplomatic tasks foreseen for the nineteen seventies, the exercise has proved to be almost totally unproductive.

The study had originally proposed that: (1) The Alliance should play a role in the effort to improve relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe; (2) The Atlantic Community, a result of the Alliance, should take concerted policy stands on crises in other parts of the world; and (3) The Alliance should have responsibility as a unit, not just as individual governments, for coordinating traffic in science and technology across the Atlantic, for developing effective methods of arms control, including the sale of arms to other countries, and finally for organizing military and economic aid to developing countries on a multilateral basis.

It could have been the most penetrating analysis of political and economic change

in the North Atlantic and Europe ever attempted under official auspices.

It could have led to specific action on Western trading policy toward the East, German reunification, NATO-Warsaw pact-to-pact negotiations, a North Atlantic parliament, and specific exploratory steps to test the thesis of North Atlantic political integration.

Instead, the response by NATO Ministers on the Harmel Exercise was a bitter disappointment.

While they extended the goals of the Alliance to include East-West detente, the role of the Alliance in this was limited to a "forum and clearing house for the exchange of information and views."

While recognizing the need to concert policy on "crises and conflicts arising outside the (treaty) area", they did not provide—nor even propose—a role for the Alliance in this. No mention was made of coordinating science and technology, controlling the sale of arms to other countries or organizing multilateral military and economic aid to developing countries.

Even NATO's usually-optimistic Secretary General Manlio Brosio expressed disappointment in the outcome when, in an analysis of the report, he said "There is nothing spectacular in it, nothing unforeseen. . . ." He said it was important primarily because it was adopted by all fifteen allies in spite of "substantial disagreements" and even a "potential crisis" in the course of the study. As if in mitigation of this, he observed that in the end everybody agreed that the "Alliance is a dynamic and vigorous organization which is constantly adapting itself to changing conditions".

It is timely, then, for those disappointed in the outcome of the Harmel Exercise to propose a new initiative for a stronger structure not merely for defense but also for the advancement of individual freedom.

Accordingly, we propose that the President, in consultation with the Congress, appoint a blue-ribbon commission to help organize an international conference of the NATO nations apart from the existing North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The conference would hopefully develop recommendations dealing with:

1. The fundamental mission of NATO, including its possible enlargement both as to membership and purpose. From time to time, several nations and areas have been suggested for consideration. As to purpose, it might be expanded to include co-ordination of global foreign policies of its members; technological cooperation in fields such as communication, computerization, space, oceanography; cooperation in monetary systems, aid to under-developed nations, and cultural affairs; and the liberalization of trade among Western nations and coordination of their trade with the Communist nations.

2. The reform of NATO by giving official status to the North Atlantic Assembly with specific responsibility in alliance affairs, and by establishing a tribunal for the adjudication of disputes which may arise from Alliance projects.

3. The reunification of Germany.

4. Adjustment and settlement of World War I debts—including the matter of German reparations.

5. The reconciliation of France with the Alliance, and full coordination of its strategic military forces with those of NATO.

These recommendations would require thorough preparation including:

1. Evaluation of studies of threats, including that of Communism, to individual freedom throughout the world and of methods to counter these threats. This would necessarily include problems like the struggle in Vietnam.

2. Evaluation of studies of past and future development of nuclear weapons, existing and proposed treaties concerning nuclear

weapons, and the proposed development of antiballistic missile systems, and the future implications of these.

3. Study of overlap and conflict of purpose of the numerous institutions already established to coordinate the defense, economies and foreign relations of free nations. Examples are not difficult to cite: NATO and the Western European Union are in part redundant and contradictory; the latter relies on the former for most of its functions and complicates everything by considering Germany half ally and half enemy. Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty lies idle while OECD halfheartedly attempts to carry out similar provisions. The Council of Europe which includes almost all the nations of the Common Market and the European Free Trade Area is impotent in the face of the essentially-competitive purposes of these two organizations.

4. Studies of the attitudes of the leaders and the public of these nations toward long-and-widely-advocated reforms of international political structure. It is a paradox that many leaders in many of the free nations have long advocated such reforms with little result.

Several years have elapsed since statesmen and scholars began warning us that NATO must be more than a military alliance. Some faltering steps have been taken but far from adequate to keep up with the changing environment.

Domestic fiscal problems are bringing insistent demands for U.S. troop reduction. The effect of such reduction would not be adverse if accompanied by basic reform of NATO's purpose and functions.

In these circumstances, a passive or do-nothing attitude on the part of the U.S. would be tragic.

WHAT JIM LUCAS TOLD CONGRESS ABOUT VIETNAM

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the July 1968 issue of the American Legion magazine, there is an article entitled "What Jim Lucas Told Congress About Vietnam." This is a most informative article which gives new insights into our situation in Vietnam.

While in Vietnam last year, it was my privilege to be associated with Jim Lucas as we went about some of the combat areas. I am convinced that he is one of our finest newspapermen, and that through his work as a war correspondent over a period of years he is an excellent appraiser of our situation. Jim Lucas has rendered many outstanding services of value to our Nation. His appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee is another of those services.

I make the article a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT JIM LUCAS TOLD CONGRESS ABOUT VIETNAM

(Congressional hearings are seldom read by the general public. Sometimes we learn only a minor point, blown up for sensationalism. Here, condensed slightly for our space, and edited to avoid repetition, is the testimony of Scripps Howard Correspondent Jim Lucas before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Subject: Vietnam. Time: March 14, 1968, after the Tet offensive, while Khe San was still besieged.)

Mr. Jim G. Lucas, witness, Vietnam is a matter about which I feel very strongly and which has divided our country more than it has ever been divided in my memory.

I suppose there were these divisions in past wars—the Mexican War and in the War Between the States. In World War II and Korea there was not this clash of American against American. And that is the most distressing part of it. Even in our office there are reporters that I have been very friendly with in the past, and I would say that our relationship is considerably strained because we have taken opposite sides.

I spent almost 4 years in Vietnam. I went out in 1964, in January. I was home several times during that time, so I would say I spent three and a half of the past four years there. I would like to go back. As I told my editor the other day, I get along much better with editors when they are 10,000 miles away.

That is one reason. And again because I feel a deep involvement on a personal level with the fighting men. Last fall I went aboard the U.S.S. *Hancock*, a carrier in the Gulf of Tonkin. We were met by the skipper, a four-striper. When we got where we could talk, he asked: "Are you the Jim Lucas who used to be in Tulsa, Okla.?" I said, "Yes, I am." He said, "Did you have a Scout troop at the Boston Avenue Methodist Church?" I said, "Yes, I did." He said, "I am sure you do not remember, but I was in your troop."

I felt like I was 900 years old all of a sudden. But it did pay dividends. The others with me were stacked in one stateroom in double-decker bunks, and I got the admiral's cabin. These other guys said, "Well; how in the hell did you rate a thing like that?" I replied, "Simple, I was the Skipper's scoutmaster."

Vietnam has divided this country. I do not understand the division. I guess I am too simplistic. To me the issues are so crystal clear that I find it puzzling that there could be these doubts. Yet, I know they exist.

The soundest advice we have had in a long time came the other day from the President when he cautioned us not to give way to our own despair. In all candor, events since January 30, the beginning of Tet, has caused me to despair.

That particular evening I was in Cincinnati, speaking to the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, and I told them that I felt the war was going very well for our side militarily, that there were a great number of pluses, that I was optimistic about the outcome. I went to a reception later at one of the television stations and the story of what was happening in Saigon, the attacks on Saigon, Da Nang, Hue, began to unfold. These people turned on me and asked, "How can you justify what you said in view of what is happening?"

I couldn't. I didn't know what was happening. These people being killed, threatened with being killed, were my friends. I was distressed about it.

But I think now I can see this thing in some degree of perspective. What is happening in Vietnam today [March 14, 1968] is not blitzkrieg; it is kamikaze—a desperation move on their part. They have taken tremendous losses. I am convinced that they decided, in effect, that General Westmoreland is right, that they cannot afford to fight for the next 2 years in the countryside and be chewed up and be decimated, that they had to go for broke; that they had to throw in their chips, and they had to risk a frontal attack on the cities and to come out and meet us in what amounts to conventional warfare.

Now, it is going to be confused for awhile and the press plays a great part in this confusion. But if these people do want to come out and meet us conventionally, this is what we have been asking of them for 4 years. I

do not presume to be prophetic, but I believe that the next several months could bring us much closer to victory than we would have had had we gone on fighting the other man by his rules, going out and searching for him as we have for the past three or four years.

To that extent, I am encouraged. Obviously, we took a tremendous pasting during Tet. And we have tried to gloss over some of those losses. Perhaps the most severe blow was struck at public confidence here in South Vietnam. The pacification program was shattered. Cities were laid waste. Mytho, which was a beautiful city—I have been there many times—two-thirds destroyed, I am told. Hue is not really as badly shattered as we are led to believe. The Citadel, which is the older part of the city, has been pretty badly wrecked, but where the university is, that is relatively untouched. These things have cost us in the international arena. Our stock has gone down. It is humiliating that we could be caught off guard, that this thing could happen.

But there are pluses. They are going to come out and meet us and this is what we want. They have got to. They cannot take the losses they have taken in this war of attrition over the years. From their point of view, I think it is the most un-Giap thing that Giap [North Vietnam Commander] has ever done. This contradicts everything that he has written and believed in. He would not have done it if he had not been desperate.

Now, they went into the cities, I am convinced, on three assumptions. One, that they could take the cities. They had hidden in Saigon—and we had known this for a long time—this elite cadre. We did not know who they were. They were disguised. A doctor or a lawyer was the commander of a battalion; and streetsweepers and busdrivers and taxi drivers and desk clerks. We did not know who they were, but we knew this elite cadre was there being husbanded for the moment of truth, whenever they decided to bring it out.

So they went into the cities convinced that they could take and hold.

They were absolutely convinced that the people and the army would rally to them, that the army was so infiltrated that it would come over. And they were convinced the government would topple and they could establish a coalition government headed by Big Minh, now in exile in Thailand.

None of these things happened. They spent half of this elite cadre. They did not take the cities. They held Hue, parts of it, for 25 days. But they did not get into Da Nang, and they threw a whole division, the 2d, against Da Nang. They mortared I Corps Headquarters, but with this whole division they could not get in.

They did not take the cities. The people did not come over to them. The people streamed out of the areas held by the Vietcong as fast as they could get out. Not one [South Vietnamese] unit in the army of even squad size defected. If it was riddled with dissatisfaction, this was the time it would have gone. Professor Schlesinger now predicts that whole divisions are going to [go] over. The moment to have gone over has passed. This was the time they would have gone, if they were going.

And they did not, of course, topple the government. None of the things they hoped for happened. They spent 31,000 dead in this futile assault, and they had nothing to show for it.

What has happened since then? I talked to General Walt last night. He had just talked with General Cushman, who is on the scene.

Quang Ngai and Da Nang are 100 percent back to normal. All the schools are open; the revolutionary development teams are back in the hamlets. Quang Tri, the northernmost province, which the North Vietnamese claim they have annexed, Quang Tri is 50 percent

of the normal. Fifty percent of the schools are open. Fifty percent of the revolutionary development teams are back out in the hamlets.

Hue is still a problem. Hue has always been a problem. It is as different from the rest of Vietnam as Washington is from the rest of the United States. Hue is 15 percent back to normal, which is much better than we are led to believe. Route 1 is open from Da Nang to Dong Ha. General Cushman said the trucks are going up there bumper to bumper. It looks like a superhighway. This is a tremendous logistic improvement. And they are not being interfered with.

And here is an interesting development. As the revolutionary development teams go back into the hamlets, at least in I Corps, they are unopposed. The local guerrillas were pulled out to fight in the cities, and they were destroyed. So, in many areas where there was heavy fighting, and a heavy concentration of guerrillas, there is just no Vietcong any more.

Khe Sanh is where they are supposed to meet us. I do not think they are going to meet us there now. I do not think they can. Khe Sanh is hell on earth but not 24 hours a day. In the past 10 days 322 planes have gone into Khe Sanh. Of that 322, 26 were fired at. Of those, eight were hit. And of those eight hit, three were destroyed or damaged to the extent they had to be taken out for repairs. This is not the sort of picture I have been getting listening to the television.

I do not watch much television any more. I get too mad. I lose my temper.

We have gone back on the counteroffensive. At least in I Corps I know we have, and I think we are going to—we can—elsewhere.

Perhaps the greatest boon out of this Tet offensive is that they hit during Tet. It is difficult to describe to an American what Tet means. It is Christmas, Thanksgiving, Easter, the Fourth of July, Memorial Day, all of these things wrapped up into one week. It has always been observed.

The first year I was there I could not understand. A cease-fire during an active war? But as I got to know these people I began to understand that you had no alternative.

I remember the first year I was in the delta the only offensive action taken was the Vietcong capture of a barge on the Bassac River. But it was a barge full of beer. They needed it to celebrate Tet. To have violated Tet is the ultimate in sacrilege. It is a mark of desperate men.

Another plus, I think, is that Saigon, which has been an island of peace and tranquility and black marketing in a sea of turbulence finally had the war brought to it.

This is a cruel thing to say. But I was in Korea. And twice I saw the Korean people march—shoeless, some of them—in the dead of winter from Seoul to Pusan, and come back and march out again, and come back a stronger people because of it. And I am told—I wish I were out there to make my own assessment—I am told that the people of Saigon, now having been exposed to war for the first time, are asking for guns to defend their own homes. They know now that this is a war. The government reacted. The government is frequently criticized—but it ought to get credit for the things it does. With our help, it brought in food and avoided disorder and famine. It brought in medicine, and there was no plague. It is now distributing cement to the people to start rebuilding their homes. These are constructive actions. I think the government is stronger for having undergone this ordeal. This testing under fire. I hope that the Vietnamese people measure up.

As a member of the press I confess that we have not been fair to either the South Vietnamese government or its army.

Now, the South Vietnamese Army was in a holiday mood when this Tet attack occurred. By our standards, that is inexcusable. By their standards it was normal, and expected, and the other guy broke the rules.

But even in that condition of standdown, there were battalions which were all at full strength. Even at that state of standdown, they took 10,000 casualties, 4,000 of whom were dead. This is not the mark of an army that will not fight. Their casualties throughout this war have been substantial.

These poor devils have been at war for 20 years. They say to us, "OK, Buster, you're a charger, you're hot to trot, but you are going home in 13 months. We are going to live here, we have lived this thing, so we take it at a pretty even pace."

Now, having had their cities attacked, they are mobilizing the 19-year-olds, effective March 1. They are going to mobilize the 18-year-olds, May 1. They are aiming at another 65,000 now. I think it is going to be close to 100,000.

We have not been fair to these people. I lived the last 2 years I was out there up in I Corps. I wrote absolutely nothing about the South Vietnamese Army. I did not have any circulation in South Vietnam. I wrote about Americans with hometown addresses. I knew General Lam, and I had a lot of respect for him. He had one good division and one fair division. About once every 2 months, prodded by [Marine General] Lew Walt, I would check to see what they had done. And I would learn that the South Vietnamese Army had won five, six, seven, or eight pretty substantial victories. But nobody had written anything about them. So the impression grows that the South Vietnamese Army is no damned good.

I am asked, "How can the North Vietnamese be so much better motivated than our people?" In the first place, they aren't. They are not 7 feet tall. They put their trousers on one leg at a time like anybody else. South Vietnam's defection rate is going down and theirs is going up. They are sending four men south for every man they intend to use. One to defect, one to be killed en route, one to succumb to malnutrition and, finally, one to engage. They don't have inexhaustible reserves of manpower. The last time I checked at the Pentagon, I was told they could muster, other than those they now have in combat, four divisions. I understand they have sent two of those down to Khe Sanh. So they are in pretty bad shape.

Back to Khe Sanh. They have not been able to launch this attack on Khe Sanh because we are pouring more bombs and artillery and naval gunfire into that area than has ever been poured on any area in the history of mankind. They cannot mass. They have to stay underground. And you cannot fight underground. They have their problems.

The difference is [the Communists] have prepared for war single mindedly for the past 15 years. Our people [South Vietnamese] have not. They have been playing politics and making love and making money and all of these things that free people do. The Communists up north have known what their goal is and that is to take over in South Vietnam.

We are catching up with them. There are more good units in the South Vietnamese Army than when I went out there in 1964. Not a lot, but some.

The Gallup poll said yesterday—and this is a phony proposition—that as we conscripted 100,000 South Vietnamese, we should take out 100,000 Americans, so that at the end of the year all Americans could be replaced by South Vietnamese. And a big majority of Americans said "Amen."

This is one of those things that reads good but just will not work. Where are you

going to get your leaders for 100,000 South Vietnamese? You don't just file a requisition with the quartermaster. You have to develop leadership. I say again the French left them nothing. They even took the light fixtures and plumbing out of the national palaces when they left. You have to develop leadership. We have got to unteach a lot of things that they learned from the French.

We got rid of a couple of very lousy corps commanders the other day. The government is now appointing the province chiefs direct from Saigon rather than let these corps commanders act like warlords. So these improvements are being made.

True, you can get awfully discouraged with the Vietnamese. But it is not surprising that they make mistakes. What is important is that they keep trying. You knock them down and they get up again.

Now, I am not trying to say that everybody in South Vietnam is a patriot, or gets a flutter in his heart when that flag goes by. I have been in areas where Saigon was as far away as Washington. The only authority those people recognized was the head of the household—or maybe the village chief. But there are those areas all over Asia. I know there are enough [South] Vietnamese who know what they want to do with and for their country to make this effort of ours worth while.

We are trying to help these people do in one generation what we have accomplished in this country in four or five: build a government, a business community, a school system, police force, army, all of these things. It is going to take time. They are trying to do this while fighting for their very existence.

The enemy assassinates close to 3,000 local officials every year. I would not be a school-teacher in South Vietnam. I do not have that kind of guts. When you become a school-teacher, you sign your own death warrant. And not only yours, but the death warrant of your wife and kids. I heard an old gal on television the other day, and she said she is a Gandhian, whatever that is. She had been in Hanoi and apparently our bombs hit nobody but women and children. Someone asked her, "Well, do you not also feel very badly about the terror and assassination in South Vietnam?" She said, "Oh, they are public officials," as if that makes some kind of difference. It may to a Gandhian. As [former Defense] Secretary McNamara said, it is as if every State in the Union would have two Governors a year and both of those men would be assassinated in office. How can they function when the Communists are killing off their functionaries? And these people say they want reunion with their brothers in the south.

The South Vietnamese are doing a good job. When I get blue I tell myself that everything we are saying about the South Vietnamese today we said about the South Koreans 15 years ago. And they turned out pretty good.

You talk to your Vietnamese friends, and they tell you about their grievances. They say we have brought inflation. And we have. General Westmoreland has done a yeoman-like job trying to curb it. But, when you pour that much money and men with cash in their pockets into a country with limited resources, you upset the economy. They say we have corrupted their youth. Particularly in Saigon, boys become pimps and black marketeers, and girls become prostitutes and bar girls. They are Buddhists and we are not. Our outlooks are different. We aren't even the same size. The average Vietnamese male weighs 110 pounds and is under five feet tall. We are giants by comparison, so he has an inferiority complex around us.

So they enumerate their grievances, and you agree they are right. So you ask, "What do you want us to do? Get out?" They look

at you like you are crazy. "Good God, no. There would be a bloodbath like the world has never known."

I was in Hanoi [back] when Ho Chi Minh marched in. I was there covering that [French] war. And over a million people voted with their feet to get out of there and those who stayed had a pretty rough time.

One of the fallacies of this war is that a lot of people believe that the South Vietnamese really want the Vietcong. I don't believe that. Last fall, outside Da Nang and Hoi An, the Marines ran an operation in an area which had been under enemy control—first Vietminh, then Vietcong—for many years. We had never tried to go into this very fertile, rich valley. Because we came in with a whole regiment, the Reds did not stay and fight. They got out. They went back into the hills. Because they got out, they took their boot heel off the necks of these people.

I was with a Marine company that went into a little hamlet I found out later had 283 families. The old village patriarch, with the scraggly beard, fell down on his knees in front of this young Marine captain. He said, "When you come out, take us with you." The captain didn't know what to do. Nothing taught him at Quantico covered a situation like this. So he got on the horn and called battalion, battalion called regiment, regiment called division; I am sure it went back to Saigon, maybe Washington, and late that afternoon a message came through, "Anybody that wants to come out, you bring them." To make a long story short, these 283 families burned their homes and marched out with us. For a Vietnamese to burn his own home, this is a traumatic experience. It is a hell of a thing. That little plot of ground has been in his family for generations. His ancestors are buried there. Back at Hoi An, Al Francis, the American consul at Da Nang, the direct antithesis of any concept of a cookie pusher—spoke fluent Vietnamese. He went out among them. "Mac" he said, "why did you do a thing like this? It makes no sense to me. It is crazy; you are out of your mind." They said, "We had to. These people were taxing us out of existence. They were taking 75 percent of our rice and everything else we earned and they had taken all of our boys over 14 years of age and gone away with them. We don't know where they took them. They are just gone. If we do not come out with you, we would never be free." This was between Hoi An and Da Nang. It was Operation Mississippi. I know in that area the people do not want to have anything to do with the Vietcong.

There are a lot of other facets of this thing I could talk about but I am going to close for questions. I just want to tell you that I am convinced that the average American GI has a close identification with the Vietnamese people. Most of them feel as I do. [Look at] the civic action program for which General Walt can take full credit, because he believed in it from the start. You will see these kids out one day on ambush or patrol and the next day they are digging wells or building a schoolhouse or clearing the road to the market, doing all of these things, and the have become very close—they have Vietnamese friends. It is a canard, it is a lie, it is a brutal thing for men [here at home] to claim that these boys of ours are over there deliberately mowing people down for the sheer sadistic hell of it because they like to see people bleed.

This is just not true. In no war in history has a power with the force that we have at our disposal conducted itself as we have. War is a brutal exercise. It is the worst of man's inhumanity to man. But we have exercised restraint often to our own detriment. at the cost of our own lives. This charge is

is not true. I do not like to see these kids of ours maligned that way.

Senator THOMAS DODD, Connecticut, vice chairman. Maybe the other Senators would like to ask some questions.

Senator STROM THURMOND, South Carolina. There is no question in my mind that this is not a war between the north and the south. This is not a regional war, but this is a war between the Communists and the free world because the Soviets are backing it, Red China is backing it, and without the supplies they get they could not keep this up. They just could not last, I am sure you will agree.

And why is it that our news media in this country cannot get over to our people that fact and that we are there not just to save the South Vietnamese, which would be a noble thing to do, but we are there in our own national interest? And if we got out of there, or if we lose there, before you know it, they would be up to the beaches of Hawaii. If they are not stopped in Vietnam, you are going to have to fight again. They will have to be stopped somewhere else. The goal of the Soviets has not changed so far as I have been able to learn. Why cannot our news media put over to the American citizens the true picture instead of every time some little incident comes up like this fellow who had two members of his family killed and then they caught this Vietcong who did it; he was shot down. Well they played that up tremendously to show how brutal the South Vietnamese generals and soldiers were to prisoners they took.

Now, they play up that kind of a thing [and play down] the terrible atrocities of assassinating 3,000 officials a year. They have assassinated 40,000 to 50,000 officials in the last few years, local officials, village chiefs and others. Is there any way that you can think that our news media can put over this true picture to the American people?

Could I be wrong? Or just what is the situation?

The truth is what the people are looking for, and that is what we all are looking for. Why is it the news media, the television networks seem to all go the other way? The New York Times and the Washington Post, St. Louis Post Dispatch, the big newspapers seem to go the other way; why is that? Are they not for America first? Why are they trying to downgrade our country? I mean what is the purpose in that? I would be glad to hear you on that a little bit.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a question I have asked myself many times, Senator: "Am I wrong on this because I see so many people who take an opposite point of view?" I do not think I am wrong.

There is no monolith known as the press or the media. I work for Scripps-Howard, this guy works for CBS, and this one for the Times. In some cases, it is a mechanical problem. You mentioned the case where General Luan executed the killer on the streets of Saigon—in the heat of emotion. A photographer, Eddie Adams, was there. He took the picture, and he should. But what we forget is that he was there because the South Vietnamese let him be there. The U.S. accredited press can photograph the things we do. If you went over to the other side—unless you were French—and tried to photograph the same thing, you would be shot. How about the young American Army officer who wandered into the wrong street, was arrested, "tried" on the spot, and shot—all in three minutes' time?

The press, I like to think, is representative of this country. If the country is divided, the press is divided. There are those in the press corps who do not see it as you and I see it. They do not think we have any right to be there. They do not believe the domino theory, which I think is still valid, which

President Kennedy thought was valid, and President Johnson thinks is valid. Some just are not on our side. If I have any recommendations to make to this committee, I would suggest that you take a hard look at some of the accreditation procedures of the Pentagon, because they do not require much to get out there. I would particularly apply this to reporters from other countries who are assigned to our forces, who are entitled to access to classified information, some of whom actually go back and forth between the lines.

We are not required to give this consideration to people like that.

A lot of our reporters are young. They are trying to make a name for themselves. Covering a war is a lot different from covering a courthouse or a city hall. I call them go-go boys. And some of the go-go boys don't give a damn how many lives they cost if they can launch a successful career. Not a lot, but some are like that.

And finally, early in this war, the wires and the networks were trying to cover it on the cheap. They hired whoever they could get, anyone who could type, the beachcombers. Many were of other nationalities. The wires and the nets [networks] didn't even have to pay the guild scale. Professionally, some turned out well. They were good reporters. They had contacts. They know the country now after four or five years in the field. But some simply do not like us. They make no bones about it. They are not on our side.

I do not believe we should demand that a reporter be prejudiced in our favor. But we have every right to insist that he not be prejudiced against us. Some are openly and flagrantly hostile. I am thinking right now of a couple I have never heard say "we" about anything. It is always "You." "You Americans did this. You bloody Americans did this, that, or the other thing."

As for the press ever policing itself, we are far too competitive for that.

Senator THURMOND. Pardon?

Mr. LUCAS. As for the press ever regulating itself, that is out of the question. We are far too competitive to ever do that.

Senator HIRAM FONG, Hawaii. This buildup at Khe Sanh, do you think that they are not ready to fight in Khe Sanh?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the time has passed, Senator Fong. If they were going to do it at all, they should have done it at least three weeks, maybe four weeks ago. They have not been able to. They made a couple of attempts to get—

Senator FONG. You think our bombing has really helped?

Mr. LUCAS. It has pinned them down. They cannot mass. We cannot really assess the damage we have done, but we know it has been considerable. Beginning tomorrow, theoretically, the weather turns in our favor. Within another three weeks it is going to be wholly in our favor.

Senator FONG. Do you think the primary intent was really to engage us there?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I think so. Khe Sanh is a thorn in their side. It sits astride the Ho Chi Minh trail. They can go around. But this is more difficult.

Yes, I think they fully intended to. They have had Giap down there commanding it, and they would not bring in the star unless they really intended to stage a production.

Senator FONG. So you feel, then, that this offensive, this Tet offensive and the present activities around the cities, is primarily to weaken the home front?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, they hoped for a general uprising.

Senator FONG. Well, they have not done that.

Mr. LUCAS. That did not happen.

Senator FONG. They hoped to do that so that it would weaken us at home?

Mr. LUCAS. Let's not say they hoped to. They are doing it. They are weakening us at home. Congress testifies to that daily. Two years ago, something like 78 percent—maybe that isn't the precise figure—of the American people were for us. Today, I don't think you would find 30 percent who are backing the war effort all out. I keep asking myself, "What has happened?"

Has the nature of the war changed? No. It has not changed substantially.

Has the enemy changed? No. He is the same guy he was two years ago.

Have our goals changed? Our goals remained substantially the same.

Have the American people sat down and realistically reappraised our position, and objectively, arrived at a new conclusion? Knowing my fellow countrymen, I doubt that.

What has happened is that it has begun to pinch us, to disaccommodate us. It makes us uncomfortable. Of course, we still have two cars in every garage. We are eating better—most of us—than anyone else in the world. We are stronger and we will live longer. But it annoys us.

I don't know. I don't have as much respect for my fellow countrymen as I once did.

Senator FONG. If we on the homefront are firm in our resolve, do you think that within the next four or five weeks something very, very noticeable will evolve out of this?

Mr. LUCAS. I think something very dramatic could happen even if we are not firm in our resolve back here.¹

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE, chief counsel. Would you associate this [attacks on the cities] with the Battle of the Bulge? [i.e.: A last gasp offensive.]

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is very apt. I believe that is what is happening.

Mr. SOURWINE. I should like to ask about the situation of the Marines who are dug in. This question is prompted by the remarks of a young Marine I know who just got back from Vietnam after being quite severely wounded. He capsuled his own training, which was long and tough and designed to make him a part of a crack assault team. Then he said: "Now they have these men in trenches, they are just sitting there waiting for Charlie to dump mortar shells on them. It is a great waste of the best shock troops in the world. Marines can't fight this way." What is your comment on this?

Mr. LUCAS. This has caused a great deal of concern. As an ex-Marine, I am concerned. This is something they have never done before. I think, with our flexibility, we have been able to adjust remarkably well. This has worried General Greene and, I am sure, General Chapman. Now that we are moving an Army division up there—we have a multi-division reserve just back of Khe Sanh now—I would hope that the Marines can go back to their old pursuits.²

Mr. SOURWINE. This might be a foolish question because I am not a military man, but we do have a good many more Army troops in there than we have Marines, do we not?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Could they not put the Army men in the holding position and put the Marines out on assault jobs, as attack troops, where they probably are the best in the world?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, we could. I am not a military man, either, and I would hesitate to second guess those who make the decisions. We could. But, actually, Vietnam is not as small a country as people think. It is 700 miles from one end to the other, and fighting can break out anywhere in that vast extent of territory. So we are not burdened

¹ Soon afterward North Vietnam gave its first indication of willingness to talk.

² As readers know, the siege of Marines at Khe Sanh was shortly relieved by the Army.

with a surplus, an overage of troops. We are thin, even though we do have a lot of men out there. There were areas, particularly around Hue, that General Walt and General Cushman never made any pretense at pacifying.

Senator DODD. In the Korean war we had, if I recall correctly, rather strict control, if that's the way to put it, of information and news out of the combat area, or the general area, did we not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, sir; we did. We had censorship.

Senator DODD. We were spared at that time a lot of what went on, enduring misleading information, confusing information. Do you think we ought to have more strict control over what is sent out?

Mr. LUCAS. I favor censorship, Senator Dodd. I think this is every bit as much a war as Korea was.

I have heard all sorts of objections that we couldn't do it because Vietnam is a sovereign country and we could be censoring dispatches of French and Swedes and Norwegians and Japanese, and all of that sort of tripe. But Korea was a sovereign country, and we worked it out there. These are excuses, not reasons.

If a German or a Swede or a Canadian or a Mexican or whoever, wants to come to Vietnam and cover American troops and accept an American card of accreditation, then he places himself under our jurisdiction. And if he doesn't want to, he just doesn't get a card. He can write about the civic opera or the school system, but he doesn't come around our troops.

Mr. SOURWINE. Americans don't like censorship, but Americans don't really like war, either. If you are going to fight a war, a reasonable censorship is a necessary part of it.

Mr. LUCAS. We are a competitive business. AP has a story that the AP correspondent doesn't really think he ought to file. But he isn't sure whether UPI is going to, or vice versa. And if UPI files and he doesn't, he catches hell from New York. His professional standing is questioned. His judgment is reflected upon. Maybe his job is in jeopardy. Without censorship, he is going to file it even though he may have grave doubts about it.

With censorship you know the ground rules. If the other so-and-so goes ahead and files something he shouldn't, he is going to be punished. You are in the clear.

I like censorship because once you get that stamp on copy you are clear. Then it's the censor's responsibility.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have here a copy of a letter which was sent to a Senator by a constituent, written to that constituent and his wife by their son in Vietnam. I want to ask Mr. Lucas if this is representative and ask him for his comment on it.

Senator THURMOND. I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. SOURWINE. This was written at Quinhon, Vietnam, October 20, 1967:

"A few words about Vietnam. It takes great courage on the part of people here, to take an active part in the fight for freedom from communism because—everyone who does that is marked by the Viet Cong to become a victim of their fury and vengeance. They and their families—children included—are automatically sentenced to torture and execution. Literally millions have become victims of this terrorism—going back years before we became actively involved. The United States really has no idea of the appalling extent of it. For some strange reason such facts are suppressed in the United States. Nor do visiting committees get it—they don't get around and see the families and relatives of such victims. They might just as well stay home and watch the pro-communist slanted television

for all they learn in a few days over here. I learned by talking with many people who escaped, and who bear the scars of their ordeals.

"It is unbelievable that not one such escapee has been brought to the United States to tell the facts. I wonder why.

"Now—every time there is a dove speech or demonstration, shivers of apprehension are felt by all our allies in Vietnam, for a very good reason. If we really do desert them, then they are all left to the merciless vengeance of the Viet Cong, and their only hope would be to defect to the Viet Cong and the chance of a reprieve from them.

"Once these people come to believe that we really are going to desert them, wholesale turnabouts can be expected. It would be their only chance of survival.

"It will be the same with nations as with individuals. Once these Far and Middle Eastern governments know for certain that an alliance with the U.S. will be dishonored, and that we plan to pull out on them, they would all switch to a deal with the communist powers, as the only safe thing for them to do. In such an event the U.S. would have to pull back to Pearl Harbor. No nation over here could risk the anger of their communist neighbors by allowing U.S. military bases on their territory. They would run us out—the cry, 'Yankee go home' would be enforced by military action.

"Also, this cry-baby talk about, let Vietnam do more—is the essence of asininity. Vietnam's young manhood has been almost exterminated. The girls realize it. They are all trying to snare American husbands because, they say, there are so few men left over here. The nation's economy has been wrecked by communist terrorism—farmers couldn't farm their land or [they] had their crops stolen—transportation and industry [have been] paralyzed.

The trouble with the U.S. is, we want to win our wars the easy way. It is not true that we have too much man power here. Korea has more fighting men here in Vietnam, in proportion to their population, than we do. We have far too few, they are scattered too thin. That is the reason for our heavy casualties. Well, there's no easy way to win this war. If the doves have their way—so will the communists. If we don't think enough of our freedom to fight for it—we don't deserve to keep it—and we won't keep it.

"More about the Koreans. They are dedicated anti-communists—because they have had communists in their country, and want no more of it. We have a sensitive cargo—bombs—on this ship. Ordinarily we need a couple of dozen guards aboard to supervise the unloading of such a cargo. This time we were told—no guards needed—Why? Because Koreans are discharging it and no guards are needed. They are 100% loyal to us. I wish I could say as much for our own people—even in Washington and the halls of Congress. But I cannot."

Mr. LUCAS. I think that boy is more perceptive than most. Certainly, the average American youngster out there would agree with what he says.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do our boys have that kind of commitment?

Mr. LUCAS. Most I have come in contact with do. This is the best generation of fighting men our country has ever produced. They are every bit as good as we were; and twice as smart. You sometimes wonder how these lads could have come from the same homes and streets and schools as these creeps we see back here.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lucas, we get reports or expressions of opinion that many of the North Vietnamese and many of the Vietcong, for that matter, are better equipped than

our troops are. Is there any substance to that?

Mr. LUCAS. I would doubt that, Mr. Sourwine. I think that we are better equipped in this war than we have been in any war in our history. There have been breakdowns, but these are local—the weather interfered or a requisition got fouled up.

Early in the war when we were trying to fight it with advisers and trying to pretend we weren't in there, yes, we were trying to fight it with things put together with bailing wire and chewing gum. But now we are in better shape. In fact, being Americans, we have too many troops assigned to supply. In Da Nang, where I lived, we had a huge PX that resembled a shopping center. We had an air-conditioned bowling alley and 1,000-man snack bar. We had a milk reconstituting plant that turned out cottage cheese and ice cream. All of these things are part of our desire to do the best we possibly can for our boys. They serve a real purpose because a lad can come back from the line and eat 10 hamburgers and a dozen dishes of ice cream if he wants them. But it does cause a diversion of manpower.

I can vouch for these figures, but I think 80,000—isn't that right, Senator Thurmond?—of the 525,000 men we have there now are actually engaged in combat operations.

Senator THURMOND. That's approximately right; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that an unusually high proportion of back-of-the-lines functioning?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I think it's the way we go about things. That's probably about average for us. On the other hand, now, the enemy has nothing like [we do.] They don't send their wounded home. Or didn't when I was there. They don't have a PX.

We have all of these things that we consider an essential part of our commitment to our troops. We have rest and rehabilitation in [Samoa], Hawaii, Hong Kong, wherever you want to go.

We have a postal system. I got mail four and five days from Washington. And this causes a diversion of troops, of course.

Senator THURMOND. I wouldn't take any of that away from our troops.

Senator FONG. When you say we have 5,000 troops in Khe Sanh, why do they give the figures as to how many troops we have there, and also how many enemy troops are there?

Mr. LUCAS. This is a mistake. It is one of the things censorship would obviate. Oh, there are rules. Supposedly, you can't write about an operation until there has been significant contact and we abide by that. But there are not enough rules, not enough ground rules, for the protection of the reporter and the national interest, which should come first.

I hear said this is not a declared war. Whether or not, you are just as dead as you would be in a declared war.

Senator DODD. I think Senator Fong raises an important question that bothers me. I never can understand why we keep announcing to the world—what is it, five or six thousand Marines there?

Mr. LUCAS. This is a mistake. Let the man who justifies it step forward.

Senator FONG. How many Vietnamese troops have you there?

Mr. LUCAS. In Khe Sanh?

Senator FONG. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I don't know. They have a ranger regiment, I think, but if they have more than that, I don't know.

Senator DODD. Do you think there is anything to this story I have read, and I guess we have all read it, about tunneling underground, digging, for the purpose of overwhelming Khe Sanh?

Mr. LUCAS. This is what Giap did at Dien Bien Phu [his final victory over the French]

and Glap froze in a mold after Dien Bien Phu. History begins and ends for him there. He is mesmerized. This is all he ever accomplished, really. He will try to do this in the classic Dien Bien Phu fashion.

Senator FONG. The mortaring and missing of our bases far away from the front lines, can that be stopped?

Mr. LUCAS. It is extremely difficult, Senator Fong, because these are light mortars. They can get in and out real fast. A lot of them are stopped, a lot of them are caught, but they are going to get through occasionally.

Senator THURMOND. If you could identify the enemy, you could destroy it, but, as Mr. Lucas said, the enemy is most anywhere.

Mr. LUCAS. You can go into a village with 100 people, and eight of these people are Vietcong, but the people aren't going to tell who they are. They are a very passive people and the Vietcong are the guys with the guns, the grenades. The other people aren't armed.

Mr. SOURWINE. I read within the last few days a news story that our actions in Vietnam are largely defended on the basis of high-minded protestation of noble principles. That was intended to be sarcastic.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it as an endorsement of what we are doing in Vietnam. We have no territorial ambitions. We want to work ourselves out of a job. We want to leave these people with a country that they can govern for themselves. At the same time, we want to protect the rest of Asia from coming under the rule of Communist China.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have one final question, sir. You are familiar, of course, with the two instances in which prisoners have been released by the North Vietnamese and in which known leftists and members of organizations opposed to our effort in Vietnam have been sent over there with at least the unofficial blessing of our State Department to either get credit for release of these people or accompany them back.

Isn't this a propaganda ploy that could have turned out to be of tremendous value to the North Vietnamese?

Mr. LUCAS. I think it was so intended. But in both cases it backfired. They released three sergeants, obviously feeling that they were brainwashed, and that they would come home and follow the party line. The NCO's duped them completely. The first thing two of them did when they got back was reenlist in the U.S. Army. I say more power to them.

In this more recent instance where they released the three pilots. I think old Dellinger and Father Berrigan, whatever his name is, went over together—

Mr. SOURWINE. No. Dellinger designated Howard Zinn and Berrigan to go.

Mr. LUCAS. Well anything old Dellinger does is suspect in my book. Apparently he is not bound by the rules that others are bound by.

They had hoped to parade them—bring them back on a commercial airliner—but we got them away and brought them back on a military plane. They think that is piracy on our part.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, Mr. Lucas, even on the basis that we want to do anything within reason to get any of our boys who are prisoners released and brought home, does it make sense to, in effect, let the North Vietnamese name people who are to be sent over there by our government to accept the release of these people?

Mr. LUCAS. I would like to make this observation, Mr. Sourwine. The conduct of our prisoners in North Vietnam has been most heartening and encouraging, a matter about which Americans can be intensely proud. The most concerted effort has been made to win them over. They have had a few marginal cases, but the vast majority of our men have stood firm, are standing firm.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have not been getting even the small percentage of brainwashing that was found in the Korean war?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I have seen captured documents in which the Reds complain bitterly about these hardheaded Yankee imperialists who just won't give an inch. And I am proud of our men.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questioning, Mr. Chairman.

BLENDING FOOD PRODUCT RICH IN PROTEIN BENEFICIAL FOR FEEDING U.S. POOR

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the important success stories of our time is the development and large-scale use of a protein-rich blended food product known as CSM.

A mixture of specially processed and precooked cornmeal, soy flour, and non-fat dry milk, CSM is particularly suited for meeting the nutritional needs of growing children, nursing mothers, and pregnant women. Already used with success in the "war on hunger" program overseas, this product is fitted to the cooking and eating patterns of a wide range of ethnic groups throughout the world. Appropriately, it is now being considered for our domestic feeding program in this country.

Foremost in the development of CSM was the Krause Milling Co., in my district of Milwaukee, Wis. On last Friday, June 21, Mr. Charles A. Krause, the company's president, outlined his firm's efforts in a statement presented to the Subcommittee of Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

One of the highlights of Mr. Krause's statement is the story of how his company and the corn millers industry invested \$1,500,000 to develop and market test CSM. Not until that testing was completed did the Government contract for the purchase of a single pound. In the 21 months since CSM came into use in our overseas food aid program more than 550 million pounds has been purchased. Approximately one-third of that amount has been manufactured in Milwaukee. At the Krause Milling Co. alone some 40 to 50 jobs are directly attributable to the production of CSM. Additional work has also resulted to another 130 employees in the Milwaukee area.

In his statement to the subcommittee, Mr. Krause urged a public acknowledgment of the responsibility "to provide enough to eat for all Americans." Taking note of the costs to the public which arise from malnutrition in the forms of mental retardation, dependency, illness, failure to learn in school, and loss of earning and taxpaying power, Mr. Krause declared that in his judgment as a businessman—

This new public responsibility is one which it will pay us, rather than cost us, to observe.

Citing what he described as CSM's success in fighting hunger and malnutrition overseas, Mr. Krause urged that the product now be made available for feeding needy persons here at home. Particularly pertinent, as Mr. Krause points out, is the fact that CSM can be produced without an extended time lag.

Because of the current interest in this important question I am pleased to bring Mr. Krause's statement to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

(Statement of Charles A. Krause, president, Krause Milling Co., Milwaukee, Wis., at Hearings of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate on Senate Resolution 281, June 21, 1968)

Mr. Chairman, I am Charles A. Krause, President of Krause Milling Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, with corn mills in Milwaukee and St. Joseph, Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear here today to talk about what my company has learned in developing economical, highly nutritious foods for relief distribution in hunger areas overseas, and to suggest what I believe its relevance might be in terms of our domestic food policies.

ENOUGH TO EAT FOR ALL AMERICANS

We have made important progress, during the past dozen years or so, both in our foreign and our domestic food policies and programs. Our food technology has been advanced in many ways which enable us to provide better nutrition at lower cost. The development of "CSM Mix," the high protein blended food we are producing for overseas distribution, is only one example. And the practical results of our efforts show progress; as the Secretary of Agriculture has noted, the number of Americans benefiting from federal food aid programs has more than doubled since the end of the 1950's, and the quality and variety of the foods offered has improved greatly.

We have also advanced in our concepts as to what constitutes the responsibility of the public for the nutrition of the population. Now, it seems to me, the day has come for us in the United States to acknowledge a new dimension in public responsibility: A public responsibility to provide enough to eat for all Americans.

As a businessman, I assert that this new public responsibility is one which it will pay us, rather than cost us, to observe.

It seems fair to say that the social policy we have followed in the past has conformed more or less to the ancient dictum: "Those who do not work shall not eat!" The underlying premise has been that hunger, or the fear of hunger, is a necessary discipline to insure that people will engage themselves in productive labor. The harshest edges of this principle have been smoothed off more and more in recent years, primarily through various welfare and charity measures aimed at protecting those who, through no fault of their own, cannot work to earn their own bread.

Perhaps some still fear that any further weakening of the connection between eating and working would demoralize the working force and transform it into a loafing force. I believe in this modern day and age that such fears are misplaced. There are simply too many other things to want today for any

physically and mentally healthy man or woman to rest on his oars and loaf through life if he should have only enough to eat.

HUNGER IS A COSTLY CURSE

Recent findings of medical and nutrition science are bringing new insights to the nature and importance of the public costs of malnutrition. Much remains to be learned, but it is already clear that malnutrition is an extremely costly burden upon society, and directly upon the taxpayers of the nation, state, and municipality.

In the Rockefeller Foundation *Quarterly Report* at the end of 1967, George Harrar writes:

"We have long known that severe food shortages and famines can have immediate injurious effects on human beings. We have all seen pictures of children with bloated bellies and emaciated bodies. Their physical constitutions are so weakened by hunger that they are highly vulnerable to all manners of other illnesses. It is also common knowledge that certain dietary deficiencies can later cause severe skeletal damage such as occurs in rickets. Contemporary research, however, has indicated that malnutrition may also have long range and more insidious effects on children and may even damage internal organs such as the liver. . . .

"There is accumulating evidence to show that an inadequate and unbalanced diet, occurring at a highly crucial and prolonged period in the development of an infant or young child, may affect its mental capacities to a degree where its ability to learn is seriously impaired. The visible effects of malnutrition may be corrected and may disappear, and the child may seem to be restored to full health and vigor. But the effects on mental development may not be readily apparent and often may be perceived only when the child manifests difficulty in competing with normal children."

Many medical and other scientific authorities have presented findings which support a growing body of evidence concerning the destructive and costly effects of malnutrition.

Dr. Willard Johnson, writing in *Child Welfare*, June 1967; Dr. Nevin Scrimshaw in *Saturday Review*, and other authorities have pointed out that there is increasing evidence that lack of protein in the diet of youngsters can cause severe and irreversible brain damage.

The *Journal of Pediatrics* reported recently that the damage caused by malnutrition begins even before birth and can affect future generations.

A World Health Organization committee has reported that malnutrition causes lowering of resistance to infection and consequently is a prime cause of infant mortality after weaning, and a significant contributory cause of parasitic infection, worms, viruses, and bacterial disease. Other direct effects of malnutrition include listlessness and apathy, shortened life expectancy, disabilities resulting from inadequate growth, and diseases such as blindness, rickets, scurvy, and pellagra that result from deficiencies of a particular nutrient.

The cost of this chronic hunger and undernutrition takes many forms; educational, psychological and social. Teachers and school administrators have told how hunger for food overrides hunger for knowledge, and raises serious obstacles against learning, in the form of listlessness, fights over food, inattentiveness, acute hunger pangs, withdrawal, and a sense of failure.

The ultimate costs are to be found in patterns of social unrest, distrust, alienation, withdrawal, and frustration. Dr. Robert Coles told a Senate Hearing on Hunger last year how hunger contributes directly to the schisms which threaten our society today.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg summed up the overall costs of hunger and malnutrition in these words in a recent article in the *Washington Post*:

"The geopolitical impact of this facet of nutritional science comes from the vicious cycle of malnutrition, mental retardation, indolence, and unemployability—a viscous cycle that afflicts depressed peoples throughout the world, be they have-not nations or have-not ghettos."

GOOD NUTRITION IS A GOOD INVESTMENT

So much for the costs of malnutrition. Let's consider the other side of the coin: What are the potential payoffs to the public for good nutrition?

How much is it worth, in added wealth-producing and tax-paying ability, to invest in the food needed to prevent mental retardation in a child?

How much is it worth, in these same hard-headed terms, to invest in the adequate diets needed to raise the average I. Q. of the children in all of the nation's poor families by some unknown number of points?

How much is it worth to secure the full, competent productivity and cooperation of men and women who because of malnutrition are now being lost in each generation to disease, physical and mental disability, lack of learning in school, social unrest, and alienation?

It is impossible to measure in any exact way either the costs of malnutrition, or the payoffs that can be expected from investments in good nutrition. But we do not need exact measures to conclude that public investments in good nutrition will pay off many fold. Consider the increased income-earning and tax-paying ability that would result for each high school drop-out who might graduate, for each mentally retarded institutional inmate who might be saved for a normal and productive life; for each increment of better mental capacity, better learning results, better social adjustment, and better life-long psychological attitude, that good nutrition would achieve as compared to the results we know are caused by malnutrition.

It is not so much a question of whether we can afford to pay the cost that is required to insure adequate diets for all. Good nutrition is a public investment opportunity that is so remunerative we cannot afford to pass it up.

In taking stock of the costs of programs to provide food for use, it should not be overlooked that these costs will be off-set in part by the resulting reduction in the scale of the present programs through which farmers are being paid to keep cropland out of production. Our analyses indicate that these costs approach and even exceed the value at the farm of an equivalent quantity of commodities at market prices. These data are presented in some detail in the table attached to this statement, which I will provide for the record. To summarize, it is fair to say that the true additional cost of providing food for our poor would be little more than is required to transport and process and distribute it from the farm to the consumer's table. We are already paying close to its full market value for the food itself, under our existing farm programs, whether we use it or not.

NEW "WAR ON HUNGER" WEAPON

We have learned a good deal about practical nutrition in the American food aid programs around the world that can be applied directly and immediately to strengthen the effective nutritional value of our food programs here at home.

The key product that has been developed and used successfully in recent years to fight malnutrition in more than 90 countries is

"CSM Mix". It is a blend of precooked corn meal, soy flour and non-fat dry milk that has been accepted by millions of consumers. It is a highly nutritious, high protein food, uniquely suited to correct malnutrition.

But it is more than that. As any home-maker knows, it is not enough to provide food that is merely "good for you". It must be appetizing and appealing as well. As the old saying goes, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." CSM has been accepted and relished by millions of consumers in scores of countries. It is appetizing and palatable and readily adaptable to a wide variety of ethnic tastes. CSM makes an excellent soup, breakfast cereal, or cold drink. It possesses unique dough-forming properties that produce delicious empanadas, tamales, and tortillas for the Latin American diet. It can also be used to make chapatti, a staple in India and Pakistan. In country after country we hear of new ways that CSM has been adapted to local feeding habits. The versatility of the product is limited only by the imagination of the cook.

Our company began acceptability studies on precooked or processed corn meal, which is the primary ingredient of CSM, in 1963. This product is familiar to the food industry as an ingredient in many kinds of manufactured foods, but its use directly by household consumers was a totally new concept. We felt that its taste and suitability for use in a wide variety of ways made it an ideal product for distribution under the foreign food aid programs.

In August of 1968, Krause Milling Company donated 10,000 pounds for testing by voluntary agencies in 16 countries. The response was most enthusiastic. In mid-1965, we joined with two other corn millers and donated an additional 90,000 pounds to voluntary agencies in 25 countries. The responses to our questionnaires showed, without exception, great enthusiasm for the taste, adaptability, and convenience of processed corn meal. All of this testing was conducted at industry expense. More than \$1,500,000 was spent for research, equipment and technology prior to any sale of CSM.

WORLD NUTRITION CRISIS ARISES

Just as these tests were getting underway, the Department of Agriculture challenged American food manufacturers to develop a blended food aimed at meeting the nutritional needs of vulnerable groups in the hunger populations of developing countries overseas—children of school and pre-school age, nursing mothers, and pregnant women. The guidelines were prepared by scientists in the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture. Cereal was specified as the primary ingredient. The protein content of the Mix was to approximate 20 per cent and the extra protein was provided by the addition of soy flour and nonfat dry milk. Vitamin and mineral fortification, a bland flavor, low-bran content, smooth texture were also specified. The guidelines further stated that the product was to be partially cooked and ready for serving after boiling for one to two minutes.

The processed corn meal which our industry had developed fully met these standards for primary product qualities. Testing quickly confirmed that mixing 25 per cent soy flour and 5 per cent nonfat dry milk with processed corn meal produced an excellent food. Tests conducted at the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation showed that "protein efficiency ratio" of CSM was 2.5, which is equal in protein quality to casein, the protein in milk.

CSM GETS WORLDWIDE USE

With the cooperation of AID Missions and Voluntary Relief Agencies around the world final acceptability studies confirmed the ex-

cellent acceptability of the product which had been indicated by our earlier testing of processed corn meal. Final specifications were developed by the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, working cooperatively with our industry. In September 1966, only 21 months ago, the first purchase of 9 1/4 million pounds was made. Today the total purchases of CSM have passed the 550 million pound mark. Acceptability of the product seems to grow steadily, as consumers around the world gain familiarity with its versatility, convenience and palatability.

The consumers asked for more because they liked it, and it fits into the way they regularly prepare their meals. Those who are responsible for the nutrition of the vulnerable population approve its superior nutritional quality, based on its content of 20 per cent protein, 1 per cent lysine, 6 per cent minimum fat, high protein efficiency ratio, and good amino acid balance.

The development of CSM is certainly an outstanding advance in food technology and in the economics of human nutrition. The food and nutrition scientists both in the government and in industry deserve our appreciation for this achievement.

Usually less appreciated, but equally as commendable, is the sense of responsibility, decisiveness, and courage displayed by the government administrators in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development, both in Washington and overseas. Their prompt action in testing, then quickly approving distribution of this new food for worldwide use, saved many human beings from death or physical or mental retardation. The world is a happier place today as a result of their competence.

TESTS FIND CSM EFFECTIVE

An impressive body of technical information on the nutritional benefits of CSM has been gathered since shipments began. Dr. Fred R. Senti, Deputy Administrator of ARS, recently reported favorably on tests by Dr. George Graham at the British American Hospital in Peru on how successfully the nitrogen balance was maintained in children 1 to 3 years old when they consumed CSM as the primary source of protein. He also reviewed the three tests conducted by the World Health Organization in Taiwan and Algeria, which show the nutritional effectiveness of CSM when fed to undernourished and malnourished children.

All of us who participated in the development of CSM felt a glow of real pride when John A. Schnitker, Under Secretary of Agriculture, upon his return from Bihar, India, last year, told us how even the inexperienced eye could discern the health improvement of young people who had been fed CSM for 30 days compared to those who were not participants in CSM feeding programs.

Your Committee is considering various ways to attack the problem of malnutrition and undernutrition of this country. We respectfully submit that CSM should be the keystone of an expanded program to bring a balanced nutritious diet to every part of the United States through the Commodity Distribution program, School Lunch program and any other special child feeding program that may be developed.

CSM SUITABLE FOR U.S. DISTRIBUTION

The advantages of using CSM as the cornerstone of such an expanded program are:

1. This is a pretested product now being consumed with satisfaction by millions of people in over 90 countries.

2. An expanding body of scientific data indicates that CSM can eliminate malnutrition in vulnerable population groups.

3. Specifications are ready today, and supplies can be procured and distribution started

within a few days, without the long time-lag that would be required for a completely new product.

4. The cost is very low, with the last purchase made at less than 7 1/2¢ a pound delivered in 50 pound bags to midwestern port cities.

5. There is substantial idle industry capacity that can be used promptly to produce CSM.

6. The product does fit into the American food culture, both for institutional and home feeding.

Let me expand on this last point. The fine granular form of CSM is certainly familiar to the American housewife who uses flour, breading mixes, breakfast cereals, cake and pancake mixes almost daily. You have only to walk down the aisles of any supermarket to note the popularity of the "instant", "prepared", and "precooked" foods that are found in every department. The "ready-to-eat" nature of CSM puts it in the category of the most modern high-class food. Certainly it is not merely a gruel for the poor.

What can the housewife do with CSM? The possibilities are limited only by her culinary creativity. For example, CSM makes an excellent soup, soup thickener or gravy thickener. It can be baked into quick breads of all kinds, such as corn muffins and corn bread. It makes delicious fluffy pancakes. It can be used as a breading for fish or for vegetables such as cauliflower, beans and asparagus. It is an excellent breakfast cereal, a real cream of protein dish. With proper instruction through recipe distributions, CSM will have the same acceptance and success in this country that it has enjoyed around the world.

We should remember that processed corn meal, which is 62 per cent of the today's improved high fat CSM formula, has been used by U.S. food processors for many years and is being sold today to such processors. Corn is an American crop of great abundance. What better vehicle can there be for a new nutritious product to fight malnutrition here at home? CSM is a corn-based, fully tested convenience food and it can be provided in large quantities, at very low cost, as quickly as a decision can be made to offer it to the needy families in America as has been done in more than 90 countries in the world.

NUTRITION EDUCATION NEEDED

Good nutrition requires more than the provision of nutritious food or sufficient purchasing power for buying enough to eat. It is necessary for the homemaker to select foods that will provide a suitable balance, and then for the food to be prepared in an appealing and appetizing way. Many poor families have particular difficulties in this respect, and many others that are economically self-sufficient also suffer from poor nutrition because of poor eating habits.

In some respects, modern food manufacturing technology makes these problems more difficult because taste and appearance may not be dependable guides. Fortified foods, in particular, may not taste any different than the same food without fortification. Consumers need to have a greater degree of sophistication about nutrition than was necessary in a simpler era of home-grown, home-processed, traditional foods. I believe that the food manufacturing and merchandising industries can and should contribute much more effectively to consumer education for good nutrition particularly among poor families who have not been reached adequately by the high school and extension home economics training programs. We are ready to enlarge our present efforts in this area in collaboration both with the food industry and appropriate public agencies.

Appropriate fortification of all foods distributed in welfare programs should be adopted as quickly as possible. The Krause

Milling Company has conducted extensive studies in the past few years on the fortification of varied corn products to improve the protein quality and quantity. Attached to this statement is a recently published summary of this work by our Research Consultant, Dr. Sidney M. Cantor, and our Director of Research and Development, Dr. Hugh J. Roberts. You can see how soy flour, nonfat dry milk, fish protein concentrate, torula yeast and sodium caseinate have all been evaluated as protein fortificants at different levels of addition. Also, the amino acids lysine, tryptophan and methionine have been added to processed corn meal and their beneficial effects on protein quality have been determined.

Fortification of corn products and other cereals, which are consumed in great quantities in the United States, holds great promise as a way to improve the nutrition of our people. Appropriate fortification of commonly-used foods should be a major element in our national good nutrition program, along with measures to insure enough to eat for all Americans, and consumer education as to what constitutes sound eating habits.

Surely there is no national concern that is more fundamentally important than the nurture of the nation's human beings. In the light both of what we are learning about the costs of poor nutrition, and of our undoubted economic and technical capability in this country, good nutrition cannot be thought of as a luxury or a sentimental whim. Good nutrition of the population is a prudent and paying investment in the nation's leading resource. It is nothing less than the primary foundation for our nation's strength and wealth.

OPERATING RESULTS OF GOVERNMENT-FINANCED ACREAGE DIVERSION PROGRAMS, 1955-68

Year	Acres idled by farmers as basis for Government payments (millions)	Estimated yield of grain from idled acres if grown and harvested (million metric tons) ¹	Market value at farm if crop of grain had been harvested from idled acres (millions) ²	Payment to farmers agreeing to not produce crops on idled acres (millions) ³
1955	---	---	---	---
1956	13.6	8.0	\$405	261
1957	27.8	15.0	654	654
1958	27.1	19.6	864	810
1959	22.4	11.3	464	324
1960	28.7	15.9	625	367
1961	53.7	41.4	1,762	1,104
1962	64.7	48.5	2,101	1,440
1963	55.7	42.5	1,825	1,382
1964	54.9	42.0	1,901	1,541
1965	55.9	52.0	2,230	1,638
1966	62.5	56.6	2,785	2,341
1967	39.9	39.4	1,661	2,001
1968	55.8	59.5	2,977	2,231
Total ⁴	560.8	451.7	20,254	16,094

¹ Computed at 2/3 of U.S. average yields per acre during year of each crop to which reductions in acreage harvested are attributed, and of projected yield for 1968. An equivalent based on average yields of corn during year is shown for acreage diverted from cotton; and an equivalent based on average yields of oats during year is shown for "other cropland" diverted primarily from tame hay, and some soybeans, flaxseed, dry edible beans, rice and tobacco.

² Estimated yield times U.S. average price per ton received by farmers for corn at the farm during the year, and projected price for 1968 equal to actual prices received by farmers for corn in 1966. Prices of the various grains, including the price of wheat less certificates, usually average close to the price per ton of corn.

³ All payments to farmers conditioned on their agreement to withhold designated farmland from production during the calendar year (corresponds generally to crop year). Wheat certificate payments are excluded because they may be paid even if no diversion requirement is in effect.

⁴ Data for 1968 based on or inferred from announced U.S. Department of Agriculture intentions and projections, particularly press release USDA 12-68, Jan. 2, 1968. Payments under feed grain and wheat programs are assumed to equal payments made for diversion from corn and sorghum, and for wheat, respectively, in 1966. Cotton program payments are assumed at 80 percent of 1967.

⁵ Minor discrepancies in totals are due to rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture data except as noted.

RESULTS OF SEVENTH DISTRICT POLL

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent to the Seventh Congressional District a questionnaire on the important legislative issues facing us during the 90th Congress.

The returned questionnaires have been tabulated, and I wish to insert the results in the RECORD at this point:

Eastbay residents who responded to Congressman Jeffery Cohelan's annual legislative poll of the 7th Congressional District overwhelmingly favored strong Federal gun control legislation even before the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Congressman Cohelan, releasing the results of the 1968 poll, reported that 81 per cent of the more than 10,000 persons who returned the questionnaire wanted a Federal law prohibiting the mail order sale of guns.

The poll had already been completed and was in the process of final tabulation and analysis at the time of Senator Kennedy's murder.

Questions in the poll covered a broad range of subjects, including a sampling of opinion on the conduct of the Vietnam war, civil rights and urban problems, military affairs and foreign policy, and other areas of national interest.

The questionnaire also asked residents of

the district to select what they considered the four most important issues facing the Congress. From a list of 20 priorities, the four selected in order of importance were, not surprisingly, Vietnam, racial tensions, civil rights and foreign policy.

The Vietnam war question, which present the public with five options from which to choose, drew a mixed response. No single option was clearly favored by a majority of the polled vote, although the overall response to the question indicated the desire for change from the present policy.

At the opposite ends of the spectrum, 11 per cent of those responding want to intensify U.S. military efforts in Vietnam, including sending more troops and removing all restrictions from bombing North Vietnam, and another 20 per cent want the immediate and presumably unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.

Only 8 per cent are satisfied with the present military and diplomatic efforts and another five per cent failed to respond to any part of the question.

Intensification of our diplomatic efforts, including an unconditional halt to all bombing of North Vietnam and inviting the National Liberation Front to any talks was supported by 28 per cent of the returns.

Another 27 per cent favored gradual withdrawal of U.S. forces and turning over increasing responsibility for the prosecution of the war and negotiations to the South Vietnamese.

While results of the poll showed a decided interest in changing the present situation in Vietnam, another aspect of the poll indicated that the public is prepared to support a continued U.S. commitment in Vietnam,

although one primarily of economic rather than military support.

Over 7,000 persons, or about 68 per cent of those responding, said they would favor continued U.S. economic assistance to Southeast Asia after the war. About 2,400, or 23 per cent, said they would support continued military assistance.

Cohelan noted that the results of the questionnaire showed strong support for efforts to deal with poverty. Over 77 per cent supported a strong Federal program to bring decent housing within the reach of low and moderate income families, and 71 per cent supported Federal programs to create new jobs in the public sector.

Federal open housing legislation, which was passed after the questionnaire was mailed, was supported by 70 per cent of the people.

One curious aspect of the poll was the sharp division over the question of whether the death penalty should be abolished for all Federal crimes.

The response to most of the questions in the poll indicated a pattern of liberal thought on the major issues of the day, and the abolition of the death penalty has generally been considered a cause widely favored among liberals.

Yet, in response to the question, over 41 per cent of the respondents said they did not favor the proposal, and another 8 per cent failed to respond to the question. Support for abolition was given by 50 per cent.

Finally, overwhelming support was expressed for a Redwood National Park and for an expanded U.S. program to help under developed nations solve population and food shortage problems.

The poll results follow:

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN JEFFERY COHELAN'S 1968 QUESTIONNAIRE POLL SENT TO RESIDENTS OF THE 7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

1. Vietnam: Which one of the following policies would it be best for our Government to follow in Vietnam?

	Percent
(a) Maintain our present level of military and diplomatic efforts.....	8.3
(b) Intensify our military efforts, including sending more troops and removing all restrictions from bombing North Vietnam.....	11.6
(c) Intensify our diplomatic efforts, including unconditionally halting the bombing of North Vietnam and inviting the National Liberation Front to any talks.....	28.0
(d) Gradually withdraw, including reducing our troop strength and turning over increasing responsibility for the prosecution of the war and the seeking of negotiations to the South Vietnamese.....	26.9
(e) Immediately withdraw our troops from South Vietnam.....	20.2
Blank.....	5.06

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion	Blank
2. When a satisfactory solution of the Vietnam question is found, would you support continued U.S. economic assistance to Southeast Asia?.....	67.8	22.9	9.2	0.1
3. When a satisfactory solution to the Vietnam question is found, would you support continued U.S. military commitments in Southeast Asia?.....	23.2	66.1	10.5	.2
4. Would you support a negotiated settlement in Vietnam which provided participation by the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) in a coalition government?.....	64.9	21.1	13.8	.2
5. Do you favor deployment at this time of a thin "Chinese-oriented" antiballistic missile system at a beginning cost of approximately \$5,000,000,000 or more?.....	14.2	66.1	19.5	.2
6. Do you favor legislation to abolish the death penalty for all Federal crimes?.....	50.2	41.5	8.2	.1
7. Do you favor legislation prohibiting mail-order sales of guns?.....	81.7	13.	5.2	.1
8. Do you favor Federal open housing legislation?.....	7.9	23.	5.9	.2
9. Do you favor legislation to lighten or remove the penalty for possession of marijuana?.....	58.6	34.9	6.3	.2
10. Do you favor the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to implement a Federal program "to bring within the reach of low- and moderate-income families within the next 5 years, 6,000,000 new and existing units of decent housing, beginning with 600,000 units in the next year?.....	77.1	15.9	6.8	.2
11. Do you favor action by the Federal Government to create new jobs in the public sector for people who are unable to find jobs elsewhere?.....	71.7	26.8	7.3	.2

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion	Blank
12. Do you favor legislation providing Federal funds to State and local agencies to train, equip, and raise salaries of law enforcement officers?.....	57.9	30.0	11.9	0.1
13. Do you favor the creation of a Redwood National Park in California?.....	87.6	5.9	6.3	.2
14. Do you support a reform of the military draft that provides for selection of draftees by lottery with the youngest eligibles being called first and with deferred college students treated as the youngest group upon leaving college?.....	41.1	35.5	23.1	.3
15. Do you support an expanded U.S. program to help willing underdeveloped countries implement birth control programs and increase agricultural output to meet the imminent threat of a world food shortage?.....	84.6	10.5	4.6	.3
16. Do you support amendment of the Constitution to provide for a popular vote runoff to choose the President in the event that no candidate obtains a majority in the electoral college?.....	72.5	12.8	14.3	.4

Would you please indicate with an X, the 4 areas of concern you feel are the most important priorities before the Congress?

a. Foreign policy.....	3,268
b. Education.....	2,247
c. Health.....	556
d. Unemployment.....	2,559
e. Vietnam.....	6,137
f. Nuclear arms control.....	1,300
g. World food/population situation.....	2,023
h. Inflation.....	2,238
i. Taxes.....	1,910
j. Conservation.....	1,232
k. Space exploration.....	226
l. Balance of payments.....	1,650
m. Law enforcement.....	2,158
n. Federal spending.....	1,983
o. Consumer protection.....	492
p. Civil rights.....	4,306
q. Housing.....	904
r. Transportation problems.....	176
s. National defense.....	663
t. Racial tensions.....	4,550

CONGRESSMAN FRASER SENDS OUT QUESTIONNAIRE ON PROPOSED GUN LAWS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, each of us in the House of Representatives has received hundreds of letters and telegrams on both sides of the firearms issue.

I am sending a questionnaire to the people of my district of Minneapolis, Minn., inviting their opinions on the proposed gun legislation. A questionnaire can help bring out the specific points which should be included—or rejected—in a new law.

I have already introduced a bill for the registration of guns and the licensing of gun owners. The President has now called for action on this kind of bill. He points out that licensing would prevent guns from being purchased or owned by "criminals, dope addicts, alcoholics, the mentally ill, and any others whose possession of guns would be harmful to the public health, safety, or welfare."

I have unanimous consent for excerpts of the President's message to be printed at this point in the RECORD. They follow:

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO PROTECTION

Within the hour, in some city in America, a gunshot will ring out. And someone will fall dead or wounded.

Unless we act purposefully to prevent it, reckless and wild gunfire will be heard again—tomorrow, the day after, and all the days to follow—as it was last Tuesday, when a 71-year-old gas station attendant was shot to death in the course of a \$75 armed robbery; as it was last Wednesday, in Graceville, Florida, when a mental patient shot a three-year-old boy through the back of the head—as it was last Thursday, in Chicago, when a young man was killed and three others injured by shotgun blasts fired by a band of roving teenagers.

These tragedies are imbedded in the grim statistics of death and destruction at gunpoint. The terrible toll is rising.

It took this country nearly two centuries to respond to the danger of guns in criminal and incompetent hands. The first Federal action came in the early 1930's, when the Congress enacted safeguards controlling the use of sawed-off shotguns and submachine-guns to answer the public indignation and fear arising out of organized gang wars in the cities.

But very little was done in the next three decades, while the velocity of speeding bullets exacted their deadly toll across America. Alone among the modern nations of the world, we remained without the gun control laws that other countries accept as an elementary need and condition of life. We can see the difference in the last reported comparisons of homicides by gunfire. Out of 15 countries reporting, the U.S. ranked worst—with a rate of 2.7 gun murders per 100,000 population. Here are some of the statistics: 2.7 for the U.S.—.03 in the Netherlands, and .04 in Japan; 2.7 for the U.S.—.05 in England and Wales; 2.7 for the U.S.—.12 in West Germany and .70 in Italy; 2.7 for the U.S.—.52 in Canada and .26 in Belgium.

Since I first became President, I have fought for strong gun control laws.

Now—at long last—we have begun to move.

When I signed the Safe Streets Act last week, America took the first major step to

control deadly firearms. That measure outlawed the interstate traffic in handguns and prohibited the sale of these small and lethal weapons to minors.

We are now within sight of the second major step—the control of interstate traffic in shotguns, rifles and ammunition, as I requested of the Congress on June 6. I hope the Congress will move with the greatest speed to complete its action on this proposal for protection.

But even before that step is finally completed, we must look to the next advance for the safety of the American people.

I propose, first, the national registration of every gun in America.

There are now more firearms than families in America. The estimates range between 50 and 100 million guns in this country. Last year more than 3 million guns were added to private stocks, building a massive arsenal which arms the murderer and the robber.

Registration will tell us how many guns there are, where they are, and in whose hands they are held.

Second, I propose that every individual in this country be required to obtain a license before he is entrusted with a gun.

Every murder by gunfire is a criminal confrontation in which—by design or through a conspiracy of events—the criminal faces his victim through the telescope cross-hairs of a rifle or over the barrel of a pistol. An inflamed moment seizes the criminal's mind, and his finger presses the trigger.

We may never be able to keep that criminal mind from erupting into violence, but we can stay the finger that squeezes the trigger—by keeping the gun out of the murderer's hand.

The surest route to accomplish this is to require every person who wants a gun to be licensed, first proving that he meets the qualifications.

To assure uniformity and adequate protection, the law I propose would establish minimum Federal licensing standards. These would prevent firearms from being sold to or possessed by criminals, dope addicts, alcoholics, the mentally ill, and any others whose possession of guns would be harmful to the public health, safety or welfare.

The Federal licensing law would go into effect only in those States without at least comparable standards, and only after the States have been given an opportunity to act first.

I call upon every Governor and State legislature to move as rapidly as they can to enact forceful laws for the protection of their people.

The proposals in this message are no more and no less than commonsense safeguards which any civilized nation must apply for the safety of its people.

Let us delay no longer in enacting that basic foundation of interstate protection and then let us go on to build—through registration and licensing—the kind of protection so long denied the American citizen.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

AFTERMATH OF THE PASSAGE OF THE 10-PERCENT SURTAX

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is a sobering editorial appearing in today's

Wall Street Journal commenting upon the administration's tax increase legislation.

A few sobering comments like this appearing before the issue was voted in the Congress might have resulted in a real expenditure cutback instead of a sham.

The editorial follows:

HARDLY A WONDER DRUG

Perhaps the greatest peculiarity about the newly enacted tax-spending law is the way it has been successfully oversold as an economic curative—by the Administration, by some in Congress and by many businessmen. It's not just a matter of academic interest; in the near future there could be bitter disappointment at the measure's unfulfilled promises.

In theory a tax increase and spending cut combination is good medicine in the prevailing budgetary and inflationary circumstances. As a practical matter, the consequences of not passing it, after the long months of overselling, would probably have been bad. At least, as Wilbur Mills argues, its passage may have a symbolic value in reassuring foreigners that the U.S. Government is trying to do something about its financial disorder.

Yet the pity of that kind of observation is that the tax increase never should have been necessary. If the Administration had all along restrained its spending, it could have obviated any such need, at the same time preventing much of the inflation and certainly giving foreigners more reassurance than they are going to get now.

Looking ahead, it may be doubted that the tax part of the package will be an effective counter to inflation.

It raises the family's cost of living by reducing the amount of money it can keep, in a period when purchasing power is already eroded by inflation and taxes of all sorts are going up at a staggering rate. Hence there is likely to be heavier pressure for still more inflationary wage boosts.

It raises a company's cost of doing business, in a period when the costs are already skyrocketing. Thus still higher prices are indicated. For just one example, this newspaper reported the other day that major utilities plan rate increases to offset earnings declines as a direct result of the 10% tax surcharge. The example is not likely to prove unusual.

Especially the tax hike may not be anti-inflationary so long as the money managers inflate the money supply. They have supposedly been quite restrictive of late, but actually the swelling goes on apace; some of them are saying the tax increase will permit easier money.

Now it is possible that the upshot, despite the wage-price spiral, will be a recession. But that would not be a very welcome outcome either, and emphatically not what the economic planners in Washington want to bring about.

The spending-reduction side of the deal would seem much more hopeful as a deterrent to inflation. Part of the trouble here is that \$6 billion is an awfully small cut out of a \$186 billion spending budget. A further part of the trouble is that it is difficult to conceive of its being realized, no matter what the politicians promise. It's easier to imagine a \$6 billion increase.

The reason is simply that the authorities have allowed budgeting to get almost hopelessly out of control. It is at the mercy of Vietnam war costs, which the Government has grossly underestimated. It is at the mercy of every pressure group in the country, and in the era of Big Government they are plentiful. So the heralded \$6 billion cut could be rescinded or swallowed up in those wonderful devices known as supplemental appropriations.

In view of all this, it is hard to understand

the near naivete with which so many discuss the supposed wonders of the tax-spending scheme. We suspect it stems partly from a feeling close to desperation, a sense that the Government's whole financial structure is in fact so dangerously out of control that something, practically anything, had to be done.

We hope the optimists about taxes and spending are right and we are wrong. Still, we think the objective evidence presently available suggests that this law is at best a palliative. Indeed, that it is a warning how far the authorities have yet to go to find the cure for inexcusable financial irresponsibility.

WHY A DOUBLE STANDARD?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the more realistic and effective editorials on recent Communist terror attacks on Saigon appeared in the Thursday, June 13, Chicago Daily News.

The editorial very effectively points out the obvious double standard does exist in world discussions, and although it does not touch on this point, I would suggest that more effective presentation of news and issues by the "Voice of America" and other operations of the USIA is needed so that we would hold our own in the opinion of the world community. The editorial follows:

WHY A DOUBLE STANDARD?

If United States war planes were to fly over the center of Hanoi, dropping bombs indiscriminately on the civil population of North Vietnam's capital city, the outcry around the world would be thunderous. American embassies in a dozen countries would be mobbed and perhaps burned. A torrent of abuse and denunciation would flow from the United Nations. There would be demands—with justification—for some new international tribunal to condemn the criminals.

Why, then, the strange silence as South Vietnam's capital of Saigon is hammered day after day by Soviet-built rockets in the hands of intruders from North Vietnam? The daily barrages are out and out terror attacks, forbidden under every civilized attempt to codify laws of war. The 5-inch rockets have only one target—the people of the city. If American or South Vietnamese soldiers are killed or military installations damaged this is sheer accident. The rockets are random weapons and used deliberately as such.

Terror has been the main reliance of the Viet Cong in the countryside although little notice has been taken outside Vietnam. The terror now has been focused on Saigon to coincide with the "official conversations" in Paris. It can hardly be longer ignored. Ambassador Harriman was more than justified in warning the North Vietnamese delegates in Paris that the United States' patience is not unlimited. The rest of the world must take notice and understand.

It would be immensely encouraging to the American negotiators if the moral standards of the world community were applied more impartially. The attacks on Saigon cry out for the broadest international condemnation. If they were treated with the outrage they deserve, the longed-for peace might be moved a little closer.

SAN ANTONIO WONDERLAND

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this past week, San Antonio has been host to tens of thousands of citizens who have come to the city to see HemisFair and help celebrate the 250th birthday of the city. Among the visitors to San Antonio last week was the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

William Randolph Hearst is more than a journalist, just as his father was. But a journalist he is, and is an acute observer of events and places. He came to San Antonio on business, and to make an address; but he took the time to look over the city, and his impressions reconfirmed his faith in the dynamism of our country.

Mr. Hearst recognizes the unique aspects of geography and history that have combined to make San Antonio a particularly charming, yet exciting, place. But his praises are not sung in empty chambers. He backs his judgments with action. Mr. Hearst's company has a newspaper in San Antonio, the San Antonio Light.

The Light is undergoing transformation under the guidance of its able new editor, Bill Bellamy. With his leadership the newspaper continues to be, and improves itself as a force for an informed and responsible public. Mr. Hearst has placed his confidence in a good man in Bill Bellamy.

But Mr. Hearst is not only a journalist. He is of necessity an investor. And he is investing in the future of San Antonio by installing new press equipment, some of which will include color equipment never before seen in the Southwest. Truly, he has caught the vision and the force that have made San Antonio such a promising place. I think that his observations, balanced as they are by the man's long acquaintance with San Antonio, his keen insight and great experience, are well worth reading.

SAN ANTONIO TYPIFIES TEXAS WONDERLAND
(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN ANTONIO.—We often ask, "Will wonders never cease?"

The question, whether quotation or cliché, has become part of our language, and applies specifically today to travel within this magnificent land of ours and its boundless treasury of natural and man-made wonders.

As early as the first half of the 19th century, in fact, the famed French author Alexis de Tocqueville wrote of this country:

"America is a land of wonders, in which everything is in constant motion and every change seems an improvement. No natural boundary seems to be set to the efforts of man; and in his eyes what is not yet done is only what he has not attempted to do."

Perhaps, nowhere in the United States is this more true than in the spectacular state of Texas, a staggering expanse of plains, mountains, forests, rolling hills—and bustling sky-scraped cities, vast oil fields and industries, and an energetic, try-anything

population still imbued with the pioneering spirit.

Not too many years ago San Antonio—tucked away down here in the live oak-dotted hills of Southwest Texas—was a somewhat tranquil old town with a leisurely Spanish tradition and a fabled place in American history.

It was here, in the chapel of the Franciscan mission in San Antonio de Valero, founded in 1718—and called the Alamo—that a handful of American settlers was massacred by Mexican forces on March 6, 1836. The subsequent slogan: "Remember the Alamo!" became the rallying-cry of Americans who finally defeated Mexico at San Jacinto, near Houston, more than a month later, on April 21, 1836.

As a result the Republic of Texas was born, contributing to another aspect of Texan uniqueness: It is the only state in the union that was itself once an independent republic. Over Texas have flown the flags of Spain, France, Mexico, its own "Lone Star," the Confederacy and the United States.

With this fascinating historical background, San Antonio has emerged from its former picturesque provincialism to become an internationally-known urban center.

To celebrate its 250th birthday, in fact, it is holding its sparkling world's fair—HemisFair '68—an exposition with an exciting and colorful theme: The fact that Texas in general, and San Antonio in particular, is at the confluence of North America—the U.S. and Canada—and Latin America, that great community of nations stretching from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn.

HemisFair has brought a wealth of overseas attractions to San Antonio. Exhibitors from Belgium and Bolivia, Spain and Switzerland, Canada and China are here, along with many others. In addition here, where part of the West was won, you can even take in as I did Russia's famed Bolshoi Ballet, a 100-member troupe led by prima ballerina Maya Plisetskaya—whom I first met in Moscow on our first trip in 1955. Miss Plisetskaya, reputed to be the world's finest ballerina, is a big hit in her home town, but believe me when I tell you she is a sensation down here—and for good reason.

She is, in fact, the first ballerina to be mentioned in the same breath as Pavlova, the world famous member of the Old Imperial Russian Ballet, and her movements possess a grace and rhythm that are sheer beauty to behold, and impossible for me to do justice to in words.

There is a "border feeling" down here in San Antonio. Its proximity to Mexico and the vast area of Latin America beyond seems to flavor much of the city's life. It's commerce and interflow of population with Mexico is huge. It is, in addition, a city of scenic charm and its many drives are shaded by live oak, palm and pecan trees, and the lazy, tree-lined San Antonio River, twisting and curling through town and the fair grounds.

Another fascinating aspect of the city is its role as the center of the largest military establishment in the U.S. San Antonio is in a very real sense, a "GI Town," and is host to thousands of servicemen from throughout the country. Here is old Ft. Sam Houston, headquarters of the 4th Army, and such U.S. Air Force installations as Randolph AFB, and Kelly, Lackland and Brooks Air Force Bases. Nearby, too, is famed Brooke Army Medical Center.

END UP LIVING HERE

Servicemen, in fact, often come here as students and cadets and end up living here as retired officers.

One of the results of this continued military presence in San Antonio, perhaps, is the relative absence of "hippies" and other

species of the longhaired, unshaved and unwashed fraternity. It is refreshing indeed to note a concentration of American youth that does not wear beads around its collective necks; such a spectacle might indeed provoke outrage among youths who dress, shave and cut their hair neatly and look like the great types of young American men that they are.

While here attending our summer Hearst Corp., board meetings I was honored to address a group of associations made up of the Association of the U.S. Army, the Navy League, Air Force Association and chamber of commerce. The audience composed largely as the names indicate, of professional soldiers and their ladies feel as disturbed as I do by the wholly false picture of the U.S. that is too often being presented by our critics at home and abroad. It is no great trick to quote oneself, but I would like to insert here just a few of the things I touched on that evening:

"You have heard much about the sickness of our nation. It is quite popular and acceptable now to demean all that we have accomplished—to suggest that we are a decadent, violent people who live in a terroristic society and seek to visit that terror on other nations . . .

VALOR OF OUR NATION

"But I am going to talk about not the sickness of our nation, but about the valor of our nation. No country in history has sacrificed as many of its men and its resources on behalf of a free and stable world as has the United States in the past quarter century . . ."

Thus, if there's any sickness—it is that I and probably you too are sick and tired of all of this kind of talk. The U.S. is maligned and impugned for its dedication to decency and sanity. But I guess this is the price we must pay for our national character—which really desires nothing in return. It may be that it is just not in the nature of others to understand this, for they know that they would not commit themselves unselfishly.

The audience of 2,000 gathered in one of the great rooms in the permanent new building dedicated to the performing arts and on the grounds of the HemisFair stood and gave me a big hand at the end.

Looking out appreciatively on all these generals and their ladies I couldn't help thinking back to my days as a buck private and for a short while corporal in military school and thinking:

"Will wonders never cease?"

SPACE PERSPECTIVE

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored to insert as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the keynote address by Hon. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, before the Fourth International Symposium on Bioastronautics and the Exploration of Space, in San Antonio, Tex.

Dr. Welsh's words and thoughts are always welcomed by those of us who are interested in the advancement of the Nation's space effort.

SPACE PERSPECTIVE

(Keynote address by Hon. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, Fourth International Symposium on Bioastronautics and the Exploration of Space, San Antonio, Tex., June 24, 1968)

It is an honor and a pleasure—a real source of satisfaction to me—to have been invited again to give the keynote address to this Symposium. This is the fourth of these events, which increase in stature and reputation each time they are held.

JUSTIFIED OPTIMISM

When I participated in the 3rd International Symposium here in 1964, I was optimistic about our space program and particularly about the role of man in space. I even went so far as to suggest that the United States must and would move with sufficient speed and competence to attain world leadership in space technology. We were behind then! We are ahead now!

CAUTION

I wish it were not necessary—but unfortunately it is—to follow such a declaration of relative status with a word of caution. We will not remain ahead for long, if we grow complacent, if we fail to recognize in full the true benefits of the space program, or if we overcut space spending—as the Congress is apparently trying all too successfully to do. We just cannot afford to waste the taxpayers' money which has been invested in national strength; yet slowing down advances in space technology would do just that. It would be wasteful and, in my judgment, contrary to the best interests of the United States. I can emphasize that point even further by being more specific: our national security would be weakened by failure to pursue such technological innovations.

If it would not seem to have political overtones, I would interrupt right here to make the factual statement that only one candidate for the Presidency of the United States—the man who is now our Vice President and Chairman of the Space Council—has come out forthrightly for pushing forward the National Space Program. I also would risk stepping on personal toes, but I would not risk any conflict with the facts, if I were to assert that he who opposes continuing advance in space technology and space experience may be honest, may be sincere, but most certainly is wrong.

ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY

Expansion of our population does not come from adroit use of technology—that might win a prize as the most obvious statement of the year—but the capacity to support a burgeoning population does depend upon technological competence. In other words, pregnancies occur and children are born with a minimum use of technology and certainly without knowledgeable application of systems analysis, but standards of living will rise for expanding numbers of people only if there is continuing advancement, continuing progress in science, engineering, and management. No program has ever before given such impetus to technological growth as has the National Space Program.

One need only cast his eyes over the map of the world while referring to statistics of each nation's per capita income, and the story will be clear. We know where poverty is greatest and living standards lowest. We know where turmoil is most likely and national strength weakest. We know these things because it is no secret—in fact it cannot be concealed—when countries invest little or nothing in technological advances. Our nation of more than 200 million people does not enjoy its high standard of living primarily

because of its location or its other natural assets, but rather because of its employment of technology in making effective use of its human and natural resources. Again, I suggest that you look about the world and note that where there is progress in human welfare it correlates closely with progress in technology.

Those who oppose adequate spending on space technology are deliberately or inadvertently campaigning for a lower standard of living for our people, a declining Gross National Product for our nation, and a secondary position in strength to that of the Soviet Union.

SPACE PROGRESS

When I attended this Symposium almost four years ago, I expected great things of the space program and I have not been disappointed. At that time, the six flights of the Mercury Program had been completed and we were indeed encouraged to see that we were making positive advances in catching up with the Soviet's manned program. Then, after adequate time of preparation, we entered upon the ten-flight Gemini Program and, in so doing, we flew right past our energetic competitor. Today, the two nations together have totalled slightly more than 2500 manhours of space flight. Approximately 80% of that was logged by U.S. astronauts. We have had almost twice as many manned flights, we have the record for flight duration, we have twelve hours compared with their twenty minutes of extra-vehicular activity, and our ten rendezvous and nine dockings of manned spacecraft are the only one which have taken place to date.

While all this was going on, we have continued to expand our knowledge and experience in other aspects of space. We have not neglected the national security features, either manned or unmanned. We have not neglected the scientific studies of the solar system. We have examined in detail the physical characteristics of the Moon, that natural satellite which we plan to visit soon. Yes, this has been the most fruitful technological decade in man's history. One cannot help but be amazed at the speed of progress, at the rate at which technological advances have taken place—even though it is characteristic of space programs to require long lead time investments and the use of new techniques.

Yet, while still retaining some optimism, I hasten to alert every one of you to the fact that our investment in the space program to date has mostly been an investment in the future, the returns from which can be lost in large measure if we lack the vision and the vigor and the desire to keep this country great by maintaining a vigorous space effort.

U.S. ECONOMY

It may seem to be a far cry from the purposes of this Symposium to enter into a discussion of the state of our economy. But, I still think it is pertinent to make at least a brief reference to it, since so many who want to slow down our technological progress use the excuse that we cannot afford it. I would make two points in that regard. First, the country has never been economically stronger than it is today. Employment is at an all-time high; unemployment is low; and the Gross National Product is at a record peak, as are profits, wages, and salaries. Second, none of those practical indices would be so favorable if we had spent less on research and development in prior years. It is foolish to believe that we cannot afford technological advance; the fact is we cannot afford to slow it down.

To such a learned audience, it is unnecessary for me to point out that funds spent on the space program are spent right here in this country, rather than out in space, and that the technology born through such ef-

fort remains here to further private enterprise in many, many fields. I say it is unnecessary to point that out to you, but I mention it anyway as a suggestion that you may want to pass those facts on to others less knowledgeable. It is probably somewhat less obvious but just as true that there would be more unemployment and more poverty, almost automatically, if the space program were severely curtailed. I suggest to those whose eyes are not on the stars and also whose feet are not on the ground that they give some additional thought to that very point. We should all know that the United States is stronger and wealthier because of its space program, and we should know also that such strength and such wealth make us much better able to handle the other urgent problems which confront us. Surely a means of handling such problems cannot help but come from increased income, increased products, increased jobs, and new sources of employment through advances in technology. This is the vital role of our space program.

DEFEATIST ATTITUDE

There are those, of course, who are trapped by the illogical proposition that if the money involved were not spent on space and if the talents of the manpower employed were available for use elsewhere, those resources would automatically flow into projects of health, housing, crime, air or water pollution, education, and other problems of our complex society. Hence, they suggest that it would be better to invest our resources in those areas instead of in space technology and space exploration. I do not agree. It is not an "either/or" situation. I have great confidence in the capabilities of this country to handle many high priority projects at the same time; I believe that the problems of poverty and its related ills certainly deserve high priority—and I believe that the space program likewise merits high priority. I never have been able to understand those who favor solving problems with the wasteful approach of "let's wait and maybe do it later."

FUTURE SPACE ACTIVITIES

Not long ago, I prepared and submitted to the Congress in response to a Committee request a summary identification of space projects we should be carrying out and space capabilities we should be building for the future. That list included improvements in methods of propulsion, both chemical and nuclear. It pointed out that we should also be melding the major features of aeronautics and astronautics, so that space vehicles will have great maneuverable reentry ability and will be recovered, maintained, refueled, and reused.

We not only expect to have men land on the Moon in the next few years, but also to follow this with other trips to explore the lunar surface and possibly to establish one or more bases there. We will also have permanent manned Earth orbiting stations with a variety of functions and missions. Such activities would include looking away from the Earth to take a magnificent step forward in astronomy and looking down toward the Earth to increase our knowledge about Earth activities, Earth characteristics, and Earth environment. We also would expect to have unmanned probes throughout the solar system and manned expeditions to visit planets whenever that becomes promising and practicable.

While all this is going on, we expect great progress in communications, navigation, weather prediction, and perhaps weather control—all through the use of the space dimension, all stressing the practical and doing the seemingly impossible.

INVESTMENT IN PROGRESS

Recently, during his presentation of the Collier Trophy, Vice President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The people who don't explore today find themselves without the ingredients of progress for tomorrow. This great economy of ours is not the product of accident. The so-called technological gap, even between ourselves and other developed nations, is not just good luck on our part or bad luck on theirs. The investment that this nation has made, both public and private, in men and materials in the fields of science and technology, and particularly in all of the related fields that surround our space exploration, has contributed immensely to our technological and scientific successes."

He then went on to mention some of the benefits of the space program and emphasized the major returns which flow from space technology into the field of medicine.

In our space program, we learn more about healthy people, preventive medicine, effects on humans of drastic changes in environment, the application of space-developed electronics to hospital care, and the adaptation of space equipment to medical science. Surely health is not the least of our interests, and certainly one effect of a slowdown in manned space exploration would be to handicap our efforts toward health improvements.

Some of you know that I make it a practice of speaking not only rather bluntly but also quite briefly. Today, I have done the former and if I stop right soon, I can also do the latter. For emphasis, I will add a few concluding points, however.

CONCLUSIONS

First, the benefits of the space program are things of which we can be proud—things to boast about, not incidental items to apologize for. I refer to the stimulus to our economy; the new materials and services; the advances in communications, observation, and navigation; the contributions to medicine; the influence on our educational system; the major additions to our store of scientific knowledge; the potential contributions to international cooperation and world peace; and the essentiality to national security.

Second, the economy of this country is built on technological capability—the greatest supplier of which is the aerospace industry and the related parts of our Federal Government. But, if we grow blind to the clear light of truth about the benefits of space exploration, the economy will slow down, and the United States will risk becoming a lesser nation.

Every major power and every nation eager to raise its standard of living and world influence strives to participate in space technology and space exploration. It certainly would be ironic if the United States, as the world's leader in international cooperation and the world's leader in standard of living, were to abandon or even neglect the source of such strength. I believe it might be labeled the worst mistake in history. The national and international effects would be disastrous. I hasten to state that I do not believe we will make that mistake. To avoid it, however, I suggest that those who are as well-informed as the attendees to this Symposium need do an even better job of nation-wide—yes, world-wide—education than we have been doing to date.

WHY MUST THERE BE HUNGER?

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days there has been a lot

of discussion and talk about hunger in the United States—mainly as a result of the critical cases revealed on a national television network program called "Hunger in the United States of America."

For the RECORD, I would like to insert my response to this program which was published in a column written by me for the Sun, a supplement of the San Antonio News-Express, June 20, 1968:

WHY MUST THERE BE HUNGER?

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ)

Here in the United States for the first time in the history of the world, we have created an economy where there is general prosperity—most Americans have plenty to eat, a decent home, and enough to wear.

How, then, many persons ask, can there still be serious cases of poverty and hunger in this country?

The question of why there is poverty is not something that can be easily discussed in a few short sentences. Even economic experts who come close to knowing all there is to know about the factors which determine the economies of the world find it hard to reduce the reasons for poverty to some simple explanation.

It cannot be dismissed by those who think it philosophical to say: "We will always have the poor with us."

One thing is certain, the vast majority of the poor are not living in poverty because they want to, but because they have never had much chance to live any other way.

Many of the persons living in poverty were born into it. Their parents were poor and their parents' parents. They have never known any other life because they, like their parents, got little education and never received the job training which would enable them to move ahead.

Most of the poor have never really understood how to take advantage of what opportunities there are, and some of the others who do have suffered the disappointment of being denied an opportunity for one reason or another.

It is incredible to me how many persons have apparently had their consciences pricked and have, at last, become awakened to the fact that there is poverty in this country by seeing the examples of critical malnutrition on the CBS program "Hunger in the USA."

Perhaps, this was the main point of the program—to shock into an awareness those in our country who are capable of being sensitive to this problem.

If there are enough of these people, who now find themselves genuinely concerned for the first time, then those of us who have waged a war against poverty all our lives—even before we had a government program by that name—will not be defeated as often as we have been in the legislative bodies of the land.

However, the program fell short in describing just how extensive hunger and poverty in our country is (rural USA and the city of San Antonio is not the extent of it) and gave no indication of what progress has been made in eradicating need through the various federal, state, and local programs.

What is being done? What progress is being made?

Well, one of the main reasons for poverty is a lack of jobs or marketable skills. As well as being instrumental in setting up training programs for hundreds of San Antonians, I have succeeded in adding a net total of 12,000 new positions since 1965 to the local economy—this by my own personal effort. I expect this total to rise by another 2,000 by the time the year is out.

Since 1964 I campaigned to get the county and the city to enter into the federal food

stamp program which we made possible here in Congress, and at last, on July 1 it will begin operating in San Antonio.

In the meanwhile about 11,000 individuals in San Antonio will receive Federal commodities every month.

Thirdly, I have campaigned for the federal school lunch program in San Antonio, and most schools offer it. Because of my efforts, San Antonio is also one of the very few places where a child can get a free breakfast at school.

San Antonio has extensive community action programs, is one of the original concentrated employment program cities, has been selected as a Model City, is one of the five Test Cities in the nation, has one of the outstanding summer youth opportunity programs, participates in the Neighborhood Youth Corps with one of the model programs in the Nation, and otherwise has taken advantage of every possible means of alleviating poverty and unemployment.

Virtually none of these programs existed before the current Administration started doing business, and all of them are in action in San Antonio because the Administration responded to my requests for help.

There are many other programs which have contributed to the health of the general economy of San Antonio and improved the standards of living for its inhabitants. However, I have tried to touch upon briefly those programs which most directly alleviate the problems of the poor.

What else can be done? Well, I have a whole passel of proposals I have introduced in Congress which have yet to get to first base because those forces who differ with my outlook and philosophy have succeeded thus far in preventing their enactment.

If I could, I would blot out poverty with one fell swoop (there are those, of course, who wouldn't even if they had the power). Needless to say, I do not have this (god-like) power. All I can do is to keep trying to work for and try to get enacted those programs which can come close to eliminating the problems of the poor.

As you know, I was the first to introduce a measure in the State Senate of Texas in 1957 calling for a minimum wage for the state, and there is yet to be one enacted although some of our current state legislators have continued the fight.

I was instrumental in getting through Congress a federal law guaranteeing a minimum wage which has been helpful in many instances, but which cannot cover all jobs; therefore, the need for the State of Texas to have its own minimum wage law is still very great.

Next week I will discuss those programs which I have proposed which, if enacted, would further eliminate poverty.

METRIC SYSTEM

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey a message from a constituent, Mr. E. Ralph Sims, Jr., of Lancaster, Ohio. Mr. Sims is a professional engineer. In an article published in the Ohio Engineer magazine some time ago Mr. Sims wrote on the subject which is now before us, the metric system.

Under unanimous consent I submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE METRIC-ENGLISH TWIST

Some intellectual controversies continue year in and year out with little or no direct impact on the world or on society. Other controversies have direct economic effect and must be examined more realistically and practically. The controversy which is coming to a crisis in America today is the argument concerning the metric system vs. the English system of measure. It was brought to a head by the recent decision of the British Government to convert to the metric system within the next 10 years. This leaves the United States as the only industrial power in the world which adheres to the old English system. What is the significance of this unilateral resistance to change?

During a recent trip to Europe I drove from Stockholm, Sweden, to Oslo, Norway, in a German-built American-financed Opel Kaydet. This automobile has the steering wheel on the left in the tradition of American and Continental manufacture. However, in Sweden the driving is to the left. For this reason, on passing the border the driver must shift from the left side of the road to the right side of the road. There is no guard or customs officer at the border. The only definition of the Swedish-Norwegian border is a switchover traffic island which you pass at speeds of from 40-70 miles an hour. By contrast, when driving in Britain you also drive on the left side of the road but the automobile has the steering on the right hand side. The net result is that for every model of British automobile sold in both the domestic and foreign market, two designs are required (a left hand a right hand steer) and for every model of a foreign car sold in Britain (Volkswagens for example) a left hand and a right hand steer model is required. In spite of this you see few British cars in Sweden.

This example tends to illustrate the futility and the economic risk of standing alone in a market which has accepted a technical standard. The British sale of automobiles is based upon inflated costs because of its single minded attention to the left side of the road. It is rumored in Britain that this will soon change. If this is possible, the economic effect will be a reduction in British automotive construction expense and an increase in their marketing flexibility.

The United States, in adhering to the English system of measure, creates somewhat the same type of economic limitation on world trade that the British left hand drive automobile has created. American products when sold overseas must either be manufactured to European specifications (thus requiring a double standard of design and manufacture) or must be used with modifying techniques in the foreign country where the metric system prevails. For example, an engine lathe manufactured in the United States would have a micrometer screw designed in thousandth of an inch. This tool, when sold in Europe would either have to be equipped with a calibrating dial or a metric feed screw. In either case the modification would increase the net cost of manufacture and reduce the competitive advantage of America's high production techniques.

One of the arguments against conversion in the United States is the high cost of replacing current investment in capital equipment and production techniques. One of the factors which is not mentioned is that most American products, even the "big ticket" items such as automobiles and refrigerators, have a built-in obsolescence. It is reputed that automobile manufacturers design their product for an optimum service life of 5 years or 70,000 miles and that refrigerators and other appliances are designed for a service life of 10 years.

The productive capacity of the United States requires a continually hungry market. The design of products with infinite or long service lives would materially reduce such

opportunities for marketing. For this reason American industry has developed two basic principles of marketing and manufacturing which have given it a continuity of market equalled nowhere else in the world.

1. The products designed and built by American industry have high reliability for specific and planned service life limits.

2. The style consciousness of the buying public has been whetted by frequent model changes to the point where style obsolescence contributes to the market capacity.

These two factors, more than anything else in American industry, create the possibility for attrition in the application of the metric system. It is quite likely that in a 10-15 year period 80%-90% of the consumer "big ticket" or capital items would be consumed and removed from the market and in the design changes that would follow each model year change through this period, much of the tooling would be obsolete. Thus, the conversion from English to Metric could be handled in high volume industry as a part of an attrition program.

The question then arises concerning spare parts in support of long life capital equipment. It is true that some dual capacity would be required in this instance. However, with modern tape controlled machines, computer design and the use of conversion tables, the conversion of English dimensions to metric dimensions on drawings and in manufacturing processes would be a relatively straightforward and routine procedure. Thus, by the simple technique of adding the conversion dimension to the drawing each time it is removed from the file for use, the drawings in use for spares and continuing products could be modified by attrition with little or no investment or "crash" action.

A more critical aspect of this situation would be the conversion of standard screw threads to metric threads. There is some question in this writer's mind concerning the validity of attempting to convert rather than to supplement. In this instance it would appear that thread charts and tables and inventories should be supplemented with the metric threads so that over a period of time, by managing design and standardization, new products would be converted entirely to metric while old products would consume existing inventories and tool life in the national thread standard of the United States.

Some products are already on metric measure. Anti-friction bearings, laboratory hardware, medical and optical products and many others have been converted. The conversion cost would largely fall to the high volume consumer industries and the producers of their manufacturing equipment. As pointed out above, this conversion is not as expensive as it might appear on the surface because the inherent product attrition in the American economy would absorb much of the cost if the program was scheduled properly.

On the basis of these comments and the conclusions drawn from the writings of others I would like to go on record as strongly recommending that the United States adopt the Metric System and apply it on the basis of a scheduled conversion, probably on a 15 year base, to bring the United States into line with the rest of the world so that we will not be left in technical isolation in our shrinking economic world.

L. B. J.: A MOVE TO FIGHT CRIME

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson signed the Omnibus

Crime Act, he took a significant step toward ridding our Nation of the spiraling crime rate. The cold statistics that come from virtually every major metropolitan area of our Nation are, in reality, a compilation of very real human misery. We can no longer tolerate the growth of crime in the United States. This act will undoubtedly assist in its eventual elimination—at least in its present pervasive magnitude.

I would also like to praise the President for the message which accompanied the signing of the act. The President expressed strongly his reluctance to endorse certain sections of this act. President Johnson acted with courage to again make the powerful and meaningful arguments against virtually uncontrolled wiretapping and eavesdropping.

Mr. Speaker, certain people in this land seem to feel if you are against wiretapping on a massive scale, you are somehow for crime. Nothing could be more ridiculous or more absurd.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, I have become aware of the fragile nature of that most basic of human and American rights. Yet, in our zeal to ferret out criminals, title III of the act will virtually turn America into a fishbowl society. The confidence in communications that Americans have formerly enjoyed will be seriously compromised. This title will permit an extension of wiretapping and eavesdropping into areas that not even the most enthusiastic opponent of crime can imagine. I would like to quote a relevant paragraph from President Johnson's statement:

Many states have protected the citizen against the invasion of privacy by making wiretapping illegal. I call upon the state and local authorities in the other states to apply the utmost restraint and caution if they exercise the broad powers of title III.

We need not surrender our privacy to win the war on crime.

Mr. Speaker, the entire bill is filled with ambiguities and so perhaps I can be permitted a few ambiguous feelings of my own. Even title III contains most laudable provisions, those which will restrict the private use and interstate shipment of eavesdropping and bugging devices. I have been working for such a bill for some time. My own bill, H.R. 602, would accomplish practically the same purpose as the provision of title III.

Up until this time, individuals could freely purchase, through the mails, devices which dissolve the walls of their neighbors. No one was safe from the casual snooper or the malicious and unscrupulous enemy. The use of these devices is widely known and they have been employed to overhear the most intimate revelations in psychiatrists' offices, church confessionals, and dozens of other places that decent people consider private. It is high time that society took this step to protect itself from the anti-social actions of some among us.

Mr. Speaker, the act contains other worthwhile features. For the first time in decades a gun control provision has seen the light of day. This is, of course, only a halfway measure and we are now in the process of strengthening this pro-

vision to meet more fully the threat that firearms pose to a free society. The act will assist local jurisdictions in meeting the overwhelming necessity of making our streets safer and in imposing law and order upon what is fast becoming the jungles of our cities.

A significant result of the act will be the ability to deal with the problem of organized crime within our society and the special threat that this poses. Certainly it is time to consider the implication of the new technology of this complex age falling into the sophisticated criminal's hands and the havoc that could be wrought.

The time is long past due when we must bring a sense of balance into the law and scientific achievement. The threat of organized crime or overzealous bureaucrats using this new tool without regard for our law poses a grave threat to each citizen as well as to the Republic. There is much more that we should and must do in this direction. Perhaps it is time too to consider new approaches to drying up the large amount of money that witnesses have testified is generated by organized gambling. Some officials of the Department of Justice have testified that 95 percent of illegal money is acquired by organized gambling. It is this money that becomes the treasury of organized crime with the corruption that follows. Perhaps some thought should be given to the alternative of total wiretapping, eavesdropping, and computerization of our society. If people wish to gamble perhaps an alternative would be to legalize gambling thus creating new tax revenues and at the same time drying up the revenues of organized crime. I believe a study should be made on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, all laws are of necessity compromises. The President reflected the difficulties in accepting some of those compromises in his message. We know that the act will strengthen local law enforcement; we can only hope and pray that these same local people will have the restraint and responsibility to use with the most extreme discretion some of the potentially disastrous features of the act.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the President's message speaks good sense to the American people, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

L. B. J.: A MOVE IN "NEW DIRECTIONS TO FIGHT CRIME"

(NOTE—Text of President Johnson's statement last night on signing the omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968.)

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968 has had a long journey.

The work behind the principal title of the Act began in July 1965 when I appointed the National Crime Commission. The work of the Congress started more than 16 months ago, in February 1967, when I called upon it to strike a sure and swift blow against crime in America.

Now, almost 500 days later, the legislative process has run its full course. The measure before me carries out many of the objectives I sought. But it also contains several other provisions which are unwise and which will not aid effective law enforcement.

Over the past ten days, I have given full consideration to this intricate, 110-page bill. I have carefully weighed the good features

against the undesirable, the questions of law and policy it raises against the remedial actions I might take to resolve those questions, the immediate crisis of local law enforcement against the bill's response.

My decision has been made only after consulting with the wisest counselors available to the President. I have asked eleven Government departments and agency heads, including those most affected, such as the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, for their views. No Department has recommended veto. On the basis of their advice and my own searching examination, I have decided that this measure contains more good than bad and that I should sign it into law.

I sign the bill because it responds to one of the most urgent problems in America today—the problem of fighting crime in the local neighborhood and on the city street.

The program I recommended 16 months ago—the Safe Streets Act—is the heart of this measure.

My program was based on the most exhaustive study of crime ever undertaken in America—the work of the President's National Crime Commission. The Commission—composed of the Nation's leading criminologists, police chiefs, educators, and urban experts—spotlighted the weaknesses in our present system of law enforcement. It concluded that the states and local communities need large-scale Federal financial assistance to help them plan, organize, and mount a concerted and effective attack on crime.

The bill I sign today provides much of that urgently needed assistance. It will give help to the ill-equipped and poorly-trained policeman on the beat, to the overburdened courtroom, to the antiquated correctional institution. The legislation honors the deeply rooted principle that the Federal Government should supplement—but never supplant—local efforts and local responsibility to prevent and control crime.

This measure moves in new directions to fight crime by:

Authorizing \$400 million in Federal grants over a two-year period for planning and launching action programs to strengthen the sinews of local law enforcement—from police to prisons to parole.

Creating a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to begin a modern research and development venture which will put science and the laboratory to work in the detection of criminals and the prevention of crime.

Establishing a pioneering aid-to-education program of forgivable college loans and tuition grants to attract better law enforcement officers and give them better education and preparation.

Providing greatly expanded training for state and local police officers at the National Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Permitting Federal funds to be used to supplement police salaries and to encourage the specialized training of community service officers whose mission will be to ease tensions in ghetto neighborhoods.

These are among the prime advantages of this bill I sign today.

The measure also ends three decades of inaction on the problem of gun controls. Interstate traffic in handguns and their sales to minors will now be prohibited by law. The majority of all the murders by firearms in this nation are committed by these small but deadly weapons.

But as I have told the Nation and the Congress repeatedly, this is only a half-way step toward the protection of our families and homes. We must go further and stop mail order murder by rifle and shotgun. We must close a glaring loophole in the law by

controlling the sale of these lethal weapons, as well as the sale of ammunition for all guns.

A week ago I submitted my proposal for more stringent safeguards. I asked, as I had before: "What in the name of conscience will it take to pass a truly effective gun control law?"

In the next few days, the Congress has the opportunity to answer that question. The call to action is compelling. We dare delay no longer. I urge the Congress to act on this bill immediately. I am asking the Attorney General to explore what further steps should be taken in the gun control area so that I may recommend them when the Congress has acted on the legislation I submitted last week.

Title III of this legislation deals with wiretapping and eavesdropping.

My views on this subject are clear. In a special message to Congress in 1967 and again this year, I called—in the Right of Privacy Act—for an end to the bugging and snooping that invade the privacy of citizens.

I urged that the Congress outlaw "all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping, public and private, wherever and whenever it occurs." The only exceptions would be those instances where "the security of the Nation itself was at stake—and then only under the strictest safeguards."

In the bill I sign today, Congress has moved part of the way by:

Banning all wiretapping and eavesdropping by private parties.

Prohibiting the sale and distribution of "listening-in" devices in interstate commerce.

But the Congress, in my judgment, has taken an unwise and potentially dangerous step by sanctioning eavesdropping and wiretapping by Federal, state and local law officials in an almost unlimited variety of situations.

If we are not very careful and cautious in our planning, these legislative provisions could result in producing a nation of snoopers bending through the keyholes of the homes and offices in America, spying on our neighbors. No conversation in the sanctity of the bedroom or relayed over a copper telephone wire would be free of eavesdropping by those who say they want to ferret out crime.

BEYOND NEEDS

Thus, I believe this action goes far beyond the effective and legitimate needs of law enforcement. The right of privacy is a valued right. That is why we must strive to protect it all the more against erosion.

I call upon the Congress immediately to reconsider the unwise provisions of Title III and take steps to repeal them. I am directing the Attorney General to confer as soon as possible with the appropriate committee chairmen and warn them of the pitfalls that lie ahead, in the hope that the Congress will move to repeal the dangerous provisions of this Title.

Until that can be accomplished we shall pursue—within the Federal Government—carefully designed safeguards to limit wiretapping and eavesdropping. The policy of this Administration has been to confine wiretapping and eavesdropping to national security cases only—and then only with the approval of the Attorney General.

This policy, now in its third year, will continue in force. I have today directed the Attorney General to assure that this policy of privacy prevails and is followed by all Federal law enforcement officers.

Many States have protected the citizen against the invasion of privacy by making wiretapping illegal. I call upon the State and local authorities in the other states to apply the utmost restraint and caution if they exercise the broad powers of Title II. We need not

surrender our privacy to win the war on crime.

Title II of the legislation deals with certain rules of evidence only in Federal criminal trials—which account for only seven per cent of the criminal felony prosecutions in this country. The provisions of Title II, vague and ambiguous as they are, can, I am advised by the Attorney General, be interpreted in harmony with the Constitution and Federal practices in this field will continue to conform to the Constitution.

Under long-standing policies, for example, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Federal law enforcement agencies have consistently given suspects full and fair warning of their constitutional rights. I have asked the Attorney General and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assure that these policies will continue.

My overriding concern today, as it has been since the first day I became President, is for safe streets in America. I believe this measure, despite its shortcomings, will help to lift the stain of crime and the shadow of fear from the streets of our communities.

That promise, contained largely in Title I and in the reinforced Gun Control law I have asked for, must not be deterred.

I believe it is in America's interest that I sign this law today.

Crime will never yield to demagogic lament—only to action. With this measure, we are beginning to act. The Federal Government is taking a long overdue step.

But at a time when crime is on the tip of every American's tongue, we must remember that our protection rests essentially with local and State police officers. For of the 40,000 law enforcement agencies in this Nation, more than 39,750 are local, while some 200 are state and only the remaining 40 plus are Federal. Of the 371,000 full-time law enforcement officers in the nation, 308,000 are local, while 40,000 are state and only 23,000 are Federal. The essential duties these 23,000 Federal officers are authorized by law to perform are to protect the President, ferret out crime in interstate commerce, investigate crime in interstate commerce, guard our borders and enforce the tax and customs laws.

Today the Federal Government is acting. But action must now also come from the cities and counties and states across America.

The cities must increase the size of their police forces.

The cities must pay their law enforcement officials more.

The local communities must train them better.

The cities and the states must streamline their courts and correctional institutions.

Both the cities and states must plan with care and imagination to use the new Federal funds we will make available under the act I sign today.

Today, I ask every Governor, every Mayor and every county and city commissioner and councilman to examine and adequacy of their state and local law enforcement systems and to move promptly to support the policemen, the law enforcement officers and the men who wage the war on crime day after day in all the streets and roads and alleys in America.

Most important of all, I call upon every citizen in this Nation to support their local police officials with respect and with the resources necessary to enable them to do their job for justice in America.

I call upon our church leaders and every parent to provide the spiritual and moral leadership necessary to make this a law-abiding Nation, with respect for the rights of others, respect for their system of government and support for those charged with the responsibility of protecting our lives, our homes and our liberties.

BUFFALO JURIST TO HEAD NOTRE DAME LAW SCHOOL IN CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the University of Notre Dame Law School, the Nation's oldest Catholic law school, will mark its 100th anniversary in 1969.

I am particularly pleased that the university has named a prominent Buffalo, N.Y., citizen and jurist, Justice William B. Lawless, Jr., of the State supreme court, as dean of the law school effective on July 1.

This is a significant occasion for the law school, and it chose wisely in selecting Justice Lawless to be its new dean as the school looks forward to substantial expansion of its operation in the next 5 years.

I know Justice Lawless well, having served with him on the Buffalo Common Council at the time he was council president.

Justice Lawless is a fine citizen and public servant, who, I am sure, will bring distinction to his new role at Notre Dame, as he has to his many responsibilities over the years in his home area of Buffalo.

Buffalo's loss is Notre Dame's gain. I know that I speak for our entire community in saying that we still miss his leadership and his guidance, but that all wish him very well as he turns to the academic field at his alma mater.

In looking ahead to his position, Justice Lawless said he hopes to be able to double the school's student body and its faculty in the next 5 years.

In so doing, Justice Lawless said:

The emphasis will be on public law and human rights—in that order.

Justice Lawless feels emphatically that the law as it is written must be obeyed, that there are peaceful ways to oppose unjust law. He adds:

But I cannot accept violence or then we would turn the nation into a jungle.

The basic solution is renewed respect for law and order in our society.

The alternative is chaos.

Mr. Speaker, the Magnificat, weekly newspaper of the Catholic diocese of Buffalo, carried an excellent article on Justice Lawless by Dick Klug in its June 20 edition, as follows:

BETTER LAW SCHOOL, GOAL OF JUSTICE LAWLESS
(By Dick Klug)

Supreme Court Justice William B. Lawless Jr. has packed a lot of life into his 45 years. He's gone from law to politics to the hallowed halls of the courts. On July 1, less than two weeks from now, he'll take on a new job in what so far has been a highly successful career—Dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School.

And more than a few of his colleagues and friends are betting that success will continue.

"He's well suited to be dean of a law school," praised one colleague, as he noted

the wide and deep intellectual interests of the respected and hard-working jurist.

A native of North Tonawanda, Lawless is resigning from the Supreme Court to accept his challenging new post in South Bend, Ind. He will succeed Dean Joseph O'Meara, 69, as head of the nation's oldest Catholic law school. O'Meara, dean since 1952, is retiring.

Lawless attended Ascension School, North Tonawanda, through the seventh grade, then shifted for his final year to St. Rose of Lima School, Buffalo. He took his high schooling at Canisius, then located at St. Michael's Church in downtown Buffalo, graduating in 1940.

Lawless remembers how after school he would visit the courts to watch the trials. "I became interested in law and never thought of anything else, really."

Next stop was the University of Notre Dame and its law school, which he attended from 1942 to 1944. He became editor-in-chief of the student publication, "Notre Dame Lawyer."

After serving for two years as a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy, he launched his private law practice with the firm of Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth.

The young Lawless was soon immersed in politics. By 1954, at the age of 31, he became the city's youngest corporation counsel when he was appointed to the administration of Mayor Steven Pankow.

He scored another "youngest" two years later when at 33 he became the Buffalo Common Council's youngest president. He served on the Council from 1956 to 1959.

His rise through the echelons of public service continued, when in 1959 he was elected to the State Supreme Court. It marked only the second time in half a century that a Democrat won a contested seat to that court in the Eighth Judicial District.

Meanwhile, as Lawless pursued his law practice and political and judicial career, he was completing his education, retaining close ties with his alma mater and raising a family.

He received a bachelor of arts degree in 1949 from the University of Buffalo. He attended evening classes and majored in history and government. He received a master of laws degree in 1950 from Harvard University.

He was married in 1944 to Jeanne M. Offermann, daughter of a former Erie County sheriff, the late Frank Offermann. The couple now has 12 children—six boys and six girls—and lives at 35 Voorhees Ave., Buffalo.

In 1961-62 he was president of the 3,000-member Notre Dame Law Association. Since 1963 he has been a member of the law school's Advisory Council, a group of 30 prominent jurists and lawyers from across the nation.

Three times during his blossoming career he was recognized with "man of the year" awards: in 1956 by the Buffalo Jaycees, in 1957 by the New York State Jaycees and in 1962 by Notre Dame.

One of Lawless' colleagues marvelled at the breadth of his intellectual interests. "Some lawyers," he observed, "have a very deep knowledge in a narrow field. But Lawless is just one of those people with a really wide intellectual grasp of things. It's very unusual for a lawyer."

In his interview with the *Magnificat*, the soft-spoken jurist bore this praise out as he expounded thoughtfully on the problems of law and the courts, and of the nation and world.

As for the State Supreme Court, which he is soon to leave, he expresses worries about that court's disposition of criminal cases. "The criminal docket has fallen badly behind," he says, citing one recent case he handled to illustrate his point.

It involved a young man arrested in March, 1967, on a burglary charge. Penniless, he

made no effort to apply for bail and get his release from jail until the time of trial. The case was finally moved to trial in March of this year, after the man had spent one year behind bars.

The man was found guilty after trial, but what worries Lawless is that he might have been innocent yet still have spent a year in prison.

Lawless suggests that State Supreme Court give preferred attention to the trial of criminal cases and that the State Legislature provide for additional judges across the state.

At present, 65 to 70 percent of the Supreme Court's work involves auto negligence cases. They are moved to trial about 10 or 11 months after lawyers on both sides are ready for trial, which is rapid by national standards, affirms Lawless.

With the keen insight of a social scientist the jurist probes for the causes of the turbulence and bitterness that affects many of today's young people and plagues the nation's urban areas.

He cites one study which traced some of the youthful discontent to their parents' lack of solid convictions. And this in turn was traced to society becoming highly mobile in the wake of World War II and the Korean War.

"Until World War II," says Lawless, "American society was not very mobile. People were born and raised in the same general community. With the war, they were sent all over the world. It left many confused."

Still, this father of 12 has praise for the young. He says:

"Youngsters today are dedicated to a search for truth and they will not accept clichés and old saws. They want hard evidence before they reach conclusions. They will not necessarily accept the judgement and guidance of their parents."

The effect of this critical attitude isn't confined to the United States alone, he says. "It's effect is seen across the board. It's a general world condition."

Lawless sees this instability manifest in law itself. For some years, he says, there has been a movement afoot not just to accept the law as it is but to ask, "Is this law just?"

In New York State this was evidenced by the liberalizing of its divorce law, moves to ease the abortion law and to completely rewrite the penal code.

To all this Lawless adds:

"If a law is unjust or improper it should be repealed."

Lawless' primary interest lies in Constitutional law and hence he says he derived his greatest satisfactions presiding over criminal cases.

"The great problems in Constitutional law today develop on a day-to-day basis in criminal law," he said, noting such perplexing and often volatile issue as search and seizure, freedom of speech, the right to counsel, the right of a suspect to be warned of his rights.

Like many Americans, perhaps more than most, Lawless as a judge is caught up in the turmoil caused by the black revolution for freedom and equality. And though he emphasizes that the law must be obeyed, he has words that should be weighed carefully by many Americans who think the sole answer to rioting and disorder is repression.

At this point Lawless reached forward to pick up the little black paperback laying amidst the clutter of papers on his desk. Leaning back in his chair, he propped his feet on the desk and paged through the book, the recently published report of the Presidential commission which studied the nation's disorders.

"I don't feel that it's any solution to the problem of civil disorders to simply arrest people who throw rocks and loot stores and create havoc in our cities.

"This isn't going to solve the social prob-

lems which produce people like that. I believe the basic problem is the need for more jobs, for greater educational opportunities, social acceptance, improved housing, tight enforcement of laws that help prevent consumer exploitation."

Lawless echoes the thoughts of communications theorist Marshall McLuhan when he sees television as playing an important role in bringing on the Negro revolution.

Before 1948, ghetto dwellers never realized how well people lived in their own city, he said. "Television portrayed the advantages that many of us enjoyed and this led to the frustrations of those living in hardship."

So he could get a first-hand glimpse of the difficulties of slum living, Lawless accompanied a social worker on visits to families a couple years ago. He calls it "the most shocking experience of my life."

But with all this said, this interpreter of the law is emphatic that the law as it's written must be obeyed.

"I don't believe that violence or intentionally breaking the law is the way to reform and to revitalize the law," he says.

"Americans have great recourse in the free press, in free speech, which includes peaceful picketing demonstrations. I'm in favor of that to oppose unjust law.

"But I can't accept violence or then we would turn the nation into a jungle. The basic solution is renewed respect for law and order in our society. The alternative is chaos."

ARMY OFFICER DIES IN CRASH

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Michael L. Phillips, a fine young soldier from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

ARMY OFFICER DIES IN CRASH—LIEUTENANT PHILLIPS WAS ON MISSION NEAR DA NANG

An Army officer from Prince Georges County was killed in Vietnam June 13 when a helicopter in which he was a passenger crashed after colliding with an Air Force plane, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

He was identified as 1st Lt. Michael L. Phillips, 25, son of Lt. Cmdr., USN (Ret.), and Mrs. Pearly L. Phillips, of 4916 White Oak Drive, Oxon Hill.

According to the Department of Defense, the crash occurred near Da Nang while Lieutenant Phillips was on an artillery observing mission. Observation was his basic military speciality.

BORN IN WASHINGTON

Born in Washington, Lieutenant Phillips lived at various naval installations while his father was on active duty.

He was graduated from the Oxon Hill High School in 1960, and after studying for a year and a half at the University of Maryland, he left school to work in the computer field with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

He later reentered the University of Maryland and then enlisted in the Army in 1965 after his junior year.

TRAINED AT FORT JACKSON

Lieutenant Phillips took his basic training at Fort Jackson, S.C., and then completed officer candidate school at Fort Sill, Okla.

He took helicopter training at an Army facility at Mineral Wells, Texas, and general warfare training at Schofield Barracks, Ha-

wall, before being assigned to Vietnam last December.

Aside from his parents, Lieutenant Phillips left no immediate survivors.

SPEECH BY JAMES RESTON

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it was inevitable that the vast majority of graduation speeches this year were tinged with gloom. Even now, most of us are still numbed with the shock of Senator Robert Kennedy's untimely and senseless death. Commencement speakers throughout the country have had a difficult time stressing opportunity, chance, and hope for the future of the graduates.

Therefore, the graduates of Williams College were unusually fortunate in having as their commencement speaker James B. Reston of the New York Times. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, to a certain feeling of closeness to Scotty Reston—since he is now a near constituent, having bought the Vineyard Gazette and made plans to eventually retire to Martha's Vineyard with his wife, Sally. However, my reasons for calling his talk to the attention of my colleagues are not based solely on local pride. Mr. Reston pointed out in his brief but to the point talk that all is not wrong with the world, and that whatever is wrong, is not all our fault. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all my colleagues will be interested in reading James Reston's speech to the graduates of Williams College, and I insert it in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, as follows:

TALK BY JAMES RESTON, WILLIAMS COLLEGE, JUNE 9, 1968

President Sawyer, Members of the faculty, parents and members of the Class of 1968: I can't get over the idea that a few minutes of silence or a walk in the woods would be more appropriate than one more speech on so hot and sad a day, but I will be brief. In fact, if I run over ten minutes, I will welcome a demonstration.

There is a certain ritual to these occasions. Some middle aged speaker you never heard of is supposed to tell you that the world is a hopeless mess, that it is all the fault of the Older Generation, and that we're just waiting around for you to bound out of college and fix things up.

Well, I have news for you. The world is not a hopeless mess. It's not all our fault, whatever is wrong. And we're certainly not hanging around to hand things over to you. The first thing you have to learn when you get out is how to tolerate middle aged bores. And the second thing is that these same bores are determined to stick around and get in your way as long as they can.

It must have been hard for you not to wonder this week whether you were going out into a lunatic world. The Puritan conscience always reappears in times of great tragedy. The assassin's guilt is suddenly transferred to the whole American nation. I wish we confessed our real sins more often and didn't assume quite so much responsibility for our imaginary sins.

America is not sick; it is drunk. It is dizzy with change. The vast advance in the pace and power of life has been too much for it.

We have changed the world faster than we can change ourselves or our institutions. We are making more progress with the social reconstruction of our lives, in my view, than any other nation in the world, but we are in a race with the pace of history and are still falling behind.

It is not the politicians who are changing the world. Johnson with his modified capitalism, Wilson with his modified socialism, DeGaulle with his modified monarchy, and Brezhnev and Kosygin with their modified communism are all in the same boat. They are all rushing about trying to make the pitiless facts of the modern world fit their old conceptions, old ideologies, and old habits and they are all in trouble. For it is the scientist and the ordinary people—the fertility of the human mind and the fertility of the human body—that are changing the world faster than we can adapt to its new problems and opportunities.

Obviously, there is a lot of mental and moral insanity in our own society. Take a walk in any great city at night, if you dare: the evidence is all around you. We used to pray: Lead us not into Temptation . . . Now we are not being led but driven into it. Many people have so much that they cannot handle it; many have so little that they cannot bear it. And the affluence is conspicuous, and the waste is appalling, and the voice of the hawk—urging us to buy more and consume more on credit—is not to be avoided even in the most miserable slum.

H. G. Wells wrote a little book thirty-three years ago called "What Are We To Do With Our Lives." When I read it again this week, I had to wonder why we have been so slow in understanding the consequences of change. He was saying then, not that society was sick, but that it was blind and thoughtless, that we had to clear a lot of mouldy rubbish out of our minds before we could begin the effective work of reconstruction. And then, he thought, we could go forward with what he called an open conspiracy to build a cooperative peaceful world.

I mention this now because it seems so relevant to me at the present time. The failure to keep asking the big question—What are we doing with our Lives?—not only leads into narrow and dangerous paths. If we were reasonably clear about this in Washington, I doubt whether we would be spending our money and energies the way we now are. Vietnam did not develop into a world issue, dividing the alliance and our own people and postponing the urgent cooperative work of the Northern Industrial nations because of the acts of wicked men. If Lyndon Johnson had been clear about the nation's priorities, he probably would not have given so much weight to his personal fear of being the first American President to lose a war.

I don't want to plunge into this thicket except to make a point. It is that men and institutions and government need a clear definition of the central purpose of their lives if they are to avoid being diverted constantly by secondary or even trivial considerations. The more complicated the world becomes, the more we specialize, the more we specialize, the more each of us concentrates on his little part of the job, and before long, if we are not careful, we find that all this machinery of colleges, newspapers, governments, and even churches clatters along without much reference to the purpose of all this activity. Incidentally, this is the really exciting thing about the Roman Catholic Church today. Pope John asked and imposed the right question: Is the church relevant to the modern age? If not, let's make it relevant.

The student activity in this year's elections provides another illustration of this problem of the effective use of our lives. The students have concentrated on electing Sena-

tor McCarthy. He did not discover and inspire them so much as they discovered and inspired him. But anyway, they have made an art of playing hockey and have shown in the process that they can be effective working within the system.

My concern is that, if they are disappointed, they will give up. It may be, however, that the really critical battleground for change this year lies not in the Presidential race but in the Congressional races. All the candidates in both parties who have a chance to win the Presidency are more in touch with the requirements of the coming age than most of the Congressional candidates.

Consider, for example, the worst of them. It would not be difficult to identify the fifty most conspicuous dunderheads running for office this year. If the University students in their districts got together, even at this late date, and worked to bring them down in November, I believe they could retire at least fifteen or twenty of them, and this would be a great service to the Republic. James McGregor Burns, who knows more about defeat in politics than I do, thinks I'm a little optimistic about this, but I still think there's something to the idea.

Everybody is deploring the use of violence these days, and no wonder. But deploring violence does not deal with the problem any more than torrents of tears deal with the assassination of Robert Kennedy. We deplored violence when John Kennedy was killed too. We criticized crowded political rallies and rides through political mobs in the emotional atmosphere of Dallas. But we still go on with the same old political campaigning techniques, and we provided no real security around the presidential candidates in this election five years later.

We are living in a violent age. We are trying to deal with a political revolution, a racial revolution, a social revolution, an urban and agrarian revolution and a military revolution all at the same time. We are involved in highly emotional controversies between communist and non-communist, Jew and Arab, Muslim and Hindu, all over the world. These things often involve the future of nations and races and creeds for which many men are willing to die or to kill. The facts are plain and pitiless.

My worry about the young rebels of today is not that they are protesting and demonstrating against many aspects of our society, but that they will stick for one or two brisk skirmishes and then quit. It is not hard to master the techniques of militant anarchy. A modern technological society is very vulnerable to it. Fifty determined young men with the aid of a few technicians can go down the manholes and cripple, not only Columbia but the City of New York. Any madman can terrorize a city or kill a Senator, but remaking a society into something even a little more fair, decent, and compassionate is a much more difficult, and complicated job.

It is very hard work. It takes a very long time. It requires a great many patient people sticking with a great many tough jobs, but the greatest ally of the militant minority is the indifference of the majority. Even today, only a very small proportion of our people are actively engaged in the improvement of our common life.

I am concerned about what seems to me a growing mood of pessimism in the land. Maybe I make too much of it because we in the reporting business are largely responsible for it. We concentrate on the contention and conflicts of life; we have forgotten Berlin, which was the real danger to world peace but talk only about Vietnam; we climb all over Columbia University in its troubles and ignore Williams. This is natural but it depresses the national mind, and despair can be almost as dangerous as indifference.

Unless I miss my guess, we shall make our way through this gloomy period. Whatever

else you can say about America it is grappling with the great questions of human life. It is working on the questions of world peace. It is at least conscious of the poor. It is making a greater effort to compose the injustices to the Negro people.

How then is a college graduate to approach this kind of world? One way is to reject it and escape from it. There are many ways of doing this, some of them quite fashionable. Academic life provides many comfortable corners where you can lose yourself in your own little narrow specialty and ignore the larger social and political issues of the age. It is not true that there is "no place to hide." A remarkable number of highly intelligent people are hiding all over the place.

Business life offers many opportunities to move from air-conditioned offices to fancy suburbs along wide highways that by-pass not only the slums but much of Life itself.

The excuses for bugging out are endless. You can say and maybe even prove, that the world has been taken over by inferior men who do not have your noble vision of life or are too slow for your tastes. You can gather with other "superior" people and scoff at the banalities of the press and politicians. And of course you can cop out altogether and live for yourself, if you can stand it, with the help of whatever stimulants you can find to ease your depression. Maybe you would be happier in porky middle age than I, but I wonder.

Meanwhile, there is work to be done. The peace talks have started but last week we lost more boys in Vietnam than in any other week of the war. Robert Kennedy is dead, but after all the crying and exhortation, the problems remain. That is the way the world has gone from the beginning:

Listen to these lines:

"To Whom Can I speak today?

The Gentle man has perished,
The violent man has access to everybody
To whom can I speak today?
There are no righteous men,
The World is surrendered to criminals."

This was not written by Gore Vidal, but by a gloomy bard, and not a very good one, over four thousand years ago in the time of Egypt's Middle Kingdom.

Or hear this second quotation:

"Never was there, perhaps, more hollowness at heart than at the present, and here in the United States. Genuine belief seems to have left us. The underlying principles of the States are not honestly believed in. . . . The spectacle is appalling. We live in an atmosphere of hypocrisy throughout. The men believe not in the women, nor the women in the men. . . . The great cities reek with robbery and scoundrelism. . . ."

This was written over a hundred years ago by Walt Whitman. So much for "the good old days."

The main difference I find in the modern grumblers is that they don't write as well as the old grumblers. Besides, despite all our troubles, it seems to me that a cool look at the present age justifies a little more hope.

You are the first college graduating class in the last third of the Twentieth Century. Far from pitying you, I think you are a comparatively lucky lot. When your parents were your age, they got out of college (if in fact they had the chance to go to college) in the middle of the most savage world war in the history of the human race. That one made Vietnam look like a minor skirmish. Or if you go back another generation, most of your grandfathers and grandmothers were confronted by the First World War. Also, in those days, college presidents punished students, instead of the other way around.

So misery is a comparative thing. I men-

tioned that we are just entering the last third of the Century. We are 23 years beyond the second world war. We have problems, God knows, but if we look at them in historic terms, they are not all that bad. Twenty-three years after the first world war was 1942. By that time, Hitler had already occupied the Rhineland. Mussolini was in Abyssinia; almost all of Europe was overrun by the German armies, and the United States was about to be attacked at Pearl Harbor.

The situation today is quite different. This country, by its sacrifices, has created a new balance of power in the world. We have not found the answer to small wars, but at least we have avoided a big war for longer than the British and French did when they had primary responsibility for maintaining peace between 1910 and 1939.

The outlook is not hopeless. The American people are not "sick." There is plenty of sickness among us but mainly we are just diverted or indifferent. The political process is responsive to the will of the people, but, like love, it has to be expressed at the right times.

Meanwhile, on a more personal note, I would urge you to be very careful about scoffing at the moral values of the past. Some things we do know about the future. You are going to live in a crowded and convulsive world. The way things are going it is likely to be a deceitful world, dominated by large institutions. If on top of this, all your fears and charges are true, that it is run by fools and demons—then surely personal love and friendship, and some kind of faith will be more precious than ever before. Already, the family is the one unit of society that makes more sense than any other, and I cannot believe that it is in your selfish interest to trifle with the values on which the honor and fidelity of the family are based.

This brings me to my final point. I sometimes think that on the great occasions of life, we celebrate the wrong people. On birthdays, we remember the child and forget the mother. We grieve for the dead and sometimes overlook those who are left behind and envy the dead. And at graduation we celebrate the graduates and forget the parents. This is not quite fair—especially now when graduation is often an expensive interlude between two expensive phases of education—all at the Old Folks' expense.

So I congratulate not only the Class of '68 but the parents of the class of '68. The latter have at least stayed the course, and that, after all, is the main thing.

THE TAXPAYERS' FRIEND: JAMESTOWN, COLO.

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is ever so easy for one of our colleagues, in the performance of his congressional chores, to accomplish something in the taxpayers' interest and have that act go unnoticed. I venture to say each Member of Congress, in the performance of his constitutional duties, has accomplished many noteworthy but unpublished acts.

It should be very heartening to us to know that we do have alert, hard-working newsmen, who will diligently search

out, then publicize, noteworthy acts by the Members of Congress.

One of our most able colleagues has been the recipient of a newsman's hard work and a well-deserved accolade in the form of an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, June 19, 1968.

The Honorable DONALD G. BROTZMAN, Congressman from the Second District of Colorado, richly deserves this "pat on the back." In my opinion, every hard-working taxpayer will want to add his "amen" to this editorial.

This editorial speaks for itself, but in calling this monumental goof to the attention of the Postmaster General, Congressman BROTZMAN put the fiscal welfare of the Nation above that of his own district. As colleagues, we do not have to be reminded of the courage such action takes. But, I might add, such action is typical of the Congressman from the Second District of Colorado.

Congressman BROTZMAN ably represents his district. He is constantly fighting in behalf of his constituents. In the Halls of Congress, the good people of the Second Congressional District of Colorado do not stand in any reflected light. In their corner, those Coloradans have an able Representative, ever willing to share their fight, ever willing to make sacrifice to save the taxpayers money. This editorial, "Three Cheers for Jamestown, Colo.," most certainly echoes three cheers for Congressman DONALD G. BROTZMAN.

I am happy to make this editorial available to the readers of the RECORD:

THREE CHEERS FOR JAMESTOWN, COLO.

There are 109 patrons of the post office at Jamestown, Colo., which is between 10 and 15 miles from Boulder, Colo. (pop., 1960 census, 38,000). In Boulder, says one citizen, "I've had to wait 30 minutes to mail a letter."

There's no such situation at Jamestown, apparently. You can walk into the post office there and mail a letter in less time than that. What's more, you can also buy a can of beans, a work shirt and stuff like that there, because the Jamestown post office is off in a corner of the general store run by Donald Haynes. Mr. Haynes also is the postmaster.

The United States Government has been paying \$120 rent a year for the Jamestown post office space.

Now this tidy if informal arrangement seems to have affronted the majesty of the United States Government, which some time back announced that it was going to approve, for Jamestown, a \$14,000 post office edifice.

The only problem, it developed, was that the citizens of Jamestown did not want a new \$14,000 post office. They liked what they had. A group of Jamestown citizens formed a group calling itself Voters Opposing Indiscriminate Civic Expenditures (i.e., VOICE, what else?) and hired an attorney to speak for them. "This," he said of the proposed \$14,000 building, "is a waste of money. The facility is not needed. It will be fought. . . ."

And fought it was. VOICE fired off a plea for help to Jamestown's Congressman, Rep. Donald G. Brozman, who in turn fired off a letter to the Hon. Marvin Watson, Postmaster General, beginning: "I would like you to personally investigate a monumental goof which the Post Office Department has committed at Jamestown, Colorado. . . ."

As Rep. Brotzman observed, the plan was for the new building to be leased to the Government for about \$2,000 a year, or substantially more than the going rate of \$120 for the space at the general store. And, he said, while the Post Office Department may regard a \$2,000 annual rental as an "insignificant amount, I do not."

Neither did the people of Jamestown. Mayor Jim Heaton said: "We do for ourselves. We'll go out and fix a road, build a firehouse or repair a bridge, rather than have the town do it, just to keep the taxes down."

The citizen who had to wait 30 minutes to mail a letter in Boulder says that if the Government has so much money to spend on post offices out that way, the Boulder post office could use it. For Jamestown's post office is going to remain in the general store. As the mayor says, Jamestown people "do for themselves," and three cheers for them.

TESTIMONY OF STEEL LABOR AND MANAGEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF STEEL QUOTAS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 18, 1968, representatives of the United Steelworkers and the American Iron and Steel Institute in a joint appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee presented testimony on the question of iron and steel quota legislation.

The Ways and Means Committee, which has been holding hearings since June 4 on the question of trade policy and quotas, heard testimony from Mr. Thomas F. Patton, chairman, Republic Steel Corp., who represented the American Iron and Steel Institute, and from Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America.

The presentation of statements by both the labor and management sectors of America's most vital industry called dramatic attention to the problems facing American iron and steel. World overcapacity of steel production facilities, foreign government subsidy of foreign steel, and restrictions by foreigners on American steel sold abroad, have created a flood of imports, generally from low labor cost areas.

The future security and prosperity of America depend considerably on the health of this most basic industry. I would like to include the statements of Mr. Abel and Mr. Patton in favor of steel quota legislation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that everyone will take the time to read this important testimony, which follows:

STATEMENT OF I. W. ABEL, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF "STEEL AND IRON ORE QUOTA BILL" (H.R. 14120), JUNE 18, 1968

Mr. Chairman, my name is I. W. Abel. I am President of the United Steelworkers of

America, a union which represents the workers in the basic iron and steel industry in the United States and Canada. We also represent iron ore mines in both countries.

I am sure that the joint appearance before this Committee of the Union and the Industry, represented by Mr. Tom Patton of Republic Steel and me, will come as a surprise to many, since we are currently engaged in negotiating a labor agreement. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we hope that our appearance will elicit more than surprise. We hope it will arouse a real concern for and a willingness to investigate the new problems which our domestic economic system faces as a result of our current national trade policy.

EVALUATION OF TRADE POLICY

All of us, of course, are moved by the argument that if a specific policy works, it must be the right one. But the converse is also true. There can be no dogmatic truths in an evolving and changing economic climate. The best argument for pursuing our foreign trade policy, which was initiated over thirty-four years ago, has been the fact that we have developed and generally maintained a favorable trade balance. This was particularly true in the steel industry until 1959, at which time we began to rapidly plunge into a deficit position. Now the national trade balance is also being jeopardized.

The 1967 trade surplus was only 3.6 billion dollars, and already this year we have experienced trade deficits. Our balance of payments have also succumbed to a long series of large international deficits, beginning in 1958. It is interesting to note that the last time this Committee deliberated upon our trade policy we were very much in a surplus condition and our payment deficits were declining. The impact of those deliberations was not to be felt until this year, but the atmosphere in which you conducted them was certainly optimistic—between 1960 and 1965, our trade surplus averaged 5.2 billion dollars and during the same period, our payment deficits dropped from minus 3.9 billion to minus 1.3 billion.

BALANCE OF PAYMENT AND TRADE

	Balance of payments (billions)	Balance of trade (billions)
1958.....	-3.4	+3.3
1959.....	-3.9	+1.0
1960.....	-3.9	+4.8
1961.....	-2.4	+5.4
1962.....	-2.2	+4.4
1963.....	-2.7	+5.1
1964.....	-2.8	+6.7
1965.....	-1.3	+4.8
1966.....	-1.4	+3.7
1967.....	-3.6	+3.6

It is no wonder then that we accepted the fact that our national trade policy was correct. It was working. But, gentlemen, the same logic should prevail today and we should acknowledge it. Our trade balances have dipped and not just because of temporary factors. Deep penetrations by foreign producers have been made into domestic industries and apparently there is no leveling off in view. At any rate, the clarity of the logic is being felt in the steel industry and the Steelworkers' Union has responded to it because it may mean the livelihood and jobs of our members.

My comments should be taken within the context of our Union's support for an expansionary trade policy. We have traditionally fought for the concept of wider trade

relations with other countries because of its political and economic advantages. The international political aspects of freer trade are readily recognized. We have equated our national political interest with the advancing of international cooperation. As Dean Rusk recently indicated: "The trade policy the United States has pursued for more than three decades contributes to [our] broad political objectives."

Moreover, we have felt that our foreign economic policy has enhanced our national economic welfare. As a matter of fact, the most persuasive justification of our trade policy was the very evident contribution which it did make to our economic growth. We are, therefore, convinced that an isolationist economic policy is outdated in a world of interdependence. It was probably one of the achievements of the New Deal era that the philosophical position of "fortress America"—at least as far as trade is concerned—was demolished. However, current evaluation cannot rest upon past performance or past factual situations. International trade has now taken on different dimensions.

I make these comments precisely because the problems of the past and their solutions are not necessarily the problems facing international trade today. Unfortunately, there are too many who would apply, in a doctrinaire manner, the public policy decisions of the past and criticize any contemporary evaluation of present day problems as an attempt to return to the days of the Smoot-Hawley Act.

Our past trade policy grew out of an economic atmosphere of scarcity. At that time, artificial trade barriers, which further restricted each countries' limited productive facilities, had condemned the various individual national economies to total dependency upon each countries' weaknesses. Within an economy of scarcity, there was little room for improvement.

However, just as today the development of our domestic public policy is being conditioned by the problems arising from an economy of affluence, so also our foreign trade policy must grapple with the same source of international economic concern. Although these complexities arise from an affluent economy, they are no less real or no less critical than those arising from a depressed economy.

We are, therefore, appealing to you to view our trade problems within this context. What I am saying is that we must have a balanced trade relationship within an expansionary trade policy.

As far as the domestic steel industry is concerned, we are experiencing a rapid and accelerated percentage penetration of our market by foreign producers. Within the last five years, steel imports have risen from 3 per cent of domestic demand to almost 15 per cent, if current imports for 1968 are projected on an annual basis.

Furthermore, we have been a deficit nation in the value of direct steel trade since 1962. The current deficit amounts to about 900 million dollars. But more than that, we are still a deficit nation even when we take into consideration indirect steel trade—that is, trade in which steel is used in manufactured products. In 1966, our total steel trade balance was in a deficit position by almost 500 million dollars. This, of course, causes a drain on our balance of payments. But is also refutes the contention that American steel which is exported in manufactured items outbalances and compensates for any deficit in direct steel trade.

STEEL IMPORT STUDY

VALUE OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT (END-USE) STEEL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS AND THEIR EFFECT ON U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

[In millions of dollars]

	Imports ¹			Exports			Trade balance total exports less imports
	Steel products (direct imports)	End-use items ² (indirect imports)	Total (direct plus indirect)	Steel products ³ (direct exports)	End-use items ⁴ (indirect exports)	Total (direct plus indirect)	
1957 ⁵	235	109	344	977	510	1,487	+1,143
1958	252	110	362	733	435	1,168	+896
1959	639	171	810	485	450	935	+125
1960	552	145	697	711	480	1,191	+494
1961	462	102	564	503	480	983	+419
1962	586	129	715	443	495	938	+223
1963	752	127	879	448	525	973	+94
1964	897	154	1,051	583	515	1,098	+147
1965	1,395	193	1,588	553	645	1,198	+390
1966	1,444	257	1,701	545	660	1,205	+496

¹ Values increased by 10 percent to adjust from FOB to CIF basis.² Values calculated by multiplying estimated net tons of indirect imports times the average CIF landed value per net ton of imported steel mill products plus 10 percent to adjust from FOB to CIF basis.³ Values represent steel product exports less AID-financed exports.⁴ Values calculated by multiplying estimated net tons by an average price of \$150 for finished carbon steel in the domestic market which during this period ranged from \$149 to \$158.⁵ The value of "other steel products" component of the steel product direct imports and exports estimated.

Note.—For comments by AISI on this table see appendix.

Source: AISI, Foreign Trade Trends Quarterly; AIS, Imports 1; AIS Exports 1; USDC, Overseas Business Reports.

We are convinced that the pressure behind these foreign imports is basically one of affluence—in other words, it results from excessive overcapacity. The Senate Finance Committee, last December, released a report indicating that surplus capacity had already reached a level of 50 million tons. Each year, steel capacity grows at a rate of 33 million tons. It is the continued investment in overcapacity facilities which must be moderated in order to bring about a balanced trade relationship.

STEEL AND ORE QUOTAS

Our support of the Vanik bill is predicated, therefore, upon a two-fold objective. First, the bill will determine that, as a matter of public policy, a 10 per cent penetration of our steel market is a balanced one. Maybe Congress will suggest another figure. But, set a level, it must, in our judgment. As far as iron ore is concerned, our miners have complained about job losses due to the continued high levels of importation of ore during periods of recession. Their job loss becomes more pronounced than basic steelworkers if there is not a proportionate reduction of iron ore imports comparable to a downturn in steel production. Currently, ore imports are about 36 per cent of domestic consumption.

The second objective will be found in the fact that the bill will serve as a guideline for foreign steel industries to moderate their investments in facilities producing steel well beyond their own domestic consumption and a reasonable share of our market.

It would be disastrous for Japan, for instance, to be led to assume it has an unlimited access to the U.S. steel market. Then, at a later date, when its investments are already made and its manpower already committed, if Japan is forced to curtail its access, severe political and economic consequence would undoubtedly ensue. Now is the time to declare whether there is a limit. And, this is a responsibility for Congress.

This, then, is the sole purpose of our support of a flexible quota bill. We have arrived at this position at a time when our own industry is accelerating its investments in new plants and equipment to modernize obsolete facilities. There has been severe criticism leveled at the industry for allowing its facilities to become outdated. There may be some justification to the charge. But the industry is now correcting this problem. My concern, however, arises from the fact that if we do not retain a steady share of the increase in domestic demand for steel, there will be a job loss, since the new facilities will be able to produce more steel with less workers. Fur-

thermore, if the increased domestic market is lost to our own producers, I am afraid that the necessary continued investment to modernize will be suspended.

OVERCAPACITY

I cannot over emphasize the coincidence of these two factors: *foreign overcapacity and domestic accelerated investment*. If the report of the Senate Finance Committee carries any real message, it is the documentation of overcapacity and the concomitant pressure that it puts on the world market. The price structures of the United Kingdom and Europe are under heavy strain because of it. It is our firm contention that the world surplus of steelmaking capacity must be brought into balance with the world demand for steel. Otherwise, these industries, as instruments of their own government's full employment policy, will be compelled to export whatever the cost—or, should I say, loss. And that loss will be at our expense in steel production and steelworkers' jobs.

The compulsion to export is dramatically revealed by a news release in the January 11, 1968, issue of the *Japan Metal Bulletin*, which I submit for the record with my statement. The Bulletin declares that "... the iron and steel industry is planning to provide obligatory export quota to steel, the tonnage allocated to be 10 per cent over the actual exports in the current fiscal year, with export target in the next fiscal year raised to over 12 million tons.

"Those companies that fail to export the allocated tonnage will get less coking coal than they want to get delivered; or will be penalized by \$28 per ton covering the balance unexported."

ACCELERATED INVESTMENT

Furthermore, the U.S. Steel industry, as indicated by Tom Patton, has embarked upon a program of rapid technological development. I note that our academic community has been critical of the past decisions of the industry. How justified those criticisms are I leave to your judgment. But those are past decisions that have no weight now. Actually, as a union president, I must begin to think about the rapidity of the investment which is at the rate of approximately \$2½ billion a year.

(a) Employment impact

The more recent acceleration of steel imports has come fortunately at a time of an extended boom in the American economy. Steel production in 1967 was 127 million tons. Despite this increased production, however, steel employment has substantially declined.

In 1952, steel production stood at 93 million tons and employment at 545,000 workers. Employment in 1967 was only 424,000 workers, 121,000 less than in 1952, although production had increased by 34 million tons. Of course, this is the result of increased productivity and is an economic factor decreasing the need for manpower in the steel industry regardless of the import situation. However, and this I stress, without the increased demand for steel accompanying our present economic growth, the impact of automation on steel employment would have been intolerable.

According to Professors Adams and Dirlam, long-run decreases in employment are due to increases in productivity and not to increases in imports. But this is true only because the foreign penetration of our growth in steel demand has begun to reach alarming proportions just recently. If, however, foreign producers had penetrated our markets earlier, the unemployment rates would have been totally unacceptable not only to our Union, but, I am sure, to the nation also. It is precisely because increase in productivity does indicate a downturn in employment that we must retain an appropriate share of increased steel demand. If investments proceed at the present clip and imports expand at the current accelerated rate then we are in for employment trouble. The *Wall Street Journal* (5/23/68) recently noted: "Consumption (1968) is much higher, but imports are siphoning off most, if not all, the growth."

Moreover, if there is a dip in the economy and the present percentage penetration by foreign producers is retained, the reaction of unemployed steelworkers will be predictable and justifiable.

(b) Conglomeration

We have become increasingly uneasy over the new tendency for corporations to conglomerate. Its impact upon labor relations could be disastrous. During the recent strike with the copper industry, we were appalled over the contemplated merger between Kennecott and Peabody. Now the steel industry is engaged in this adventure. The list of companies so far include Crucible, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, Allegheny Detroit Steel. Inland Steel has created a Ludlum, Bethlehem, U. S. Steel, J & L, and corporate development staff unit which will be responsible for seeking out and evaluating new diversification opportunities.

I mention this new development here because the pressure to get a higher rate of return upon capital investment may begin to drive steel funds out of the industry into other lucrative endeavors. If the industry is doubtful of its future share of the market, its stockholders will put the doubt to rest.

We are all aware of the fact that the industry must and is investing heavily in new technology. But as the Senate Finance Committee reports: "Aside from the fact that foreign producers are also modernizing their facilities, often with assistance from their governments, these investments are greatly increasing the fixed charges of the domestic industry. Unless the output of the U.S. steel industry increases by some 2 to 2½ per cent a year, such fixed charges can only mean higher rather than reduced costs per ton of output and, therefore, smaller rather than higher profits. This would result in less funds being available from retained earnings and the capital market for investment in research and modern facilities."

A rise in imports may, therefore, not only result in a displacement of workers but also by encouraging conglomeration may put the workers who remain in the industry in an extremely jeopardized position as far as their ability to collectively bargain.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

There is yet another major concern which we have over increased imports. It is the short-term adverse impact which these im-

ports exert upon our membership's expectation of normally continuous employment and our union's right to bargain. When the union's contract approaches the termination date, there is a rush to build up inventories as a hedge against strike action. Despite various attempts to keep the purchasing domestic, many steel consumers increase their foreign orders. After the immediate period of negotiations and/or strike is over, there are layoffs in the steel mills as inventories are worked off. Furthermore, long-range commitments are made by the domestic consumers to foreign producers which result in a long-term loss to domestic steel production.

These commitments are being made because the foreign producer takes the advantage of a good opportunity and demands a long-term contract for shipping steel for a period of two to five years.

In 1965, after the last inventory buildup, some 65,000 steelworkers were laid off, while steel imports were coming in at the rate of about one million tons a month.

We very definitely do not think that our foreign trade policy should be taken advantage of to the detriment of the domestic workers who are exercising their prerogatives under the expressed public-policy procedure in labor-management relations—namely, to bargain collectively.

The right to bargain is a cherished one, but it is being eroded by the unfair intrusion of foreign trade. The February 8 issue of the *Japan Metal Bulletin* mentions that the Japanese government, concerned about its own balance of payment deficits, has "... asked steel companies for increased exports and decreased imports (here, I especially call your attention to the comment) and with the threatened steel strike in America resulting in increased enquiries, the original export target of 10 million tons is likely to be attained." (Emphasis supplied)

Gentlemen, we should be allowed to bargain a domestic agreement within the framework of a domestic situation.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we are becoming very annoyed by the so-called advocates of the free trade market. The labor movement has never accepted the fact that the unhampered decisions of the market place will redound to the benefit of the workingman or the consumer for that matter. It was for that reason that unions were organized to protect workers from the callousness and inhuman operations of the free market where labor was considered a commodity and social justice was a trade barrier. As a matter of fact, the trade union movement was considered to be an illegal conspiracy in restraint of trade. The great social laws of the thirties denounced the notion that a union was an illegal conspiracy, although it does remain as a restraint of trade in the domestic market place when it exercises its obligation to prevent labor from being treated as a commodity.

Why, then, in the international trade market must labor again be treated as a commodity and a union's right to negotiate a wage benefit be a restraint of international trade? Well, Mr. Chairman, we reject that notion of a foreign trade policy. Our trade policy is not an end in itself in which its primary objective is merely to increase the free flow of goods. A free flow of goods did not automatically insure the interest of workers and consumers domestically and it will not do so internationally. A trade policy, like an economic system, must also provide for the raising of the workers' standard of living. At that point, where the trade balance begins to restrain a union from negotiating wage increases consistent with the growth in the domestic economy, then that trade policy like the economic policy of the thirties, is treating labor as a commodity. This observation is particularly true when imports presumed to flow because of a com-

petitive advantage, penetrate a market when there is a particular domestic problem unrelated to the cost competitiveness of the domestic industry. I speak about periods of negotiations and strike action. Recently, we witnessed the unwarranted strike-breaking acceleration of copper imports (and, I might say, they are still coming in despite the fact that copper miners are not being recalled to work) and today, we are deluged by steel imports for inventory buildup, despite the fact that the union and the industry have only recently begun formal negotiations. I mentioned earlier that there is always a search for scapegoats to explain a drop in trade. It seems too many are eager to point a finger at the labor movement and the unit labor cost. Yet, the U.S. Treasury Department in its release of January 1968 on *Maintaining the Strength of the Dollar* stated that: "In the 1960's, U.S. unit labor costs in manufacturing declined slightly while those of our major European competitors rose significantly. If changes in relative costs were the only determinant of export performance, then we should have noticeably increased our relative share of world markets."

It is this dimension of our trade policy which contravenes our public policy on collective bargaining that this Committee should also give serious attention. However, let me reiterate that our problem in the steel industry exists whether we are engaged in negotiations or not. The negotiation period is only an occasion in which the increased levels of imports become more noticeable in that they reach these levels more rapidly. It is certainly erroneous to leave the impression, as some earlier testimony did, that the upsurge in steel imports is a result of strike or the negotiations of this union.

Moreover, it is maintained that one of the reasons for a greater flow of trade is to restrain price increases. But, after reading some of the recent extreme statements by import trade associations, I wonder whether the real objective is to restrain legitimate wage increases. At what level of market penetration will this be a reality in the steel industry? And when it reaches that level, how many workers will be penalized by losing their jobs in order to control the pricing policy of the various corporations? Until such time as we can have international price competition in which labor is not a commodity and there are international fair labor standards, then I suggest that American workers not bear the full brunt of a national pricing policy.

I submit, therefore, that we are not talking about extremes—a total free trade policy or the protectionism of Smoot-Hawley, as envisioned by the massive retaliation arguments. Our position as a Union lies within the framework of an expansionary trade policy—but one which is balanced. Our concern is not over a freer trade relationship. We are committed to that. Nor is it one of being unduly aroused over fairer trade. Certainly, we seek equitable anti-dumping laws and the reciprocal elimination of non-tariff barriers. But for an industry that is primarily domestic, our attention is directed at a more orderly and balanced penetration of our market. Even GATT regulations recognizes the chaotic conditions arising from "market disruption."

We are advocating, therefore, that these quota restrictions be enacted and enforced until such time as world overcapacity is moderated. Once there is a more proper relationship between world demand and world capacity, then, injurious competition will be abated. We are not opposed to steel trade—even at competitive prices—but, we are convinced that the competition should arise from lower cost factors and not from the compulsion of excess facilities. Hence, we view the fact of overcapacity as the crucial malady in the world steel trade picture and

not necessarily other competitive factors, like wage costs.

I might also mention that the principle of trade adjustment assistance to a limited number of workers displaced by foreign trade is most necessary, but highly unsatisfactory as a solution to massive displacement. I am aware that there are a number of proposals before Congress which would liberalize that section of the Trade Expansion Act dealing with assistance to workers adversely affected by foreign trade. I hope that Congress will react favorably to these proposals. It is my understanding that, as of now, not one single case has been acted upon favorably by the Federal Tariff Commission. However, it is one thing to provide assistance for a small group of workers, who will be adversely affected in the interest of a broader trade policy, which provides greater demonstrable economic growth for the economy and more job opportunities for American workers. However, such a relief program cannot be a substitute for a more basic solution to the problems facing the steel industry.

Within the framework of an expansionary trade policy, we must now grapple with the question of a balanced trade development. It is that task which Congress must face, and it is one which this Union is completely convinced must be done now—this year.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS F. PATTON, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLIC STEEL CORP., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 18, 1968

My name is Thomas F. Patton. I am Chairman of Republic Steel Corporation. I am accompanied by Mr. William G. Stewart, President of Cyclops Corporation, and Mr. Laurence Fenninger, Jr., Assistant Vice President of Bethlehem Steel Corporation. We are appearing today as representatives of the American Iron and Steel Institute, a non-profit trade association having 67 member companies in the United States. Those companies, which include mine and those of my colleagues, account for about 95% of this country's raw steel production.

Before I proceed with my statement, I should like to express my own and the Institute's appreciation for the opportunity to be heard during your review of tariff and trade proposals. May I point out that we appear today together with I. W. Abel, President of United Steelworkers of America, and his colleagues from that Union, which represents the vast majority of the employees of the Institute's member companies. Whatever our differences may be as to other matters, we and the Union are of one mind as to the seriousness of the problem of imports of pig iron and steel mill products into the United States. We and the Union are in agreement that there is an immediate need for some reasonable limitation on the importation of those commodities to prevent the present negative balance in steel trade from growing rapidly worse.

Recognizing the importance of conserving the Committee's time and the extensive testimony you have already heard on general trade matters, I shall confine my remarks to a summary of the problem of steel imports and the solution which the member companies of the Institute endorse. Documentation for this statement is found in "The Steel Import Problem" published by the Institute in October, 1967, and recently updated to include those 1967 data currently available, a study of steel imports prepared by the staff of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, and a paper prepared by the Institute on the national security aspects of steel imports. I ask that these documents be entered in the record of these hearings, although I suggest that only the national security paper need be made part of the printed record.

In this statement, I shall use data applying only to trade in steel mill products to

avoid confusion. Those data are generally representative of the trade in pig iron, although there are substantial differences as to countries of origin of imports. All data on imports and exports will be expressed in net tons of 2000 pounds.

1. DIMENSIONS OF THE CURRENT IRON AND STEEL IMPORT PROBLEM

The dimensions of the iron and steel import problem can be described quickly. Until 1959, the United States was a net exporter of steel. In 1957, for example, we exported 5.3 million tons of steel mill products and imported a nominal 1.2 million tons. In 1967, by contrast, we exported a mere 1.7 million tons, about half of which was financed by the United States under AID programs, and imported 11.5 million tons, 12.2% of the total steel supply in the United States. Thus, in one decade, we experienced an adverse swing in trade of about 14 million tons having a value of about \$1½ billion. During the late months of 1967 and the early months of this year, the situation has grown rapidly worse. In fact, steel imports in the first four months of 1968 were more than 50% above the corresponding period last year, the previous record for those months. (Chart 1). [Charts not printed in RECORD.]

Initially, steel imports were concentrated in product categories, such as common wire rods, concrete reinforcing bars and wire products, the manufacture of which involves relatively simple technology and comparatively broad dimensional and physical tolerances. As time has gone on, however, there has been a marked shift toward the more sophisticated products, with the greatest gains occurring in flat rolled items such as hot and cold-rolled sheets and the specialty products—stainless steels, tool steels and high alloy steels. In fact, imports of specialty steels now account for a higher proportion of the supply in the United States than do imports of common steel products.

A similar shift has occurred in the distribution of imports by geographical regions. Originally, as might be expected, imported steel was confined largely to coastal areas. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, however, all major steel-consuming sections of the United States became markets for steel produced abroad. Last year, for example, the port receiving the largest amounts of imported steel was Detroit, Michigan.

As to countries of origin, Western Europe, a traditional steel exporter, supplied about two-thirds of all United States steel imports at the beginning of the last decade. The rapid expansion of the Japanese steel industry has changed the picture radically. Presently, the countries of the European Common Market account for about 42% of our total imports and Japan accounts for a similar proportion.

2. CAUSES OF THE STEEL IMPORT PROBLEM

The basic forces which have changed the United States from a net exporter of steel to the world's greatest importer are four:

First, the availability of a large amount of excess steel producing capacity outside the United States and the policies of certain foreign countries as to the use of this capacity;

Second, production costs in other countries which are far less than those in the United States;

Third, resulting low prices in world markets, some of which are below the home market prices of many foreign producers; and

Fourth, measures taken by foreign governments to protect and strengthen their own steel industries and to encourage exports.

For some time after World War II, steel-making facilities abroad were largely occupied with filling their own domestic requirements. Supply and demand were in approximate balance and such steel as was available for export went largely to countries which traditionally had imported all or

most of their steel needs. The demand for steel after World War II was, of course, very high. This, together with such factors as the formation of the European Common Market and the anticipated growth of underdeveloped countries, led the planners in Western Europe and other industrialized countries to overestimate the growth of steel consumption. The 1958 economic recession in Europe and Japan revealed for the first time a substantial excess of capacity over demand. It has never disappeared and, in fact, has grown to the point where steelmaking capacity outside the United States now exceeds production by about 55 million tons. (Chart 2). [Chart not printed in RECORD.] The pressure which it exerts on world steel markets results from the determination of other countries to export in an effort to employ their steelmaking facilities as fully as possible. It has been aggravated by the establishment of new steel industries in the less developed countries and the deliberate expansion of exports by Japan.

Exports to the United States have been stimulated by the substantial cost advantages enjoyed by foreign producers. Evidence obtained by the Institute and corroborated by the Senate Finance Committee Staff study indicates that direct production costs in Japan are about \$40 per ton and those in Western Europe are about \$25 per ton below those of the United States. With the opening of large coal and iron ore deposits around the world (principally through the activities of American producers and with American financing), the development of very large bulk cargo ships and the construction of steel plants on deep water, foreign producers have been able to reduce their raw materials costs to levels about equal to those of the United States. Costs of purchased services and supplies are below those in this country, largely because they reflect much lower wage levels. This is also true of construction costs, with the result that higher interest rates abroad have been offset by much lower initial costs.

Japanese hourly employment costs, including all identifiable benefits, are about one-fourth of ours, while those in Europe are one-half to one-third those in this country. This is largely a reflection of differences among national wage levels, since the relationship between steel wages and industrial wages generally is about the same in Europe and Japan as it is in the United States. Such differences obviously cannot be changed significantly by the actions of one industry or one labor union. By way of contrast, output per manhour in the Japanese industry as a whole is about three-quarters of ours and in the newer plants it appears to equal the current level in this country. Thus, unit labor cost in the Japanese steel industry is only one-third that in the United States. The difference is very large—\$35 to \$40 per ton of steel mill products. Unit labor costs in Western Europe, where productivity is lower than it is in Japan, are about \$25 per ton below ours.

Following World War II, the United States provided both money and know-how for the rebuilding of war-torn steel industries abroad. This, together with the rapid expansion of domestic markets in other countries, led to the adoption of superior technology around the world. That has continued and technological developments in steel are now quickly available to all who have the funds required for their adoption. Thus, although the steel industry in the United States still leads the rest of the world in efficiency, its advantage is smaller now than it was ten years ago. Furthermore, even maintaining, let alone expanding, that advantage is becoming more difficult as the steel industries of Western Europe and Japan approach that of the United States in size and continue to obtain, from domestic and other sources, the funds required for expansion and improvement of their plants. In any case, tech-

nology now available or in sight could not possibly reduce output per manhour to a level which would make our production costs competitive with those of the European and Japanese steel industries.

Excess capacity and the determination to use it for export purposes have caused the decline of steel prices on the world market. Low export prices depress the prices charged in the domestic markets of the producers toward world levels. This is especially true of Western Europe and the United Kingdom and it has been the source of constant complaint by producers in those countries.

Little is known about Japanese domestic prices since most of the steel used in that country is sold to affiliates of the steel producers or through associated trading companies. (I might note that this system of distribution also acts as a powerful deterrent to imports.) Indirect evidence derived from the financial reports of Japanese steel producers indicates that domestic prices are somewhat higher than export prices. Such information as we have been able to collect shows that world steel prices are little, if any, above the direct production costs of European producers and roughly equal to the total costs of the Japanese. Delivered prices of foreign steel in the United States average \$30 to \$40 per ton below the prices of steel produced in this country, while the average profit before taxes of American steel companies in 1967 was about \$12.50 per ton. The key to current world market price levels is the cost structure of the Japanese steel industry. Japan is the largest single exporter and all other steel exporters are affected by Japanese prices, especially in the United States market.

Foreign governments have generally taken the view that domestic steel industries capable of supplying all or most of the steel required by their economies are necessary for economic strength. They have also supported, with few exceptions, efforts by their steel industries to maintain high production levels and, therefore, employment. In many cases, they have looked on steel exports as an important means of generating foreign exchange. These views have led other governments increasingly to involve themselves in the affairs of their steel industries and to encourage exports. This involvement has taken a variety of forms, including outright ownership, as in the case of Great Britain; majority equity holdings, as in the case of Italy; low-interest bearing loans, as in the case of France; preferential capital allocation, as in the case of Japan; and the encouragement of mergers and the formation of cartels in France and West Germany.

All the steel producing countries, save the United States, have a variety of effective restrictions on steel imports, some of which are matters of practice and custom rather than of formal laws and regulations. These include, from time to time and in varying combinations, border taxes, all-pervasive domestic preference buying, special warehousing charges, customs "red-tape," and other restrictions tantamount to outright embargoes. Exports are encouraged by protection of domestic markets and by a variety of special devices including tax incentives and rebates, direct and indirect subsidies, favorable credit terms for exports and credit guarantees.

3. PROBABLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN SUPPLY, DEMAND AND COST FACTORS

The current situation is extremely serious and the prospects for the future are worse. World steel trade has been expanding at an average rate of about 4½% a year. The major foreign producers, however, have been expanding their steel-producing facilities at much higher rates, each with the intention of increasing his exports. The most notable example is, again, Japan. Last year, Japan produced 68 million net tons of raw steel, more than any other country except the

United States and the Soviet Union. That was double the amount produced as recently as 1963. Capital expenditure plans recently submitted for government approval call for a steelmaking capacity of 110 million net tons by 1971, four years earlier than had been anticipated. While domestic consumption has been growing very rapidly in Japan, it has not equaled that expansion rate over the years. The meaning is clear: vastly increased exports. Meanwhile, the European industry is continuing to expand faster than domestic consumption in spite of financial difficulties and a substantial current excess of capacity. (Charts 3 and 4). [Charts not printed in Record.]

There is little prospect that steel export markets outside the United States, will grow rapidly enough during the next five years or so to absorb the excess supply. Thus, the principal target for rising exports from Japan and Europe is the United States market.

As to costs, the Senate Finance Committee Staff study noted that if steel hourly employment costs here and abroad continued to rise at the rates of increase experienced from 1960 to 1964, it would take the French 21 years, the West Germans 25 years and the Japanese 26 years to catch up with the United States. Since world supplies of iron ore and coal are expanding rapidly, foreign producers may enjoy even lower prices for these raw materials in the future. Thus, American producers are likely to continue to be at a serious cost disadvantage. This, together with the growing supply of steel available for export from other countries, makes the continued rapid growth of steel imports into the United States a certainty unless steps are taken by the government to prevent it.

4. IMPLICATIONS OF A CONTINUED RAPID RISE IN IRON AND STEEL IMPORTS

The growth of imports into the United States during the last ten years has taken a substantial portion of the secular growth in steel consumption in this country during that period. The disparity in growth rates has been extremely large; imports have grown about ten times as fast as consumption over the last decade. The implications are very serious. If these trends continue, they mean an inevitable decline in steel producing facilities in the United States in both relative and absolute terms. The steel companies obviously cannot justify economically the continued expenditure of their owners' money for steelmaking facilities under these conditions.

During the course of our industrial history, many industries have waxed and waned in response to changes in demand and other market conditions. There are, however, two factors which make the prospective decline in the domestic steel industry as a consequence of rising imports a real problem for the United States. The first is its effect on the security of the United States. The role of steel in national defense is twofold. It is an important component of the great variety of materials and equipment used in military operations of every kind. At present, direct military requirements account for more than 4½ million tons of steel mill products, many of them highly specialized. Even more important in terms of the volume required, steel is an essential ingredient in the facilities and equipment used in the manufacture and transportation of war materials, whether or not they are made of steel. The Executive Branch agencies concerned with national security have estimated that a conventional, non-nuclear war of three years' duration occurring in the early 1970's when Gross National Product had reached one trillion dollars would result in direct military steel requirements more than double those of today and an increase in steel demand for both military and civilian purposes of about

20 percent, to a total of 140 million tons of steel mill products. The assumption is that sources of steel, other than Canada and Mexico, would not be available in case of such a war and that civilian requirements would not be curtailed.

Normal requirements are expected to increase to 115 million tons of steel mill products by 1975. If imports rise at only half the rate experienced during the last ten years, they will amount to 30 million tons, or 26% of requirements, by that year. Under those conditions, the domestic industry may well be smaller than it is now. If, at that time, a war emergency of the type envisioned by the Executive Branch occurred and steel imports largely disappeared, total domestic supply could not be expanded to 140 million tons of steel mill products. It takes three to five years to plan, construct and bring into operation a major steelmaking facility. The result, obviously, would be severe steel shortages.

Plans now being made determine the facilities available in the early 1970's. As matters now stand, those plans must assume a static or declining market for domestic steel, unless action is taken promptly to prevent imports from taking all or most of the growth in the demand for steel.

The second source of danger from a decline of the domestic steel industry is the effect of such a decline on our balance of trade. As early as January, 1966, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers pointed out that the adverse swing in steel trade between the average for 1955-57 and 1965 had reached the huge amount of \$1.3 billion. It has grown since then as exports have continued their decline and imports have continued their rapid increase. In 1967, our steel trade deficit, excluding freight charges, was \$877 million and, if the trends reflected in the first four months of this year are indicative of the rest of the year, our 1968 adverse balance will be on the order of \$1.4 billion. Compared with the average surplus enjoyed in 1955-57, this will mean a deterioration in our foreign trade of more than \$2 billion a year on the steel account alone. If steel imports were to increase at only half the rate experienced during the last ten years, the annual steel trade deficit would reach \$3 billion by 1975 for a cumulative dollar drain over the seven-year period of more than \$15 billion.

5. INADEQUATE REMEDIES SUGGESTED BY OTHERS

The suggestion has been made that steel imports could be discouraged by vigorous price competition. Let us see where that would lead the domestic producers. As I have noted earlier, the average disparity between domestic prices and the delivered prices of imported steel is on the order of \$35 per ton, or approximately 20%. In 1967, the domestic steel companies earned just over 7%, or \$12.50 per ton, before federal income tax on the sale of their products. It is obvious, therefore, that widespread price reductions sufficiently large to affect the volume of imports would put the domestic companies in serious financial difficulty. Critics of the industry have argued that price reductions could be selective, but they overlook the fact that imports have penetrated all major regional markets and all important product lines. They also ignore the point that many of steel's customers have operations in a number of regions and purchase a variety of steel products.

The experience of the steel industries within the European Common Market is instructive in this regard. In recent years, there has been an increasing flow of steel from one member country to another at prices approaching or equaling world export prices. Producers in one country, faced with exports from a neighbor at prices below those established for the domestic market, have tried to solve the problem by aligning on the

low prices of imports. The result has been a decline in the general price level and financial distress among European steel producers. Alignment on import prices by steel producers in the United States would lead inevitably to the same unfortunate consequences.

It has also been suggested that vigorous efforts to export at prices prevailing in the world market would discourage or help offset imports into this country. Selling abroad at prices below prevailing domestic prices would be extremely costly. Domestic customers could not be expected to subsidize exports at prevailing world prices and, in fact, could be expected to demand those prices themselves. This would be ruinous for the domestic steel companies. Moreover, if such actions succeeded in taking business away from foreign producers in their own or third country markets, that would simply make more foreign steel available for the United States market. Thus, this so-called remedy would aggravate the present situation.

Another "remedy" prescribed for solving the import problem is the installation of large steelmaking facilities by American producers in low-wage countries, even though there is already a world-wide excess of steel supply. This is, of course, impossible on any substantial scale under existing restrictions on capital investment abroad. Even if it were not, large scale shipments of steel from such facilities to the United States would add to the amounts of steel imported into the United States and, therefore, to our balance of payments and national security problems. They would also create domestic political problems as plants in the United States curtailed operations in favor of shipments from overseas plants. Furthermore, a modern, large-scale steel plant in a less-developed country would be a considerable economic hostage.

The most frequently heard suggestion for solving the steel import problem is that the industry in the United States should regain its former commanding lead in steel technology. This stems in part from the mistaken belief that the industry has been slow to adopt new technological developments. That criticism is usually based on a superficial analysis of the development and adoption of the basic oxygen steelmaking process which has had wide circulation. It has been thoroughly discredited by Professor Alan K. McAdams of Cornell University in an article entitled "Big Steel, Invention, and Innovation, Reconsidered." I shall not attempt to summarize this article but ask that it be included in the record of these hearings for later study by members of this Committee. I would note, however, that more steel is produced by this process in the United States than anywhere else in the world and our basic oxygen furnaces are the most advanced.

The fact is that the American steel industry is still the most technically efficient in the world. Our technology, particularly as to upgrading of raw materials and the processing of steel beyond the crude ingot stage, is superior to that of any other country. Our research facilities and efforts far exceed those of any other nation and the fruits of our research are widely and quickly adopted by the industries of other nations. This is why foreign producers continue to buy American-made equipment and seek licenses to use American-developed processes and make American-developed steel products. Furthermore, the steel companies in the United States are investing in improved steelmaking and processing facilities at a record rate and engaging in vigorous campaigns to expand the uses of steel products.

The difficulties involved in increasing our technical superiority enough to overcome our cost disadvantages are two-fold. First, steel technology is almost completely interna-

tional. An innovation by one company soon finds its way into the operations of others, both here and abroad. No one country has a monopoly on brains, curiosity and imagination. And, as the domestic markets of major steel producers abroad have grown, their former prejudices against innovation have tended to disappear.

The second difficulty arises from the cost of adopting innovations. One hears stories about the savings to be achieved through the adoption of new processes and techniques. The amounts of those alleged savings are frequently exaggerated. Comprehensive studies of the production costs which could be expected from wholly new plants embodying the latest in technology indicate that they would be substantially above those in modern plants abroad if proper account is taken of capital costs. In short, nothing now available or in the process of development can be expected to lower domestic steel production costs to the extent of overcoming the production cost advantages now enjoyed by foreign producers.

Another suggested solution for the steel import problem is the removal by international agreement of existing non-tariff barriers to trade. There is no need to dwell here on the great difficulties involved in identifying those barriers, obtaining agreement on their removal and enforcing such an agreement in the face of nationalistic considerations. It is sufficient to point out that cost disparities between steel producers in the United States and those in other countries are so large that elimination of those barriers is not likely to change the competitive situation significantly. Moreover, the removal of those barriers would not reduce the optimistic expansion plans of foreign producers and, therefore, the excess steel supply in world markets. Finally, the process of removing those barriers would consume so much time that the domestic steel industry might have suffered irreparable injury long before they disappeared.

All these suggestions for meeting the threat posed by growing imports presuppose the existence of conditions essential to the operation of a free market. They also assume no need to maintain a strong, domestic steel industry for national security. These conditions do not exist today. Differentials in basic cost factors persist among steel producing countries. Wide differences prevail among nations as to what constitute proper rules of international trade. Thus, remedies which depend on free market conditions cannot be effective in the real world of today.

To sum up, the remedies suggested by many simply do not fit the case.

6. OUR PROPOSED SOLUTION

We believe that an equitable solution to the problem of rising imports into this country is a system of quotas based on recent market shares of the countries which export steel to the United States. Action to establish such a system must be taken to prevent serious damage to the domestic steel industry. This is the system embodied in the orderly trade bills now before this Committee.

The industry recognizes that, troublesome as steel imports have become, foreign producers rely on the United States market for an important part of their sales. Any control device, therefore, which greatly reduced imports would have a seriously adverse effect on the economies of other countries. An embargo or sharply increased tariffs would have such an effect. Quotas based on recent import shares of the market would not. The bills before you not only embody such quotas but also provide review every five years to examine the system in light of then-existing conditions.

We recognize also that the capital spending programs of steel industries in certain countries, notably Japan, are presently based in part on expectations of a continuing expansion of exports to the United States. Lim-

iting those exports to fixed, absolute quantities might be disruptive to those industries. Flexible quotas expressed in terms of historical market shares would permit the volume of steel imports to grow as the United States market for steel expands. Thus, they would minimize the adverse effects on the steel industries of other countries and encourage their orderly development in the future.

7. ANSWERS TO CRITICISMS OF QUOTAS

The assertion is frequently made that the institution of quotas on steel imports would lead to instant retaliation by the countries affected against other commodities exported from the United States. This is by no means a foregone conclusion. Other nations purchase goods and services from this country because they want and need them, not because of altruistic feelings. Curtailment of those purchases would hurt not only the United States but also the country taking such action. Retaliation could be expected, therefore, only if the country involved believed that its own national interest would be served by that course.

A flexible quota system which preserved recent shares of the United States market and permitted imports to grow with those markets would not provide much to retaliate against. We are not advocating sharp reductions in imports. In essence, we are talking about maintaining market shares as they exist under normal conditions.

Under GATT, signatory nations are allowed to limit imports for national security reasons without fear of retaliation by other countries. As I have noted earlier, our national security is threatened by rising imports of steel mill products. No other important nation has net imports of such products in excess of 5 percent of its total requirements. Ours are now at nearly three times that level.

Another criticism of flexible quotas is that they would destroy competition among steel companies in the United States. The assumption here is that the only form of competition faced by steel companies is that from foreign steel producers. This is far from the case. Everyone of you has seen evidence of the competition we face from a host of other materials—in construction, packaging and the manufacture of a wide variety of articles. Limiting the flow of imported steel to recent levels is not going to reduce that competition at all. Furthermore, I can assure you from my own long experience that domestic steel companies compete vigorously with each other. Generally speaking, we do not sell a consumer product and our competition is not, therefore, as evident as that of the makers of automobiles, appliances, cosmetics or foods. But it is there, nevertheless. Finally, recent levels of imports represent a large piece of the United States market and one worth going after. Only two steel companies in this country produce more than the amount which would be coming in from abroad under the proposed quota system.

One other criticism of quotas should be mentioned. It is that their establishment would harm our friendly relationships with other nations. Our view is that far greater damage to those relationships will result from letting steel imports continue to rise to the point where even the most ardent advocates of free trade recognize that our national security is in danger. A policy of drift would encourage other nations, particularly Japan, to continue to expand their steel industries more rapidly than would be warranted by domestic and normal export requirements, only to tell them later that they must curtail sharply their sales to this country. The longer remedial action is put off, the more disruptive will be the effects on the economies of our own and other countries.

CONCLUSION

The American steel industry provides a material essential to the economy and the security of the United States. Our national

well-being depends on having an assured supply of this material in all the many grades and forms needed by a complex, industrial society. Rapidly rising imports are eroding the ability of the domestic industry to perform this essential function and increasing dependence on imports is endangering our national security. No one questions the need for steel in our economy and few doubt that there is a point beyond which it is unsafe to rely on supplies from abroad. We believe that point was passed in 1967 and that, in our national interest and the interests of the countries now exporting steel to the United States, the rate of growth of steel imports above recent historical levels should be limited to the rate of growth of steel requirements in our economy. Accordingly, we respectfully request your favorable action, during this session of Congress, on the bills before you which would limit steel imports in that fashion.

JOHN Q. PUBLIC: SUGAR DADDY

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on June 18, the Wall Street Journal pointed out that one result of our present policy on sugar quotas will be an increase in what the consumer has to pay for sugar. The editorial also decried that fact that the sugar lobby has been successful in thwarting moves by economy-minded legislators to place a ceiling on the amount that can be received in Federal support by a single producer. This problem should be of interest to all who are concerned with our Nation's current economic situation and who seek to protect the interests of the American consumer.

JOHN Q. PUBLIC: SUGAR DADDY

The way it's laid down in the U.S. Government Organization Manual, the Government's sugar program sounds simple enough. "This program," the manual says, "is designed to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and those engaged in the domestic sugar producing industry. It involves (1) determination of United States consumption requirements, (2) administration of quotas to regulate imports of sugar produced in foreign areas, as well as marketings of sugar produced in domestic areas; and (3) payments to domestic producers of sugarbeets and sugarcane who comply with certain labor, wage, price, and acreage requirements prescribed by law."

Note that in this presentation "the welfare of consumers" comes first. And yet, as this newspaper reported the other day, U.S. consumers will be paying more for sugar shortly—unless the Agriculture Department allows more supplies to come into the domestic markets. Refiners are paying, for raw sugar, the highest prices since the spring of 1964.

The way the sugar program works, the Agriculture Department at the year's end makes an educated guess as to what the next 12 months' consumption will be. It set the marketing quota for 1966 at 9.8 million tons, which during the year had to be raised to 10.2 million. It set the quota for 1967 at 10.2 million tons, and that later had to be raised to 10.8 million.

Now although the population is increasing and sugar consumption rising, the department last winter set the 1968 quota at 10.4 million tons—surely a bad guess inasmuch as refined distribution now is running about 250,000 tons ahead of a year ago.

Plainly, in creating the sugar program and subscribing to the International Sugar Agreement, Congress has saddled the Agriculture Department with an almost impossible task. The system, which, under the agreement, assigns quotas to foreign producers, has spawned an army of highly-paid lobbyists seeking to wheedle the best quota deals they can for their employers.

The system also has encouraged development of a strong lobby representing domestic sugar producers, a lobby which year after year has defeated economy-minded legislators' efforts to put some limit—such as \$100,000 annually to any one producer—on the amount of Federal support the program provides. At last count the program costs about \$80 million annually to administer.

In this juggling act to keep foreign and domestic producers happy, without causing consumers to become openly rebellious at raising prices, clearly the welfare of the consumer seems to have slipped far from its primary designation. Which is where it is likely to stay until John Q. Public lets Congress know he is pretty tired of being sugar daddy.

GUN-CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter received a few days ago, and from which I quote in part, seems to me to be a good answer to the incredible message sent to Congress late this afternoon by President Johnson:

Hon. H. R. Gross,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR H.R.: I feel obliged and compelled to write some thoughts regarding the stampede for stupid gun legislation now being crammed down the throats of legislators both national and state by many panicked but thoughtless and disoriented individuals.

I have, in the past, been associated with law enforcement agencies, the armed forces, and the sporting goods industry. I am also an inventor, have been a military as well as a civilian weapons instructor, an exhibition shot and a gunsmith.

It is my firm opinion that improper gun legislation is the greatest boon and concession to the hired killers, hoodlums, bootleggers, and black marketers in this country since prohibition was enacted. Regulations, prohibitions and laws only affect the citizen who will obey laws. The crooks, murderers, and hoodlums disregard such laws and welcome all restrictive legislation which will result in a bonanza in smuggled guns, and the clandestine manufacture of deadly weapons. Abolition of the indiscriminate mail order racket is not objectionable but will do little in the way of prevention of crime. Limitation on firearms by law cannot and will not reduce the premeditated murders or the crime rate in this country one small fraction of a percentage point. It can be predicted that such restrictive laws will not only increase the armed robbery rate but will add a whole new racket in gun running that will increase gangland killings, hijacking of arms shipments and the attendant killing of innocent bystanders and of the people legally handling such shipments.

The criminal will still be able to buy a gun from the underground, steal one, or, if necessary, make or have one made. The necessary components with which to make a firearm can be purchased in any hardware store, dime store, or found in a junkyard. From these components a lethal firearm can

be assembled by any "jackleg" machinist or mechanic in a few hours time. Such a home made weapon is capable of man killing accuracy and power over a considerable range, dependent upon the skill of the maker. Moreover, these components can be legally sent through the mail with no suspicion of what they are to be eventually used for. Silencers for guns have been illegal for years and yet they are used by gangsters and are very simple to make from standard hardware merchandise, screen wire, plumbing tubing, washers, and a couple of machine bolts.

A big hurrah will emanate from the criminal element if thoughtless restrictive gun laws are passed. Gun smuggling will become big business and the knowledge that their victim's chance of using a gun against them is small will bolster the depredations of any crook.

The gun is not the culprit to be exterminated, it is the man who makes the gun perform the task for which it is designed. There are many, many more guns in the hands of honest people than are in the hands of criminals and therefore improper gun laws will hit the honest person while leaving the lawless element unscathed. It is indeed strange that a nation would arm, train, and send its citizens off to foreign lands to fight an enemy, and disarm and harass its citizens at home in their defense against their domestic foe, the underworld. Surely there are ways of curbing the felon and reducing crime in this country by direct attack on the individual criminal through competent and vigorous prosecution and appropriate, tough sentences being imposed by fearless courts on the perpetrators of all felonious crimes against society.

The Oswalds, Rays and the Sirhans have to be eliminated along with the Mafia, psychopathic killers, and the criminal element of our society. To think that they all can be put out of business is, of course, just wishful thinking but severe curbs could be imposed on them by competent courts and unhampered, aggressive, and educated law enforcement.

Anyone with a criminal or homicidal psychiatric record should be treated severely, and I mean severely, if he is known to carry a lethal weapon or is apprehended with one in his possession. This includes guns, knives, bows and arrows, black jacks of any type.

Greed, lust, jealousy, hate, and disrespect for the law and rights of others are the basis causes of crime today, and foolish legislation on guns will only accentuate these curses in man. The finger of guilt should rather focus on our gutless and indifferent courts that have turned loose the many morons and felons to further prey on the masses and who have so shackled, frustrated, and emasculated our law enforcement bodies that they are powerless to cope with the problem.

It would seem that law makers would seek advice and research the records of the past before bringing forth another unprofessional, unenforceable, and stupid law to clutter up an already redundant law system. Prohibition of the sale or use of alcoholic beverages, dope, and other illicit contraband has, without doubt, created a huge society of hoodlums and crime barons who seem to be immune from such laws. The Sullivan Act prohibiting the possession of weapons in New York is a colossal failure in curbing crime in that state.

Sensible legislation relating to the control of guns can be enacted, but let's not be panicked into the acceptance of a senseless misdirected set of laws which will only foment another breed of mobster, and will work against the interests of the honest law abiding citizens of the country, who, thank God, are still the majority.

The Kennedys, the Kings, and many of the other people murdered each year would still have been murdered in spite of the most

rigid gun laws, because the morons perpetuating the crimes would have a total disregard for laws or consequences.

Perhaps it might be worthy of consideration to supply weapons to the solid citizens of the country and institute training classes in their use and in elementary police procedure to constitute an auxiliary law enforcement reserve force to augment our understaffed law enforcement agencies. Such an orientation might just make the citizen more law conscious and lessen their apprehension of becoming involved when supplying information which might prevent a crime. In this regard, it might be worthy of consideration to look to the ranks of retired regular army officers as a cadre of instructors. All of these people have been thoroughly investigated by the FBI, and their background documented. They have also had the basics of weapon handling, and training, command, and instructional backgrounds. I am sure many would cooperate on a voluntary basis if asked. All, naturally, are interested in the future of our country. Add to these men the efficient and trained retired personnel of the FBI and treasury department as a complement to the instructional staff and you would soon have a law conscious citizenry that would most surely inhibit the criminal element that now runs roughshod over our nation and its law enforcing structure.

Let me repeat that severe and poorly constructed gun restriction laws can only aid and comfort the criminal and will provide one more lucrative racket that can only breed more crime. Any person so naive as to think otherwise is neither practical nor responsible.

MAURICE J. FLETCHER,
Col. USA Retired.

ELY, MINN.

GUN LEGISLATION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be confusion about gun laws and gun legislation. A San Antonio constituent recently inquired: "What ever happened to the Federal Firearms Act?" Another inquired: "Why doesn't Congress prohibit the sale of guns to children, criminals, and mental cases?" Another urged: "Please do not let them take our guns away from us."

The concern is understandable. It goes without saying that every right-thinking American wants to prevent the sale of guns to youngsters, hoodlums, the mentally ill, dope addicts, and so forth. It also goes without saying that Americans respect the constitutional right of law-abiding citizens to own and bear arms.

To begin with, there is no proposal pending in the House which would interfere with the right of a law-abiding citizen to buy a gun through a local dealer and use it in any legal manner.

Nor has any responsible person suggested the confiscation of guns in the hands of the law abiding.

FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT OF 1938

The truth is that for 30 years we have had a fairly strong gun-control law. But there has been only token enforcement.

I am referring to the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. This act authorizes the regu-

lation of interstate transportation of all varieties of firearms.

That act authorizes the licensing of dealers who sell guns which have moved in interstate commerce, and holds them strictly accountable for conformance with the provisions in the law, with records of all sales to be kept. Regulations may be promulgated to implement the law.

The law forbids sales to convicts or even persons under indictment for a crime. Penalty for any violation is a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

That is the law now. It has been the law since 1938.

PISTOL SALES RESTRICTED

In addition, the Congress in the Crime Control Act, recently enacted, prohibited mail order sales of pistols, and the sale of such weapons by dealers to children, ex-convicts, nonresidents, and so forth.

Following that enactment, the Postmaster General by regulation applied police scrutiny to all mail order shipments of shotguns and rifles.

That surveillance is in effect now. The pistol control provision is now the law.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

Concerned citizens call for enactment of "the President's strong gun control bill." What does it call for? It simply extends the present prohibition of interstate sales of pistols to also apply to rifles and shotguns.

A bill which includes the President's recommendations has been reported by the House Judiciary Committee. It actually does very little that cannot already be done by regulation under the Federal Firearms Act.

As an afterthought, following hearings and committee action on his prior recommendations, the President has belatedly suggested a registration program—which normally comes under State authority. Mandatory recordkeeping by gun dealers of all sales is provided in the 1938 law.

The net effect of pending proposals would be to deny gun purchases to minors, ex-convicts, narcotic addicts, those under indictment, and the mentally ill.

The mature, law-abiding citizen would, under all pending proposals, continue to have the same right he has always had to purchase guns from local dealers. That is a constitutional right.

One other thing: Every effort should be made to encourage the States and cities to strengthen their gun laws, particularly with respect to stiffer punishment for those who use guns for any kind of illegal purposes. Such people should be shown no mercy.

Laws do little good unless they are enforced.

RESURRECTION CITY

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I understand from the news reports that the Federal Government has finally taken

action toward eliminating the eyesore and the trouble-breeding camp called "Resurrection City." While I am pleased that steps have been taken to right this wrong that has been perpetuated on the American taxpayer, I am also surprised that this action came so soon after the expiration of the permit. I had been prepared for several more weeks of the law-enforcement agencies playing footsie with the demonstrators. Hopefully, this is a good sign. Americans everywhere are becoming tired of seeing laws purposely broken with no response from authorities. It is time once again for the people of this country to be able to depend on the Government to defend the rights of all Americans and not just those who threaten violence if their demands are not met.

The Washington Police, the Park Police, and our own U.S. Capitol Police are to be commended for the manner in which they have handled this very serious situation. These officers have worked long hours over the past few months and have been subjected to many abuses and have placed their own personal safety in jeopardy. Again, I want to commend the policemen who handled the closing of the camp in such an efficient manner, and especially do I want to commend the officials who made the decision to put an end to this farce which has cost the taxpayers of America many thousands of dollars. I believe the sentiments of the people of this country are best expressed in the following news articles:

[From the Childersburg (Ala.) Star, June 20, 1968]

CONFRONTATION NEARING

An interesting confrontation is shaping up June 24 between the U.S. government and the occupants of Resurrection City in Washington, D.C.

That date is the deadline for the carnival to leave public grounds, but leaders say they have no intention of leaving, permit or no permit—which puts government officials on the spot.

On the one hand the government has an obligation to see that the law is obeyed, which in short means no permit, no camping. However, the government of late has hesitated to do anything which might not please such unlawful demonstrators.

So five will get you \$10 from this corner that the permit will be extended. If the permit is extended, it will be another example of the government of the strongest nation on earth bowing to blackmail, no other word for it.

A group of the campers stormed Attorney General Ramsey Clark's office and probably shook him up a little. One told him, "We ain't got no money, man, but we got matches, man. Mr. Ramsey Clark, you better tell the police to get their guns ready because we're ready. For every one of us you kill in Resurrection City, 10 cities are going to burn 'cause we ain't got nothing to lose."

Fr. James E. Groppl, the Catholic priest who's shaken up Milwaukee, said, "If we have to turn this capital upside down, brother, I'm all for it. I've got an army back in Milwaukee that's ready to march here."

We don't see how the government can permit itself to bow down before such blatant threats of blackmail, but we predict it will. It's a sad day when decisions are made in Washington as a result of mob demands.

Resurrection City is costing taxpayers \$1,000 a day for police protection alone and causing damages totaling more than \$50,000. D.C. business is off at least one-third, per-

haps more. Campers have violated nearly all the rules of their permit. An epidemic could easily spread from the camp's unsanitary conditions.

Maybe this is the price of freedom!

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, June 20, 1968]

TIME TO CALL HALT

The major event of the Poor People's Campaign, a mass rally in support of demands for more government action in behalf of the poor, is finished—thank God without major incident.

The point was made. It could have been made without the contrived "drama" of such a gathering.

The camping permit for the demonstrators who have lived in "Resurrection City" for weeks was extended once, and now is supposed to expire on Sunday. Rev. Ralph Abernathy said yesterday that the campers have no intention of leaving until their demands are met, permit or no permit.

Now is it time for the President and others in authority to make it clear that their, the capital's and the nation's patience is very nearly exhausted. No one can say that the demonstrators have not had ample opportunity to be seen and heard.

The President should remind Rev. Abernathy and any others who might have forgotten it that the United States has undertaken to do more for its poor than any other nation; that it has committed itself to do still more.

And then he should advise the campers to pack up and go home.

We cannot permit this nation's political system to be turned into government by demonstration, by threat, by intimidation. Government officials have patiently heard the demands of the demonstrators; have endured abuse in several instances. Congress has been sympathetic.

But neither the President nor government departments nor Congress can permit this nation to be intimidated by whoever can get up a crowd to converge on the capital.

Washington has suffered grievously in recent months. Not only the residents of the city but all Americans, including many who wished to visit the capital this summer, have been victimized by the continuing tension.

The message reprinted below, which appeared originally as a full-page advertisement in the *Washington Star*, speaks volumes.

Let the organizers of the Poor People's Campaign who have demanded a show of commitment by the government and the American people, now give a show of commitment themselves, by calling off their demonstrations and giving the nation an opportunity to act in an atmosphere of calm and reason.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 23, 1968]

RESURRECTION CITY WEARS OUT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICIALS' WELCOME

(By Carl Bernstein)

The District government, which for six weeks took extraordinary measures to aid the encampment at Resurrection City, believes the Poor People's Campaign has become counterproductive and should be ended.

Mayor Walter E. Washington's and his principal aides though still committed to the Campaign's goals, now regard the continued occupation of Resurrection City and further civil disobedience as—quite simply—menacing.

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy and other top officials of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference have demonstrated that they are unable to maintain effective control over the Campaign, according to the view at the District Building.

Officials there are also dissatisfied with the

negative reactions of the Congress to the Campaign's demands. But the violence that erupted during and after Thursday's demonstration at the Agriculture Department has, if anything, made the Congress only more intransigent they believe.

In the view of several of the Mayor's advisers, Wednesday's orderly Solidarity Day demonstration put the Campaign on "the psychological offensive," in the words of one, for the first time. But Thursday's events, the same official added, "wiped out the advantage altogether."

The Mayor's principal aides—Deputy Mayor Thomas W. Fletcher, Corporation Counsel Charles T. Duncan, Julian Dugas, director of Licenses and Inspections, and Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy—had been worried for some time before Thursday that the SCLC leadership was losing its control over the Campaign.

Reports were reaching the District Building of violent incidents in and around Resurrection City, leaders of various ethnic groups in the Campaign were openly quarreling with each other, and more energy appeared to be going into demonstrations against the Justice and Interior Departments—which are sympathetic to the Campaign—than against the more logical congressional targets. Residents of the plywood shanties by the Reflecting Pool spent idle days and nights while waiting for some direction from Mr. Abernathy and his aides.

It was precisely to aid the SCLC leadership and to avoid such problems that the city government quietly began aiding the Campaign in early May. Although the Mayor was never enthused about the Campaign's coming to Washington, especially so soon after the April rioting, the city government began mapping plans to feed the demonstrators and provide other services.

Dugas was designated by the Mayor to serve as the District's liaison to Resurrection City and the Health and Welfare Council was given the task of organizing emergency housing and health services for the demonstrators.

Public Safety Director Murphy dispatched an aide to Resurrection City to help Campaign marshals establish security plans for the encampment.

When the Campaigners found themselves in need of such varied items as blankets and bullhorns, Dugas found them. On May 16, when SCLC was confronted by a critical housing shortage at the tent city, the Mayor presided over an all-night meeting in which all city department heads were exhorted to expedite any aid they could provide in speeding construction at the Poor People's encampment.

The Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, a top SCLC official and vice chairman of the City Council, was asked repeatedly by Mayor Washington and his aides how the District government could help the campaign.

The offers of help, of course were not completely selfless, and were partially rooted in the city government's fear that a disorganized campaign could bring disorder to Washington.

Now, despite the help, Mayor Washington and his advisers see little hope of a productive future for the Poor People's Campaign as it is presently structured.

Privately, Mr. Fauntroy has told some of his city government colleagues he agrees that the situation is "out of hand" at the encampment.

The city, of course, does not have jurisdiction over parkland areas. The Interior Department does, and thus problems created by the expiration of city's permit are in the lap of the Federal government.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
June 23, 1968]

DEMANDS TO CLOSE TENT CITY MOUNTING ON CAPITOL HILL

Stern demands for an end to the Poor People's encampment in West Potomac Park came yesterday from several members of Congress as Resurrection City's permit neared expiration.

Continuing presence and increasing militancy of the demonstrators is a "direct threat" to the safety of thousands of federal and private employees working and parking in the area, warned Rep. Hervey G. Machen, D-Md.

He said federal troops should be brought in, if necessary, to maintain law and order in the area pending action on legislation to end such camping on federally owned lands here.

Rep. John O. Marsh Jr., D-Va., said the Interior Department should not renew the permit expiring tonight and wrote Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall the plywood city "has become a symbol of defiance to lawful authority."

Marsh said the camp "makes a mockery of the urging by federal officials that citizens observe the law and is inexplicable to those who seek to present their grievances to their government in an orderly way."

Rep. Paul Rogers, D-Fla., who also wrote to Udall, said further extension of the camp permit "would be a willful, conscious act of irresponsibility clearly against the interests of the public peace, health and safety."

Rogers said the permit never should have been issued in the first place and "certainly not extended a week" and declared "I trust your department will at last realize the importance of closing down this national disgrace."

BYRD URGES REMOVAL

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., in a Senate speech Friday demanded that the shantytown be evacuated and torn down when the permit expires.

"It is the responsibility of the executive branch to act now to remove this carbuncle of infestious disorder from federal property if the occupants of Resurrection City will not leave voluntarily," he said.

"It has now become a cesspool from which nothing but further violence and infection can issue," Byrd asserted.

"Where they might have created public good will and an image of people eager and willing to help themselves," he said "they have shown only a slovenly disregard for even the elemental ingredient of a self-disciplined, energetic and self-respecting community."

Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., called Resurrection City "an enclave of anarchy" and declared "week after week of rampant crime."

PROPOSED BAN CITED

Machen said the House leadership should call up a pending bill which would revoke any permits for continued camping in West Potomac Park and prohibit any other permission to use federal property for such overnight occupancy.

He said his office had received "many calls" from employees of the Agriculture Department complaining about being locked in their buildings during demonstrations there.

He also reported "many calls" from employees at the main Navy building who have been threatened as they walk to their cars at the Tidal Basin.

"These employees are public employees and cannot perform efficiently if they are harassed and threatened to and from work," he said. "If their safety is in danger, and if our police force is not large enough to provide protection to everyone, then the sources of the problem must be removed promptly."

HERE "LONG ENOUGH"

He went on to say the demonstrators "have been with us long enough. They have said their piece, presented their demands, and demonstrated. There is no more they can accomplish by a continuing presence except to incur the wrath of people who are in positions to help them."

Rogers protested in his letter to Udall that crime is being committed on federal parklands in front of witnesses and even park police, without arrests, according to newspaper accounts.

Declaring that law violations are taking place on lands under Udall's direct control, he asked, "If high-ranking officials of the government have so little regard for law and order, how can we expect to build any respect among others?"

"The permit you have sanctioned is a sham, its enforcement nonexistent and law violations an open fact," he said.

OPEN BURNING

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the *Havre de Grace Record*, edited by Dr. Henry Winter, has just published a thoughtful editorial concerning open burning in Harford County. I should like to share this article with my colleagues:

OPEN BURNING

The State Health Department ban on open burning in Maryland is a blessing in disguise for *Havre de Grace*. Elimination of air pollution isn't the only benefit which will become evident.

Dumps of any description cause more problems than air pollution. Dumps are breeding grounds for vermin and mosquitoes and become unsightly scars on the face of the land. Dumps are also malodorous and can cause contamination of underground and nearby waters.

The present city dump was started as an emergency measure to rid *Havre de Grace* of an unsanitary condition at the river end of Congress Avenue, the former dumping ground.

All considered, we can heartily agree with the landfill recommendation of Public Works Director Robert J. Hajzyk to eliminate the joint use *Havre de Grace*—Harford County dump located near the quarry North of the B&O-C&O railroad bridge.

It can be added that the present land should be developed as a picnic and recreation area. The view is excellent and the amount of land the city owns can be put to a better use now that dumping and burning of trash and garbage is to be discontinued.

PIONEERING STOL FLIGHTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the problems of air congestion and aviation safety have been subjected to increasing congressional scrutiny in recent months.

The boom in aviation and the inadequacy of physical facilities to cope with the industry's fantastic growth have created a crisis in transportation.

One aviation innovation which offers great possibilities for at least a partial solution is the development of STOL—short takeoff and landing—aircraft. Flights of these aircraft will commence on an experimental basis in the north-east corridor this summer under the joint auspices of Eastern Airlines and the McDonnell-Douglas Corp.

Details of this project were disclosed in a June 21 New York Times article by Edward Hudson, which I present for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINE TO TEST STOL OPERATION—EASTERN WILL TRY 64-SEAT CRAFT ON A SHUTTLE RUN

(By Edward Hudson)

A major airline and an airplane maker announced yesterday they would pioneer in testing the feasibility of STOL (short take-off and landing) flights late this summer in the Northeast Corridor.

For about six weeks, starting in September, a STOL craft large enough to carry 64 passengers and agile enough to lift off a 1,000-foot runway will be flown on the Air-Shuttle routes between New York, Newark and Washington, as well as to Boston.

The propeller-driven plane, a French design known as the McDonnell Douglas 188, will operate in most instances from separate STOL strips—short runways at the major airports that can ease the traffic on regular runways—and along special flight paths.

The experiment will pit the STOL craft against conventional jets on the same schedule to determine, among other unknowns, the saving in time that can be achieved with the use of separate runways and separate terminal airspace.

During the experiment the STOL craft will not be used to carry public passengers.

The announcement was made jointly here by Eastern Airlines and the McDonnell Douglas Corporation, which will share the cost along with several electronics manufacturers. The companies declined to make public the cost.

EXPANSION ENVISIONED

The 188, known in Europe as the Breguet 941, cruises at 250 miles an hour and is unpressurized, which means it cannot fly above the levels of the worst weather. At the news conference at the Plaza Hotel, McDonnell Douglas and Eastern both indicated that larger, faster and fully pressurized models could be built if the STOL concept proved to be a good one.

A. Scott Crossfield, an Eastern official heading the STOL project, said that at the conclusion of the experiment, Eastern would compare the performance of STOL craft with its present jets.

The official said that if the STOL craft could be used on Eastern's shuttle, "hundreds" of additional planes could be operated from the airports without laying any more runways.

The STOL craft obtains its ability to take off quickly, climb steeply and maneuver in relatively small areas from its four large turbine-powered propellers and large, full-span flaps. New navigation equipment will permit it to use airspace not used now by conventional planes, it was said.

The airline hopes to eliminate the time consumed in the waiting in line for take-off clearance on the regular runways, as well as in the stacking of planes over the airport during poor weather.

At La Guardia Airport the STOL plane will use a newly completed 1,100-foot black top strip for STOL craft. At other airports segments of old runways and former taxi strips will be employed.

REMARKS ON THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE EXCISE TAX BILL, H.R. 15414

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, to summarize my position on this measure, I include in the RECORD at this point my newsletter for this week, which is being mailed for release Monday:

[From Capitol Comment by CHARLES "MAC" MATHIAS, June 24, 1968]

TOWARD A SOUND ECONOMY

The big news from Washington, which could affect every American for years, is that the House of Representatives last week finally "bit the bullet" and squarely faced the very serious, fiscal situation which has been generated by the policies which have prevailed in Washington for the past several years.

As I outlined in this newsletter a few weeks ago, we have been running the Federal Government through deficit financing for several years. Despite Congressional efforts to economize and impose some prudence on our fiscal policies, too many in Washington had continued down the primrose path in the belief that we could afford both guns and butter. On this false premise, for example, we proceeded to escalate the war in Vietnam to a cost of probably well over \$30 billion per year, according to the figures which are obtainable now. At the same time, the myth was spread that this enormous expense could be absorbed without putting the country on a wartime footing or curbing the expansion of other Federal programs.

Our failure to come to grips either with deficit spending or with our balance of payments problems finally, inevitably, produced a loss of confidence both here and abroad . . . not in the basic strength of the American economy, but rather in our will to discipline ourselves and to impose a proper balance in our economic affairs.

Economists are fond of saying that governments can do things in the economic sphere which individuals cannot. Certainly our recent experience is proof that governments can sustain the kind of deficit spending which would probably drive a family or a business into bankruptcy. Yet even governments, even nations as strong as ours, eventually come to the crunch, and face a day of reckoning.

Last week the House admitted that the day of reckoning has come. In a preliminary vote recently, the House had already tentatively agreed to cut at least \$6 billion from current spending. A portion of this sum can be cut by the Congress, but in many cases, since programs have already been set up and funds already approved, the actual reductions and delays will have to be made by the President. I trust that, in apportioning these reductions, the President will establish the clear priorities which have so far been lacking. I also trust that long-range projects can be stretched out and new programs modified so the vital efforts now in operation will not be seriously curtailed.

Last week the House, in addition to approving this large spending cut, took a final step which will not be popular, but which was absolutely necessary. This was to approve a temporary income tax surcharge of ten percent. Under the terms of the measure approved last week, this additional revenue will not go to support additional deficit spending, but instead will be directed toward cutting the Federal deficit and cooling off

the economy, objectives which simply cannot be attained through any other course.

If the House had not taken these steps, international confidence in the United States would have been eroded further, and the condition of the dollar would have grown even more perilous. If we had not acted last week, soaring inflation could have undermined every dollar in your savings account, your pension funds and your insurance policies. By taking the necessary steps, the House has turned the country back toward a course of fiscal responsibility and economic sense.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14-20

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next month, in the period of July 14-20, will be the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week. Under the direction of the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, local committees throughout the country are now making preparations for the most successful observance yet. In foreign lands of the free world similar preparations are underway.

No finer source material on the meaning and significance of Captive Nations Week can be found than what appears in the current work, "The Vulnerable Russians." Highlights of this 10-year movement are explained lucidly in this book, authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. In a sense, it is in part a most useful handbook for the understanding and conduct of this annual observance.

The work is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Its maps and appendixes help the reader immensely in understanding the week and why, more than anything else, the captive nations movement has been a thorn in the side of Moscow's deceptive peaceful coexistence policy. The work also interprets the various Presidential proclamations of the week, which are excerpted here for the reader's interest.

The excerpts follow:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as

"Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world;

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1959, and of the independence of the United States of America the 184th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world;

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1961—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation

designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

Whereas it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest their interests in the freedom of other nations;

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1961, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 14th day of July in the year of our Lord 1961, and of the independence of the United States of America the 186th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1962—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas there exist many historical and cultural ties between the people of these captive nations and the American people; and

Whereas, the principles of self-government and human freedom are universal ideas and the common heritage of mankind;

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 13th day of July in the year of our Lord 1962, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1963—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and dignity remain a universal aspiration; and

Whereas justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom;

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 5th day of July in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations;

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1965—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas these basic rights unfortunately

are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 2nd day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 190th.

By the President:

[SEAL]

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples; and

Whereas these basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and

Whereas in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples;

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 8th day of July in the year of our Lord, 1966, and of the independence of the United States of America the 191st.

By the President:

[SEAL]

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States

of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are basic human rights to which all men are entitled; and

Whereas the independence of peoples requires their exercise of the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas these inalienable rights have been circumscribed or denied in many areas of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has had an abiding commitment to the principles of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1967, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,

FOREIGN AID TODAY IS A PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in times like these when we hear much uninformed criticism of foreign aid as a government-to-government handout program, it is helpful to be reminded of the growing public-private partnership in our U.S. foreign assistance programs.

The address given before the National Farmers Union convention in Minneapolis on March 18, 1968, by W. G. Carter, Executive Director of the Private Resources Development Service of the Agency for International Development, is an exciting report on the broad participation of U.S. private groups, both profit and nonprofit, in the less-developed countries. Moreover, the report shows a gratifying responsiveness by AID to congressional mandates.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carter's remarks are convincing evidence that the major attack on the problems of development, abroad as well as here at home, can best be made through effective public-private cooperation.

AID'S CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP

(Address by W. G. Carter, Executive Director, Private Resources Development Service, Agency for International Development)

Our country is committed to foreign aid for a very simple reason—it is the right thing to do. Assisting the developing nations of the world is not a sacrifice—it is an opportunity to make a better world for all of us. Your great organization has recognized this for decades. I know of no grass roots organization—particularly here in the heartland of the United States—more committed to

creative international cooperation than the National Farmers Union. We know we have your support and, even more importantly, your active participation—and are very deeply grateful for it.

However, there is no blinking the fact that foreign aid is in trouble—deep trouble. While the reasons for this are complex, one element seems to loom very large—that is the image of foreign aid as a "government-to-government handout" program. I would like to discuss this with you today.

Congress believes that personal initiative and private organizations in the developing countries must be encouraged and strengthened. So do we—and we are working at it.

Congress believes that private U.S. business and non-profit organizations should be used as much as possible to do the job. So do we—and they are being used.

In spite of this, many people on Capitol Hill and in the country at large still view foreign aid as a purely "government-to-government" program. This image is false.

I want to give you the evidence that today's foreign aid is a creative public-private partnership.

Ten—or even five—years ago a report like this would not have been possible. Foreign aid has changed.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 pointed the way—it tells us what to do.

U.S. private community leaders on our advisory committees tell us how to do it.

We are doing it.

Over the years we have learned that development does not get rolling until the energies of private citizens are fully engaged. This requires:

A sound governmental framework of laws and policies—commercial, fiscal, monetary, export-import, price and wage—which support private initiative.

Diverse, democratic and independent private organizations—labor unions, cooperatives, business firms, foundations and voluntary groups. Groups—like yours—who know that their own actions can help make a better future for themselves.

Skilled and motivated managers, workers and technicians.

Means to accumulate private savings and to give private citizens access to medium and long-term credit.

These requirements can be met in a developing country to the extent that four forces of change work together. Three of these forces are permanent—the local government, the local private sector and the foreign private sector. The fourth—official foreign aid—has a more limited role. In the early stages of development, A.I.D. brings a missing margin of needed goods and talent to bear on critical bottlenecks and helps build up the relationships between the others three forces to the point where we can—and do—drop out of the picture.

During the time we are on the scene we do have "government-to-government" programs. But let's go behind the label and see what goes into them.

AID TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BUILDS PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

We use our technical assistance funds to call on the experience and talents of private U.S. organizations to build up private institutions in the developing countries because American non-government institutions can best do the job.

Private organizations representing the whole spectrum of American society—the professions, business, education, labor and cooperatives—hold about 1,400 technical assistance contracts totaling more than \$500 million. Since 1962, the value of these contracts has increased fourfold in Latin America and in Africa. American experts are at work in technology and science, education and agriculture, industry and family planning.

AID DEVELOPMENT LOANS SPUR PRIVATE SECTOR GROWTH

Development loans are essential to A.I.D.'s development assistance efforts. They provide goods and services from American private enterprise and they result in faster private sector growth.

We use the process of negotiations for program and sector loans to help bring about changes in government policies—fiscal, monetary, export-import, price and wage—so that they support rather than inhibit private investment and entrepreneurship. Moreover, program loans directly support private enterprise and initiative by getting U.S. capital equipment, fertilizer, spare parts and raw materials into the hands of private businessmen and farmers.

These goods are paid for in local currency. The local currency received by the government is used for long term investments in fields such as education, agriculture and transportation. The government in turn repays A.I.D. in dollars.

A.I.D.'s project loans also help build the country's infrastructure and increase national productivity. Without power, roads and communications, no sector of a nation's economy can advance.

Here at home A.I.D. financing directly benefits the U.S. economy. Machinery, fertilizer and people leave our ports—not dollars. And these exports open up long term commercial markets for U.S. business.

So far, I have been talking about projects funded 100 percent by A.I.D., using private organizations as contractors to the government. I would like to turn now to a growing part of our program—the use of appropriated funds and guaranty authorities to generate an increased flow of private resources, both capital and technical assistance, to privately managed programs.

AID PROVIDES INCENTIVES FOR PRIVATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PRIVATE INVESTMENT

In its landmark report of 1965, the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid said: "Public resources wisely used can attract private resources in even greater quantities."

We fully accept this and have done something about it. Our new Office of Private Resources strengthens our partnership with private U.S. organizations, profit and non-profit, and is working out new ways to multiply private investment and technical assistance.

Private technical assistance

Private organizations registered by our Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid represent millions of Americans: Church World Service is supported by 26 Protestant denominations; Catholic Relief Services by the Catholic Bishops' overseas aid fund; the Jewish organizations by the United Jewish Appeal; Lutheran World Relief by Lutheran constituencies. Other organizations such as CARE are supported by direct appeals and individual contributions.

Altogether there are some 500 non-profit organizations at work in these fields. A.I.D. supports the Technical Assistance Information Clearing House which serves these groups.

For some time, A.I.D. has used incentives to increase private investment. The same approach makes sense for private technical assistance. We are expanding the use of incentive grants to provide partial funding of private technical assistance programs. The key to our approach is that, within broad policy limits agreed with A.I.D., the private organization raises substantial funds, uses its own people, selects its projects and carries full responsibility for achieving results. We hope—and believe—that we can adapt this approach in certain aspects of working with the cooperatives in the U.S., particularly in giving management assistance on a short term basis to operating co-ops.

Some current examples:

Business management: The International Executive Service Corps was created by a group of American business executives, with A.I.D.'s help, to furnish U.S. business know-how to developing countries. Drawing on a roster of U.S. volunteers now approaching 4,000, it completed 400 projects in 38 countries in its first three years. IESC has shown such promise that the Japanese and Canadians have created their own versions and Germany is planning to follow.

Community-based programs: The potentials of setting up direct links between U.S. communities and the developing countries have been convincingly demonstrated by the Partners of the Alliance which now involves 33 States.

Technology: Volunteers for International Technical Assistance (VITA), Inc. draws on the contributed talents of 4,500 specialists from 800 corporations and 200 universities in technical problem-solving through a person-to-person mail inquiry and counseling service.

Private investment

American private investment helps speed growth in the less developed countries. Because of this important development role, the President's emergency balance of payments program permits private investment in less developed countries at 110 percent of previous levels.

Although U.S. investment to less developed countries is not increasing as rapidly as we would like, it is becoming more diversified. In fields other than petroleum, annual U.S. direct capital flows to less developed countries increased from about \$180 million in 1960 to \$380 million in 1966. Over the same period, the amount of these investments assisted by A.I.D. guaranties increased from about \$30 million to about \$325 million.

Since management of the Cooley loan program was transferred from the Export-Import Bank to A.I.D. on January 1, 1962, we have loaned local currencies with a dollar value of \$258 million to private firms.

THE OTHER END OF THE PIPELINE

I have pointed out the ways in which foreign aid today is a partnership between the U.S. Government and private U.S. organizations.

Turning to the other end of the pipeline, we see that development programs are a four-way partnership between the local government, the local private sector, the U.S. private sector and the U.S. Government. A project now being put together in India illustrates the process.

The project is for a 450,000 nutrient tons per year fertilizer plant to be eventually owned and operated by Indian farm cooperatives. Let's look at what had to happen, what each partner had to do.

A series of policy changes by the Indian Government created the necessary climate:

Under the 1965-66 economic reforms, absolute priority was given to increasing food grain production.

Producer rather than consumer oriented farm price policies were adopted to provide incentives to farmers to increase productivity.

Fertilizer production and distribution were opened up to the private sector.

These policy changes were strongly urged by A.I.D., the World Bank and other donors backed up by long term loans to finance fertilizer, capital goods and spare parts needed by Indian farmers and businessmen.

Indian farm cooperatives have not yet expanded their activities into ownership and management of factories producing farm supplies. As you know far better than I, this has been an outstanding feature of U.S. farm cooperatives for many years.

In 1966, a team of U.S. farm co-op experts, organized by the Cooperative League of the USA and the International Cooperative Development Association, suggested to Indian

co-op leaders that a joint effort be launched to set up a fertilizer plant for the Indian co-ops. The fine relations built up between the Indian and U.S. cooperatives through an office in New Delhi operated for many years by the Cooperative League, largely at its own expense, provided the necessary foundation of mutual confidence. The Indian co-ops reacted enthusiastically.

With strong encouragement from the Indian Government and A.I.D., the project is taking shape.

Over 20 U.S. supply co-ops have together pledged \$1 million in cash which will provide executive talent to manage the project during construction and start-up and train Indian management to take over.

Market surveys and technical studies are being carried out by Indian and American consulting firms.

Much of the construction will probably be carried out under a contract with an American engineering/construction firm.

The fertilizer produced by the plant will be sold to the farmers through their own co-ops.

The Indian Government will help finance rupee construction costs of the plant.

Long term dollar financing for the U.S. capital goods going into the plant will be provided by private U.S. banks and insurance companies. These private credits would not be possible without A.I.D.'s Extended Risk Guaranties.

This project is by no means wrapped up. It does look promising. But, the point is this: five years ago this kind of integrated effort would have been impossible. It shows what it takes to get development rolling.

I am not satisfied with the progress we have made—here at home, in India or anywhere else—towards strengthening the public-private partnerships on which successful development depends. Far from it. I doubt that any of us are fully satisfied and we probably never will be. But we have come a long way. If this is recognized and if we—the Congress, the Executive Branch and the American people—stick to it, I am confident that we can go a lot further.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, starvation is intolerable in the United States. Hunger is an evil which we must do all that we can to eliminate. Yet today people are starving in the United States and hunger is a lingering aberration of our affluent society. We can no longer accept this situation, and accordingly I am supporting congressional actions which could literally stamp out hunger in the United States.

When we talk of the war on poverty, we usually have in mind the Economic Opportunity Act which authorizes such programs as Headstart, the Job Corps, and VISTA. But there is another program, enacted at about the same time as the antipoverty program, which is designed to help the poor in one of their basic needs. This is the food stamp program.

Though it has not received the public attention which other programs may have, the food-stamp program is an essential weapon in the war on poverty. Currently Congress is considering an expansion of this program and I strongly

support the efforts of Mrs. SULLIVAN, the distinguished Congresswoman from Missouri, and a large number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, to give the food-stamp program enough funding so that it can reach all of the needy, hungry people in the country.

The food-stamp program has been in operation for 7 years, having been established on a pilot basis in 1961. During this time it has established itself as a most valuable program for millions of hungry Americans. Certainly, it has benefits over the food-commodity program, under which certain surplus commodities are made available on a free basis.

In November 1967, 2.2 million persons were participating in nearly 900 food-stamp projects throughout the United States. In fiscal year 1967, the total amount paid for bonus coupons was more than \$105 million, and the coupons were worth almost \$300 million when used to purchase food. If expansion of the food-stamp program were to continue at that rate of growth we could be confident that eventually no American would be hungry. But with the funding limitation currently placed on the program, there will not be enough money to permit the participation of all eligible persons and to establish programs in new counties which want and need them.

Seven years of experience with the program have indicated that it works successfully and that it is the most effective method yet devised to assure that all Americans have the opportunity for an adequate diet. The program is relatively easy to administer, and very few program violations have occurred. The evidence has shown that it is a program worth extending and expanding.

The bill under consideration at this time, which I am proud to cosponsor with many other Congressmen, would remove the authorization ceiling on the amount which may be appropriated for the food-stamp program. This would allow for further expansion of the program, so that it might be established in every county and every city where there is a need for it.

It is regretful that the food-stamp program has not been implemented by the State of Florida. Like other States, Florida has a number of residents who have less than a completely wholesome diet. Yet the State government has not moved to take advantage of this proven program to benefit aged residents, those with small incomes, and others who for whatever reason lack enough food to eat. Some Florida counties do receive benefits from the commodity distribution program, but I would like to see this replaced by the food-stamp program, which offers many advantages over the free distribution of food.

One major advantage of the food-stamp program is that it improves the diets of those participating by increasing the amounts of meat and meat products, dairy products, and fresh fruits and vegetables purchased and consumed. These are items which are rarely, if ever distributed as surplus foods. The food-stamp program, on the other hand, uses ordinary marketing channels—thus

opening the way for purchase of any of the foodstuffs available in the neighborhood grocery store.

Because the food-stamp program relies on ordinary marketing channels, it stimulates the economy, rather than adding a separate Government office. Under the commodity program, a person must travel long distances to receive his free food.

The commodity program has a limited number of products available. Perhaps, however, the psychological difference is an even more important advantage than the fact that stamps make available a more balanced diet. Those who are unfortunate enough to lack adequate resources for food may still maintain their pride and dignity through the use of food coupons; they are able to shop for their food as other persons do. They can choose what they want to buy and are not limited to a diet consisting of whatever happens to be available in the commodity distribution program. The surplus foods may be basic, but in themselves they do not necessarily provide for a nutritionally adequate diet.

The food-stamp program is not a handout program but one that will surely contribute to the participant's sense of self-respect. People pay what they can, thus elevating the program from a dole system to one of contribution at whatever level the person can afford. When families have their own money tied up on coupons, they are more apt to shop carefully and to treat the coupons as money and not as handouts. The humiliation of the breadline is banished.

The retail grocer benefits, as his sales increase with the added purchasing power of the food-stamp participants. The whole mechanism is geared to our free enterprise system. The food needs and desires of the people are expressed in the marketplace, thus serving as a guide to the farmer and the food industry as to what they should produce and process.

I think that as public officials across the country are made aware of the advantages of the food-stamp program, they will be encouraged to establish it in their areas. For my part, I have been an early backer of the food-stamp program and have worked in Congress to see it expanded and improved. But we cannot expect to reach its full potential until Congress allows enough funds. The advantage of an open-ended appropriation is that it would permit the program to expand naturally as localities respond to the needs of their hungry people.

Numerous recent reports have documented the pressing need to take positive action now to eliminate hunger and starvation in America. I believe this legislative approach would go far toward accomplishing this objective and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to give immediate favorable consideration to this imperative measure.

Let us not stand idly by while many of our countrymen go to bed hungry each night, while children suffer for lack of adequate nourishment, and while older citizens impair their health through poor diets. Let us, instead, stamp out hunger in this our beloved

land and insure that the malignancy of starvation is not allowed in a society of plenty.

THE REAL AMERICA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when we must stand back from all the studies, reports, commissions, polls, and pronouncements and see just where we are.

There are more than enough persons around to show us where we should go, and how, and to demonstrate in sundry statistical modes how well off we are, or how many refrigerators there are for the population.

In their place these are fine. But I believe we can also get a view of where we are and where we have been merely by stopping and remembering.

This is what Neil McCaffrey, president of Conservative Book Club, has done in a recent short statement directed at "remembering the real America." By looking back to the "real America"—before the burgeoning crime violence and apathy, sloth as a norm, before inflation was taken for granted, and right and wrong were confused, and religion was solid and helpful and directed for the religious, by looking back at these we can not only see where we have been, but where we are going.

I include his thoughts at this point:

AND RIGHTLY SO

You're old enough to remember the real America if you can remember when you never dreamed our country could ever lose. When you left the front door open. When you went to church and found spiritual consolation. When people knew what the Fourth of July stood for. When you took it for granted that women and the elderly and the clergy were to be respected. When a girl was considered daring if she smoked in public. When a girl was a girl. When a boy was a boy. When they liked each other. When you didn't feel embarrassed to say that this is the best damn country in the world. When socialist was a dirty word. When liberal wasn't. When a nickel was worth five cents and could buy you a magazine, or a good cigar, or a 12-ounce Pepsi, or a big ice cream cone with chocolate sprinkles, or a beer. When two nickels got you into the movies on Saturday afternoon, and you saw *three* pictures. When taxes were only a nuisance. When the poor were proud to take charity. When you weren't afraid to go out at night. When Protestants and Catholics thought enough of their beliefs to argue about them. When ghettos were neighborhoods. When you knew that the law meant justice, and you felt a little shiver of awe at the sight of a policeman. When young fellows *tried* to join the army or the navy. When songs had a tune. When you wrote love notes. When criminals went to jail. When you could get away from it all for a while. When you bragged about your home state and your home town. When politicians proclaimed their patriotism. When clerks and repairmen tried to please you, or else. When a Sunday drive was an adventure, not an ordeal. When you had to be brave to fly. When you could always find someone willing and able, whenever you wanted something done. When riots were unthinkable. When the clergy talked about religion.

When you took it for granted that the law would be enforced, and your safety protected. When Christmas was merry, and Christ was kept in it. When the flag was a sacred symbol. When our government stood up for Americans, anywhere in the world. When a man who went wrong was blamed, not his mother's nursing habits or his father's income. When everyone knew the difference between right and wrong, even Harvard professors. When things weren't perfect, but you never expected them to be. When you weren't made to feel guilty for enjoying dialect comedy. When people still had the capacity for indignation. When you considered yourself lucky to have a good job. When you were proud to have one. When sick meant you weren't feeling well. When a complaint could accomplish something. When people expected less, and valued what they had more. When everybody wasn't entitled to a college education. When college kids swallowed goldfish, not acid. When America was the land of the free, the home of the brave.

THE NAVY WILL NEVER BE THE SAME

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy has been placed in an extremely embarrassing position by the Arnheiter case. How that situation came about is indeed due in part, as the Navy claims, to Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter's gift for articulate expression and to his obvious flair for public relations. But the Navy's emphasis on this facet of the Arnheiter affair protests too much, while deliberately ignoring and evading what should be considered as the basic issues. It is on these issues, rather than on consideration of whether Arnheiter was properly qualified to command the USS *Vance*, that Arnheiter's supporters plead for fair judgment. Whether or not Arnheiter was summarily relieved because his immediate superiors received "information of irregular practices within USS *Vance* and her operations in the combat area," the immediate questions are, "What information is that? How was it received? Was it in any way verified? Did anyone in authority question Arnheiter or discuss with him the merits of the various allegations which were made against him? Did anyone, before the boom was suddenly lowered, so much as hint to him that such allegations had been made?" The Navy's Office of Information, liberally staffed with experts in the field of public relations, states that:

Aside from the conclusion that LCDR Arnheiter had been treated properly from a procedural point of view, i.e., that his relief was proper under the circumstances, the investigation was adequate, that the review was thorough . . .

Be the Navy's statement ever so articulate, facts argue otherwise:

First. His relief was not proper under the circumstances. It was improper in that it violated article C-7801 of the Navy's BuPers Manual, which carries the full weight of law. The official position now is that the impending return of the *Vance* to coastal operations in Viet-

nam justified the extraordinarily preemptory manner in which Arnheiter was relieved. For at least a week prior to the day he was relieved, Arnheiter was with the *Vance* in Manila Bay, 15 minutes by regular military shuttle flight from the staff in Subic Bay. The opportunity did exist for counseling him or discussing the matter with him before his relief. Such counsel was never given. Article C-7801 provides, in case of the relief of a commanding officer, that his seniors: "assure that the difficulty involved, whatever its nature, is not reasonably susceptible to correction"; "assure that all factual allegations of misconduct have been adequately verified by formal or informal investigations"; "it is of the utmost importance that strong command guidance and counseling be given the officer concerned and that there is no reasonable alternative to the action requested."

Second. That Arnheiter's superiors received a list of accusations against him—the "Dando Report"—and acted on those accusations without giving him so much as the opportunity to know that the accusations existed, much less the chance to answer them, not only offends against the rules of fair play, but is clearly a direct violation of Article 1404.1, U.S. Navy Regulations. The Navy's summary press release does not address itself to this point. The reason is obvious—their position is indefensible.

Article 1404.1, U.S. Navy Regulations states:

1404.1 Whenever an accusation is made against an officer, whether by report or by endorsement upon a communication, a copy of such report or endorsement shall be furnished him at the time.

Third. It is not mere coincidence, but rather the Navy's own reflection on its procedural handling of the Arnheiter case, that in January 1967, shortly after his review of the Arnheiter case, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, issued a general notice calling for the most meticulous care in adherence to regulations in "Treatment of Complaints Against Commanding Officers."

Fourth. The investigation was entirely inadequate. Arnheiter has spent 2 years pointing this out, and begging for an impartial, open inquiry. That the investigation was not adequate is shown by the following:

First. Technically, the investigation began when Commander Milligan reported aboard the *Vance* in Manila Bay and relieved Arnheiter. Milligan—the same officer who had started the actual process of firing Arnheiter—began the preliminary investigation onboard the *Vance* after Arnheiter departed. His manner of doing so was to post a notice on the ship's bulletin boards and make a spoken announcement soliciting comments regarding "events in the ship since December 22, 1965," which the ship's company knew as the date that Arnheiter had taken command. He then used his judgment—which could have been colored by the realization that he had his own actions to defend—to select from the material collected those items which he thought would be of interest to the investigating board in Subic Bay.

Second. The investigating officer in

Subic Bay was Capt. Ward W. Witter, U.S.N. The Navy summary describes him as "commander of a destroyer squadron in the area." The Navy does not go on to reveal, as was the case, that Captain Witter's place in the chain of command was directly below Rear Admiral King. This led to Witter's changing the purpose of the Subic Bay investigation from one of "determining the circumstances in the *Vance* which led to the relief of her commanding officer" to one of dredging up sufficient reasons to justify the action which had already taken place. That is what Capt. Richard G. Alexander, in his ill-fated, albeit lucid and penetrating, commentary referred to as a "fantastic fishing expedition."

Third. It is astonishing that the Navy should still insist that the Subic Bay hearing was adequate and procedurally proper. Their summary of the case glosses over Rear Admiral Baumberger's second review with an alacrity that is downright comical:

At the request of the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet (Adm Johnson), Commander Cruiser-Destroyer Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet (RADM Baumberger) endorsed the JAG Manual Investigation Report as a matter separate and distinct from the detachment for cause letter and reiterated his previous position.

What this statement conveniently overlooks is that the second time Rear Admiral Baumberger reviewed the case marks the first—and thus far the only—searching inquiry as to what actually transpired during the Subic Bay hearing. Rear Admiral Baumberger not only "reiterated his previous position"—that Arnheiter should be restored to command—he went a great deal further in pointing out that:

There appears an additional statement that many of the opinions are based on matter that could not feasibly be laid out in the "facts section." It is considered that had the Investigating Officer pursued his inquiry in accordance with the dictates of the convening order and conducted the proceedings in strict accordance with the provisions of reference (a), he may have avoided this dilemma.

3. An Investigation is a quasi-legal proceeding designed to determine facts, and, where appropriate, to state opinions based upon factual determinations, and to make recommendations as to the disposition of certain matters relative thereto. This Investigation was convened to inquire "into the circumstances connected with the relief of Lieutenant Commander M. A. Arnheiter from command of USS *Vance* (DER 387)." It is evident that from its inception the Investigating Officer changed the purpose for which the Investigation was convened—that of determining the factual validity of allegations made against the commanding officer which had occasioned his summary relief—to one of whether he is "the type of officer who deserves command at sea." (Preliminary Remarks, para 8). It is not surprising therefore, that in pursuing this objective the Investigating Officer found it necessary to hold long off-the-record "discussions" with Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter to get him to see "the overall problem" (Preliminary Remarks, para 6). Conceding that an inquiry for the purpose of the Investigation was convened is most difficult under ideal circumstances, the Investigating Officer is in his approach unwittingly compounded his already difficult task by injecting himself personally

into the role of a "psychologist" rather than that of an impartial finder of fact. Indicative are his improper comments respecting Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter's "vicious exchanges" and "incredulous tones and responses." Well intentioned as these "illuminating" remarks may be, they are completely improper in the context in which they appear in the record, and indicate a lack of objectivity on the part of the Investigating Officer. Further, the record is replete with instances in which the Investigating Officer either neglected or refused to pursue available evidence concerning specific allegations of misconduct. His findings of fact are for the most part based upon the unsubstantiated opinions of witnesses inimical to Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter.

Particularly noteworthy is the seeming disregard in the findings of fact and opinions of the prerogatives of a commanding officer, of the circumstances surrounding some of his admitted violations of regulations, and the sometimes less than adequate support he had a right to expect from his subordinates.

Fifth. The review of this case certainly was thorough, as the Navy states. What the Navy is reluctant to mention with regard to the review is obvious:

First. While the main point of the review was supposedly to determine whether Arnheiter's being fired was justified, only one reviewing authority addressed the specifics in the case. That was Baumberger, who wrote the only detailed commentary in the entire case record that addresses itself to the allegations against Arnheiter from the standpoint of the evidence to support such accusations and the credibility of the witnesses who made them. It must be strongly emphasized that in his official comment on the case, Adm. Roy L. Johnson, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet agreed with Baumberger, except to state that Arnheiter should not be reassigned to a command. Johnson reaffirmed that no offenses had been committed which should result in formal charges being leveled against anyone. That was a convenient ploy to remove the case from the judicial arena and hopefully resolve it as a strictly administrative matter.

Second. It was in the events following Rear Admiral Baumberger's initial review of the case that events become muddled and somewhat sinister. Careful attention should be paid to the chronological order of events, noting the dates as the Navy summary relates them:

September 1: Investigative report, with Baumberger's initial endorsement, arrives in Washington.

September 2:—about—Arnheiter's appeal to the President of the Commander Selection Board arrives in Washington. This letter points out that since review of his case had not been completed, the matter of his having been relieved from command should be viewed by the board with the understanding that the case might still be resolved in his favor.

September 9, 1966: Vice Adm. B. J. Semmes, Jr., the Chief of Navy Personnel receives from the "Assistant Chief for Performance"—Capt. W. R. DeLoach—a "Brief of Case Memorandum" entitled:

Subj: Detachment of LCDR Marcus A. Arnheiter, USN, 554819/1100, from command of USS VANCE (DER-387), for cause.

The memorandum recommends that Arnheiter's detachment "for cause"—as opposed to detachment without prejudice—be approved and that the investigation report along with the "Brief of Case Memo" be placed in Arnheiter's file before the selection board—which was then in session. Semmes' completes his "extensive" review on that very same day, and signs the memo:

"1. Returned. Approved. /s/ B. J. Semmes, Jr., Vice Admiral, USN."

Following the recommendation that he approved, the memo was placed in Arnheiter's file before the selection board. It bears the following stamped receipt:

Sep. 12, 1966, Finished File Pers F2 Selection Board.

This memorandum and its handling are pointed out with special care because in later correspondence to high-ranking Government officials. Vice Admiral Semmes goes to great pains to deny that it ever existed. In a letter to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH and others, he expresses great indignation at being accused of sending such a memo, which he knows to be highly improper. In a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Serial F2/1449 dated June 29, 1967, Vice Admiral Semmes states:

No memorandum on Lcdr Arnheiter was sent to the selection board at any time while it was in session.

The latest summary issued by the Navy modifies that position somewhat by stating that approval of the detachment "for cause" was routinely entered in Arnheiter's record. This is an application of the time-honored naval tactic of "Fire and Fall Back."

November 1, 1966: Rear Admiral Baumberger again reviews the case, at the request of CinCPacFlt—Admiral Johnson. Once more, Baumberger supports Arnheiter, this time accompanying his support by a critique, in the finest detail, not only of the "findings" arrived at by Witter in his Subic Bay hearings, but of the very nature of the hearings themselves.

January 20, 1967: CinCPacFlt reviews the case, concurs with Baumberger except to change the basic recommendation on Arnheiter's restoration to command. Why? The implication is quite clear. Despite the Navy's present artful dodging, Semmes' action on September 9, 1966, wherein he passed final judgment on Arnheiter before review of the investigative report was complete was highly improper and prejudicial. For CinCPacFlt to agree with Baumberger at this late date would be an admission that Semmes had erred.

January 26, 1967: In an amazing testimonial to the wonders of modern communications, the Judge Advocate General completes and signs his endorsement on the investigative report. The Navy is quick to note the sheer volume of the case record: 413 pages of the hearing's transcript, plus a probable 200 pages in endorsements and statements. Yet now the Navy claims that this entire record was sent by mail from Pearl Harbor to Washington, and subjected to an "exhaustive" review all within 6 days. Hog-

wash. The Judge Advocate General made a routine endorsement based on a cursory scan of the record. He literally could not have had time to do otherwise. Routine mail service between the Main Navy Building, 18th and Constitution, and the Munitions Building, 20th and Constitution, in Washington, takes an average of 3 days by the time the various mail rooms are done with their handling. This might give some idea of the time the Judge Advocate General had to review the case.

The basic issues in the Arnheiter case should now be restated:

First. The manner in which Arnheiter was relieved.

Second. The manner in which the Navy has attempted to cover up and justify Rear Admiral King's precipitate relieving action and the blunder Vice Admiral Semmes made in prematurely backing King. The underlying principle is that no matter what else happens, it must never be admitted that an admiral made a mistake.

Third. A third issue is now clearly in view, being closely allied to the two preceding. That is the matter of the extent to which the Navy has gone, in a high-powered public relations effort far surpassing Arnheiter's to arrogantly establish that mistakes simply do not happen in the Navy when admirals are involved.

The Navy's summary paper is a case in point. Consider the material starting on page 6, "Basic Points in the Arnheiter Case":

Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter lacked reliability and predictability in command:

First. The conduct of bombardments was not a violation of his operating instructions, but was included within his mission—attested to by sworn statement of Lieutenant Commander Stong, then executive officer of the U.S.S. *Kretschmer*—DER—329. If this were not so, then why was this allegation thrown out by Rear Admiral Baumberger and not reborn until the Navy's position became desperate? The same comment applies to the accusation that he fired blindly without knowing of the presence of friendly troops. That is a lying insinuation. If the Navy maintains otherwise, let it be brought out in open inquiry. Several witnesses—Petty Officers Farnum, Joy, and Boson, as well as Chief Petty Officer Young—testified in sworn statement that these accusations are false. The Navy knows this, but rather than submit to a damaging inquiry, chooses to engage in deliberate lies.

Second. The incident involving boarding of the MV *Dinard*, referred to as an unauthorized boarding, is wide open to inquiry. Arnheiter is prepared to defend himself on this point. Rear Admiral Baumberger heard his defense and threw this charge out. CinCPacFlt concurred. But now Arnheiter stands convicted.

Third. The accusation regarding false position reports is particularly odious. The following is quoted from a sworn statement submitted by Lieutenant Commander Russel T. Stong, U.S. Navy dated April 10, 1968. Lieutenant Commander Stong was the executive officer of U.S.S. *Kretschmer*—DER—329—a ship which

preceded the *Vance* on the same mission in the same Vietnamese coastal area:

Question: Was there any doubt in your mind as to the function of the Coastal Surveillance Center at Qui Nhon?

Answer: No. Some of the CSC people mistakenly thought they were in the chain of command between the Admiral and the ship. But they were not, and Admiral Ward sent an ALMART message telling everyone that the only boss of the ship's skipper was himself, the admiral. This message was sent because the CSC people had illegally sent the USS *Newell*, a DER, permission to fire across the bow of a Russian freighter, without getting the word to do so from the Admiral. CTF 115 was to the point about this, and said the CSC was only a radio and information relay link, nothing more. I recall the CSC was reprimanded for unwarranted assumption of authority and they were put in their place. The CSC had no operational control or authority over the DER in the area, and had no authority to send the ship any orders originated by themselves at the CSC. Of course, they had tried to do this.

The "false position reports" which Arnheiter was accused of sending were intended to satisfy the demands of CSC, Qui Nhon. Even the Navy admits that the reports Arnheiter was required to make to his operational superiors were prompt and proper.

Fourth. Other commanding officers in the same general area, under similar circumstances used their scout boats and MWB's in the same manner as Arnheiter and were commended for it; for example, U.S.S. *Koiner* and U.S.S. *Lowe*.

Fifth. The Secretary of the Navy chooses to reflect on what would have happened during the Cuban missile crisis had Arnheiter commanded a ship there. What indeed? Foreign merchantmen were stopped and boarded off Cuba. Other persons, including Congressmen—for example, Representative RARICK, of Louisiana—have brought up conjecture on a different *Pueblo* situation had Arnheiter been in command there.

II. LCDR Arnheiter was lacking in integrity:

First. See the Stong statement quoted above regarding position reports.

Second. The game of tailoring reports of spare parts availability to fit one's own needs is played by every ship's captain.

Third. The false survey referred to, covered \$17 worth of candy for Vietnamese children in a junk full of refugees which *Vance* stopped. The Navy could well afford the money. Arnheiter's action was not without precedent. The Navy can ill afford a close inquiry, servicewide, into how much is given away—usually with the finest of motives—in violation of the letter of the law.

Fourth. Introduction of alcoholic beverages is indeed a violation. Arnheiter permitted his wife to bring an eggnog—1 quart for five people—as consolation for the duty officer and his wife, "duty-bound" on Christmas Eve—2 days before the ship departed for Vietnam. If admirals were condemned for "liquor on board," many prominent names in the Navy over the past half-century would have gained far more notoriety than fame.

Fifth. As regards Arnheiter's reduc-

tion of the in-port watch below the fleet regulations minimum to permit maximum attendance at a "social function," it should first be noted, that what the Navy now passes off as a minor social function was a deliberately planned attempt to demonstrate to the young officers in *Vance* the richness of Navy tradition and ceremony involved in a formal mess night. The commander of the Pacific Fleet's cruiser-destroyer force himself, Admiral Baumberger, noted in the record that this technical violation was well tempered by circumstances. Especially since *Vance* had a large hole cut in her side, had her engineering plant completely shut down, and could not have been able to get underway under any circumstances.

It would be well to note here the statement of Rear Adm. Alexander S. Goodfellow, USN—an active duty admiral—who stated on June 8, 1966:

As for the various charges which appear to have been made against Lcdr Arnheiter by some of his officers, none seem to be of particular importance to me. In fact, every action seems to have a logical and certainly acceptable explanation. *Even when viewed en toto, the charges appear inconsequential.* Particularly when the reasoning behind Lcdr Arnheiter's actions is known. (Underlining supplied.)

This statement weighs heavily against the Navy's present disclaimer of the minor nature of the offenses Arnheiter is alleged to have committed.

Sixth. Exactly what was involved in the "credit purchases" of which Arnheiter is accused? Sunglasses and cigars when he could not leave the bridge. These items were paid for within hours. A captain of lesser restraint would have had his supply officer in irons for daring to quibble over these items.

Seventh. Pilfering? The gasoline—for a small outboard engine—was taken on a Sunday from his assigned sedan and was unobtainable elsewhere. The silver candelabra caper, as related now by the Navy, is a deliberate reversal of the facts. The candelabra was taken by drunken junior officers under their own volition. It was returned the following day by Arnheiter. A sworn statement from three members of the club staff at Guam attests to this.

Eighth. Arnheiter's judgment in the case of the medal citations is indeed questionable. But, if this offense were as serious as the Navy now alleges, why was he never charged with it?

Ninth. A comment is in order on the allegation that Arnheiter's officers felt he was "depriving them of dignity." The conduct and testimony of several *Vance* officers—Generous, Belmonte, and Hardy—at Subic Bay does not leave them with much in the way of dignity. Arnheiter deprived them not of dignity, but of the yachting type existence they had grown accustomed to under the previous regime. Sworn testimony of *Vance* crewmen—Young, Farnum, Boson, Joy, Cise-rich—attests to the fact that before, during and after Arnheiter's tenure in command, *Vance's* officers had precious little dignity to lose.

III. Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter's judgment and leadership were faulty:

First. Regarding the "character guidance" program, the Navy's own chief of chaplains, Rear Adm. J. W. Kelly (ChC), USN (Protestant) and the director, Chaplains Division, Bureau of Personnel, Rear Adm. H. J. Rotrige (ChC), USN (Catholic), as well as two senior chaplains in the 7th Fleet—too bad they are not Jewish to round things out—all signed testimonials affirming the worth, merit, advisability, and nonsectarian nature of the program Arnheiter conducted. Several *Vance* crewmen did the same. The only ones who objected were Lieutenant Generous and the few—Belmonte and Cornejo—that he was able to sway. At the Subic Bay hearing, the investigating officer, Witter, stated that "This is perhaps the most serious of all the allegations."

Two. The "Boner Box." Childish, perhaps, but common in the armed services in officer clubs and on some ships. This, by the way, represents in its entirety the regime of summary "fines" of which Arnheiter was accused behind his back by Generous via Lieutenant Dando. Dando carried the story to Commander Milligan that the "fines" Arnheiter levied amounted to as much as \$25 instead of cents, and accompanied that canard with the insinuation that Arnheiter pocketed the proceeds.

Three. As the commanding officer—and an expert rifleman to boot—Arnheiter was entitled to decide where and when he should fire small arms. Sworn testimony of witnesses—Young, Boston, Farnum—refutes Belmonte's accusation in this instance.

Fourth. The record clearly shows that the speedboat was used for recreational as well as military purposes. It is amazing to consider that in other ships of the same type—*Lowe*, *Koiner*—speedboats were bought and used for the exact same purpose. The other captains were commended for their initiative and ingenuity.

Fifth. Each captain rightfully has his own way of conducting "mast"—a non-judicial proceeding. The man of whom Arnheiter made a public example had come aboard drunk the night before and picked fights with several senior petty officers. He was lucky to be let off at "mast" rather than having to face a court-martial. As regards unusual "mast" procedure, a former CNO, while still a captain, used to walk about his ship with a master-at-arms. Summary justice was immediately dealt to any offenders noted. The punishment was standard:

Three days in the brig on bread and water!
Master-at-arms, take him away!

Sixth and seventh. The Navy establishes a dangerous precedent by taking Arnheiter to task for these offenses. A literal interpretation of the message carried here would leave us with many ships that run safely, but damned few that would fight. Even these days, a man-o'-war's captain is supposed to seek out and destroy the enemy as best he knows how. God help this country if those rules change.

The entire body of the Navy's summary statement on the Arnheiter case is wide open to detailed and specific rebuttal. The proper place for securing all

the "Irish pendants" which flutter from this case is in the open inquiry for which Arnheiter begs, for which Captain Alexander sacrificed his career, and which the Navy adamantly and arrogantly refuses to conduct, even at the joint request of 86 Members of Congress.

Consider the unpredictability in command shown by Arnheiter's seniors. Consider the Navy's demonstrated lack of integrity in false and deliberately misleading statements exemplified by the initial assertion that there was no connection whatsoever between Captain Alexander's firing and the Arnheiter case. Consider the faulty judgment and leadership of the Navy officials who improperly—with respect to procedure—fired Arnheiter and have since been burying the Navy's honor and integrity in the hole intended to cover up this case.

This case has left an impression on countless thousands of Navy enlisted men, midshipmen, and officers. As a result, the Navy will never be the same.

COTTON TALKS

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald A. Johnson, executive vice president of the Plains Cotton Growers Organization of Texas, who recently served as producer adviser to the U.S. delegation at meetings of the International Cotton Advisory Committee and the International Institute for Cotton in Athens, Greece, has made a report on the meetings that will be of intense interest to the Congress, for Mr. Johnson comments on the international view that only American cotton producers should curtail their production and only the United States should not share in the growing market for cotton textiles and materials.

I share the view expressed by Mr. Johnson that this notion should be corrected in the minds of our foreign friends. We should not penalize our U.S. growers further and that we need to work to expand markets for American-

grown cotton. For too long we have held an umbrella over the foreign cotton producer and protected him while requiring U.S. growers to curtail their production.

The June 21 "Cotton Talks" issued by the Plains Cotton Growers comments on Mr. Johnson's impressions, as follows:

COTTON TALKS

LUBBOCK, Friday, June 21, 1968.— "The rest of the world seems to believe the United States has the sole responsibility for maintaining a balance between cotton supply and demand and that we should sacrifice our own interests to carry out that responsibility."

This is the impression gained by Donald A. Johnson, Executive Vice President of Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., who just returned from Athens, Greece, where he attended meetings of both the International Cotton Advisory Committee and the International Institute for Cotton. Cotton leaders and government officials from some 50 countries were on hand.

Johnson said "Liberal U.S. foreign aid and trade policies of the past have led other cotton producing countries to feel we have an almost moral obligation to protect their cotton markets, whatever the cost to U.S. cotton producers, processors or taxpayers."

"And until we take the actions necessary to dispel that notion it is going to be extremely difficult for us to share in the world's increasing demand for textile fibers."

The ICAC is an association of governments having an interest in the production, export, import and consumption of cotton. It is designed to promote cooperation in the solution of cotton problems, particularly those of international scope and significance. It now has 42 member countries.

Johnson was invited by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to attend the Athens meeting as producer adviser to the official U.S. delegation.

"Despite a firm and highly commendable U.S. Cotton Policy Statement to the contrary, most of our foreign competitors are convinced we will continue to adjust our production in this country to suit the production plans of the rest of the world," Johnson observed.

The U.S. policy statement, presented by USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Administrator Horace Godfrey, pointed out that the U.S. has been almost totally responsible for bringing world cotton carryover down to a "reasonably satisfactory" level.

On August 1, 1966 cotton carried over by all countries totaled 30.5 million bales. The figure is expected to be down to 20.5 million by August 1 of this year, largely as a result of reduced production in the U.S. from almost 15 million bales in 1965 to 9.7 million in 1966 and about 7.5 million last year.

"This adjustment program has required severe sacrifices in the United States," Godfrey said. "The reduction has had widespread community effects, especially in reducing the volume of business for ginner, buyers, machinery dealers, fertilizer and pesticide firms and cottonseed oil mills."

Later in his report Godfrey said "The United States has every intention of sharing in the improvement of the world cotton situation which has been brought about to such a significant extent through our own efforts. We are not satisfied with the current level of U.S. cotton exports. We intend to continue to take vigorous steps to export more cotton in the future."

If taken at face value this should put foreign cotton producing countries on notice that the U.S. will no longer be content to remain the "residual supplier" in world markets.

But Johnson does not believe this statement of policy alone is going to convince anyone.

"We've got to show the rest of the world we mean business. We've got to produce enough cotton to meet a larger share of world demand and we've got to adopt what some will call cold-blooded sales policies that will move our production into world markets. If we do this we can return to a more normal level of production in the U.S. without creating a surplus, and other countries will be obliged to accept their part of the responsibility for maintaining a supply-demand balance."

Specifically, Johnson referred to the need for improvements in U.S. cotton quality, bale packaging, credit arrangements, arbitration procedures, technical services and the expanded use of trade teams.

He said "When we begin to use these sales tools to the fullest we may be able to convince foreign cotton producers that we are in the export market to stay and that we aren't going to sacrifice our own producers and processors to their expansion plans."

The International Institute for Cotton, an organization of cotton exporting countries who contribute \$1 per bale on exports toward international cotton research and promotion, held its annual meeting immediately prior to the ICAC meeting.

Johnson was favorably impressed with IIC reports on programs of technical and market research, promotion and public relations.

He said "Several of the programs started by IIC have been adopted by large fabric and apparel merchandisers in Japan and other countries, and that is about the finest compliment IIC could have."

On the return trip from Athens Johnson visited with cotton and textile leaders in Milan, Italy; Zurich and Winterture, Switzerland; Amsterdam, Holland; Bremen, Germany and London, England.

SENATE—Tuesday, June 25, 1968

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., pastor, Capitol Hill United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we acknowledge that God is our strength and courage, making us equal to the tasks of the day. Your strength within us gives us power, understanding, and the balance of love.

We are grateful for the power of a moment of prayer. Physical strength is increased, mental stability is possible, emotional serenity is ours as we meet any experience with Your presence in us.

The Psalmist sang the affirmation: *The Lord is the stronghold of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?*—Psalm 27: 1.

May this also be our deep affirmation. For national and international leaders, for responsible citizens, we pray. Give guidance and strength during these hours of tension. May life, courage, persistence, and fearlessness for the right be gifts of God upon these to whom we look for leadership this day.

We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Monday, June 24, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16913) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses