

Avecilla, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 18364. A bill for the relief of Prabhakar G. Chitnis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 18365. A bill for the relief of Bernward

Karl Paulke and Winfried Paulke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

366. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the board of supervisors, Contra Costa County, Calif., relative to legislation re-imposing or permitting imposition of residence requirements for welfare benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO TRINI LOPEZ

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times it gives me pleasure to call to your attention, a man of most humble origin, who has traveled the world over making friends for the United States. This man is Trini Lopez, known to you as an actor and singer, but also known to the people of Asia, Africa, Australia, South America, and Europe as a friendly ambassador of good will.

One week he may be in Brussels making a charity appearance with Marlene Dietrich. The next week could find him in Austin, Tex., taking part in a program sponsored by the National Council for the Arts. But regardless of his schedule, he makes it a point to make new friends wherever he goes. In every concert he sings the song from "West Side Story" with the lyric "I like to be in America," and nothing pleases him so much as having the audience join in the singing. This frequently happens in countries where English is seldom spoken, but people learn the song from records.

On a recent tour he performed before an integrated audience in Rhodesia, the integration taking place only after he threatened to cancel the concert. Regardless of his schedule, he always makes it a point to find free time for worthy causes. He has been known to cancel commercial performances to appear at events such as the Red Cross gala in Monte Carlo. Regardless of what areas he visits, he has no trouble reaching across the language barriers. The one experience that has eluded him is playing behind the Iron Curtain, and he is anxiously waiting for the Cultural Exchange Committee to complete the arrangements.

Had these activities been the work of a person born with the advantages of our affluent society, the efforts on behalf of the less-fortunate people could be attributed to some need for self-justification and social consciousness. Mr. Lopez, however, was offered the very minimum of the material benefits during his formative years. Born in the Little Mexico district of Dallas, he and his family lived eight to a room as they struggled for survival. Only the music of his father's guitar brightened the dismal world around them. By the age of 11, the son knew that music was to be his life. By the age of 15, he had his own musical group and started the harsh one-night stands that are the training ground for

many musicians. Eventually the trail led him to California, where Frank Sinatra helped him break through to stardom. Now wealthy and famous, Mr. Lopez associates with the glamorous figures of the international set, but he has not overlooked his responsibility to the multitudes of less-fortunate people. Nothing pleases him more than the salute from the Mexican newspaper Novedades, which hailed him as "the greatest U.S. export since Coca-Cola."

Thank you.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I sent questionnaires to each of the more than 130,000 homes in my congressional district, seeking my constituents' viewpoints on some of the major issues facing this Congress and the Nation.

This was the fourth year that I had conducted such a poll, and the response was the largest ever. More than 15,000 persons responded, and many expanded their views in letters.

With the thought that many of my colleagues might be interested in the results of my survey, I, under unanimous consent, include them in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is a breakdown of the replies to each of the questions asked:

1. Do you favor a 10-percent surcharge (10 percent of the tax now paid) on individual and corporate income taxes to help combat inflation?

Total replies.....	14,697
Yes (34 percent).....	4,997
No (66 percent).....	9,700

2. Do you favor a tax on tourist travel abroad to help solve this nation's balance-of-payments problem?

Total replies.....	16,263
Yes (60 percent).....	9,757
No (40 percent).....	6,506

3. Do you favor stricter penalties for producing, selling, or possessing LSD, marijuana, and similar drugs?

Total replies.....	16,398
Yes (81 percent).....	13,283
No (19 percent).....	3,115

4. Do you favor increased use of Federal funds to help provide long-term loans for middle-income college students?

Total replies.....	14,868
--------------------	--------

Yes (62 percent).....	9,218
No (38 percent).....	5,650

5. Do you favor stronger Federal action to help solve the problems of air and water pollution?

Total replies.....	14,834
Yes (93 percent).....	13,796
No (7 percent).....	1,038

6. Do you favor enactment of an all-out national program to train the hard-core unemployed and put them in jobs?

Total replies.....	14,570
Yes (64 percent).....	9,324
No (36 percent).....	5,246

7. Do you favor increased Federal aid to municipal, county and state police for salaries, equipment and training?

Total replies.....	14,683
Yes (58 percent).....	8,517
No (42 percent).....	6,166

7a. Would you favor a similar program for fire departments?

Total replies.....	14,267
Yes (48 percent).....	6,849
No (52 percent).....	7,418

8. Do you favor Federal legislation to regulate and control the sale of firearms?

Total replies.....	14,913
Yes (54 percent).....	8,053
No (46 percent).....	6,860

9. Do you approve of the present United States policy in Vietnam and Southeast Asia?

Total replies.....	14,152
Yes (28 percent).....	3,963
No (72 percent).....	10,189

Those who indicated that they did not favor the then apparent U.S. policy in Vietnam and Southeast Asia were asked what alternative course of action they would suggest. The replies show a broad spectrum of opinion. The most common suggestions are listed below, with the percentage of votes they received:

	Percent
a. Escalate the War.....	24
b. Withdraw from Vietnam.....	21
c. De-escalate the War.....	8
d. Either fight to win or get out.....	19
e. Make the Vietnamese do more.....	14

The final question in the poll asked, "What, in your opinion, are the most vital problems facing our nation today?" The most common replies are listed below in order of the number of people suggesting them:

1. Vietnam.

It should be noted that some persons answered the question before and some after President Johnson's March 31 speech and the subsequent Preliminary Peace talks.

2. Civil Rights.
3. Crime.
4. Inflation.
5. Riots.
6. Balance of payments.
7. Disrespect for authority.
8. High Taxes.
9. Education.
10. Air and Water Pollution.
11. Unemployment.
12. Narcotics.
13. Foreign Policy.

SENATOR RANDOLPH CITES EDITORIAL IN FAIRMONT, W. VA., TIMES ON APPROVAL OF SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last Friday, I stated that "the President has the right and the responsibility to fill vacancies on the Nation's highest court during his entire term." This contention cannot be reasonably disputed. I reiterate my support for the appointments of Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice and Judge Homer Thornberry to be Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The argument that President Johnson should not take this action because he is a "lameduck" Chief Executive begs the issue. The charge of cronyism is not worth answering.

Mr. President, a distinguished West Virginia journalist, William D. "Bill" Evans, in an editorial, "The Pettiest Kind of Politics," in the June 29, 1968, Fairmont Times calls the threat of a filibuster to block confirmation of the two nominations a "sordid maneuver." I agree.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this well-reasoned comment by Mr. Evans inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE PETTIEST KIND OF POLITICS

Motivated entirely by sheer partisan malice, some 18 Republican members of the Senate are attempting to thwart the Constitution by trying to block the confirmation of Justice Abe Fortas to be chief justice of the United States and Judge Homer Thornberry to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court. If they fail to halt approval within the Senate Judiciary Committee, they are prepared to filibuster against confirmation until the end of the present session.

Behind this sordid maneuver is the desire of the GOP bloc to delay the selection of the two high court members until after the November election, hoping that it will be a Republican President who will then have the opportunity to make the appointments after his inauguration in January.

Because President Johnson, last March 31, took himself out of the 1968 campaign, he is described by the Republican senators as a "lame duck." They know full well that this is a total distortion of facts.

The 22nd Amendment which prohibits the election of a President more than twice makes the holder of that office a "lame duck" in his second term. This has been true since

March 1, 1951, and Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first to come under the ban that had been launched by Republicans who never forgave Franklin D. Roosevelt for winning four terms.

But Lyndon Baines Johnson is President of the United States until Jan. 20, 1969, with the full powers and privileges of his office. Since he would still be eligible to run for another term, having come to the presidency with less than two years of the late John F. Kennedy's tenure to serve, if that was his wish, he can in no way be considered a "lame duck" in the common acceptance of the term.

Many other Presidents have made appointments to the Supreme Court with far less of their terms remaining than Johnson has of his. He acted not only constitutionally but with the precedents to support him in nominating Mr. Justice Fortas and Judge Thornberry.

The other excuse offered by the Republican opposition is that the President sent up the names of two "cronies" to fill the high judicial posts. This attack on two jurists whose nominations have been generally acclaimed and to which approval was given by the American Bar Association's committee on the federal judiciary is even more reprehensible than the cry of "lame duck."

It is quite unlikely that a president would name a personal enemy or a political opponent to the Supreme Court. The history of this country is full of examples where the sole criterion has been political expediency, which is surely not true in the Fortas-Thornberry case.

Even if it were true that "cronism" had entered into the nominations, the Republicans might well recall how Eisenhower, when President, surrounded himself with high ranking officers and executives of big defense contractors. They did not rise to cry "cronism" then and they have no reason for doing so now.

Filmsiest of all the objections is the question of whether a vacancy for chief justice actually exists. Chief Justice Earl Warren was asked to stay on until his successor had qualified, a perfectly natural request to insure continuity of the court and one to which he was glad to accede. To say that no one can be chosen to take Warren's place until he has actually stepped down is nit-picking in its purest form.

As a matter of practical politics, too, the recalcitrant Republicans may be taking exactly the wrong tack. A lot of people already have the idea that Chief Justice Warren submitted his resignation to avoid any chance that Richard Nixon, as President, would name his successor. If the Republicans are able to block the Fortas-Thornberry confirmations, a majority of voters may concur with Warren and make absolutely sure that Nixon doesn't get the opportunity to appoint anyone.

Curiously enough, it is always the Republicans who are crying "petty politics." Their own conduct in the Senate with respect to the pending nominations is a precise example of what this expression means and they are certainly not going to win any awards for statesmanship by it.

IN MEMORY OF GORDON
McDONOUGH

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, my respect and admiration for Gordon McDonough grew every day during the many years we served together

in the House. He was indeed a fine American in every sense of the word, a most conscientious and effective legislator, and a devoted husband and father. He contributed immeasurably to the betterment of our country. I extend to Mrs. McDonough and to the other members of his family my deep sympathy.

KATY JO LANCIANESE, ST. MARYS, W. VA., HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT, STRESSED AMERICANISM IN WINNING ESSAY

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we will celebrate tomorrow our Fourth of July. And there is a need—a compelling need—to rededicate ourselves to citizenship responsibilities.

People are inclined to be critical of youth. There are, however, evidences of genuine patriotism by high school students, as evidenced by Miss Katy Jo Lancianese. She participated in the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary Post 79, St. Marys, W. Va. Katy Jo received the first prize.

Her father, George Lancianese, wrote me, under date of July 1:

The deep meaning of Americanism expressed by my daughter during these critical times, when youth have been accused of lacking in the meaning of Americanism, touched me to the extent that I have taken the liberty of sharing the essay with you. It reinforces my feelings of long standing that young people have not lost their sense of values, that they are responsible and trustworthy Americans and, if given an opportunity they will respond to and defend the true meaning of Americanism. There are many thousands of young people who share Katy Jo's deep feelings for America. She firmly believes that youth is dedicated to the democratic principles established by our forefathers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the winning essay, "America, the Land of Hope," by Katy Jo Lancianese, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICA, THE LAND OF HOPE

(By Katy Jo Lancianese)

As we look backward along the pathway of human progress, we can be proud of the many gains made by the American nation.

During the critical period at the end of the Revolution, our forefathers were faced with the difficult problem of bringing diverse people and conflicting interests into a unified body. In the face of serious difficulties their efforts were successful. The new government emphasized the individual and gave him more liberty than had been given to the people of any other nation. It kindled hope in the hearts of the citizens and this burning torch was passed on to future generations.

In the years between 1860-65, when ties of brotherhood and loyalty to the nation were sharply severed and Americans began to fear that never again would the Stars and Stripes reign from sea to sea, the people

were looking for an answer. Under the leadership of a great president, Abraham Lincoln, the answer was found: we stood united again. Although the flames had sputtered momentarily, the fire again rose up.

The next century found Americans appalled by the ravages of two terrible wars yet determined to protect their rights and those of men around the world, no matter what the cost. The seemingly ill-wind strengthened the flames of hope and courage.

Today there are serious problems which must be solved; we are faced with the challenge of substituting for war the settlement of conflicts by peaceful, orderly, reasonable means. The fulfillment of our hopes for a better world will depend upon the willingness and ability of the people of all countries to rise above selfish nationalistic ambitions and attempt to settle the differences by international cooperation. The history of our great nation would serve as a beacon for the rest of the world.

The discoveries and achievements made by Americans in the past decade should brighten the hopes for a world of peace, happiness, and freedom. Medicine, technology, economics, sciences, and scientific exploration are but a few of the fields into which our people have ventured and have been slowly advancing. Americans are now far better equipped with the means for improving mankind than were the patriots of old. Yet our accomplishments are being covered by blankets of unrest and insecurity. Daily, new problems emerge; however, we cannot be discouraged. We must take the lead in the great search for peace and freedom; let us be guided by the example of our forefathers when they brought order out of chaos in the face of seemingly insuperable odds. In this way our blazing spirit of hope and accomplishment will be branded on the face of time, and future generations will carry on our great tradition.

"O Land, the measure of our prayers, Hope of the world in grief and wrong, Be thine the blessing of the years: The gift of faith—the crown of song." (Julia Ward Howe.)

POVERTY ON THE INDIAN RESERVATIONS

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Congress to take a good hard look at the bureaucracy down in the Department of the Interior.

The taxpayers are spending a lot of money on what is known as the Poor People's March—the real poor, however, are not here—the real poor are on Indian reservations. They are waiting for Congress to help them.

The way Congress can help them is providing a tax incentive for industry to locate on Indian reservations, providing employment, salaries and dignity.

This program has been successful wherever it has been tried. It lifted Puerto Rico from a slum area to a country with the highest per capita income in Latin America, but the Indian Department is opposed to trying it on Indian reservations. They are opposed to trying to help these people lift themselves by their own bootstraps. The Department had the audacity to recommend against passage of H.R. 10218.

Possibly, Mr. Speaker, they would

rather maintain the Indian reservations with their poverty and their squalor and have jobs for those in the Bureau.

THE NEED FOR FLOOD INSURANCE

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will consider the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, which, among other things, seeks to establish a nationwide system of flood insurance. I would like to discuss this for a moment.

Three separate disasters in June dramatized the need for flood insurance in this country. Early last month heavy rains brought flooding to northern New Jersey. The damage to property was estimated to total more than \$140 million. A few days later, a small but ominous hurricane named Abby slammed into the west coast of Florida, causing flooding there. Finally, June 23, tropical storm Candy—the third storm of this early season—moved inland near Corpus Christi, Tex., bringing high tides and flooding to that area.

Fortunately, the death toll from these incidents has been minimal. Property losses, however, will be high. In the coming months, there will be more severe storms. I know from personal experience the terrible price in human life and human misery these storms exact. I know people who have lost their homes or their places of business to flooding and with them their hope.

I submit that we can and should do something to help people who will be the victims of floods in the future. That something, Mr. Speaker, is a national system of flood insurance, made available at a reasonable cost through private companies.

Congress authorized such a system of national flood insurance in 1956, but unfortunately that legislation was never implemented.

After Hurricane Betsy devastated a large section of the Southern United States, the Congress authorized a study of alternative methods of making flood insurance available.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development conducted an exhaustive study of flood insurance and recommended an excellent system by which the National Government would join with private insurance companies to make this insurance available.

The concept of flood insurance was overwhelmingly approved by both the House and Senate but differences arose over financing provisions.

These differences still exist. Likewise, the problem still exists.

The growing need for flood insurance is painfully dramatized each spring, when the rains come, and in the fall, with the arrival of hurricanes.

Between 1945 and 1967, flood losses exceeded \$100 million in 15 of the 22

years, and in two of these years the loss was about \$1 billion.

Local, State, and National Governments and private relief agencies have performed well during natural disasters. But their efforts have been piecemeal and insufficient. What is needed is a program of flood insurance on a nationwide basis through the cooperative efforts of the National Government and the private insurance industry.

In the long run, such a system would be less expensive than present ad hoc disaster relief efforts.

Flood insurance is not a panacea—we will still need emergency aid for the victims of natural disasters—but it is a promising start. It is needed; it has the support of the people, and I hope it will be passed into law soon.

Under unanimous consent I submit several news articles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TROPICAL STORM RIPS TEXAS COAST—CANDY BLASTS AUSTWELL WITH WINDS, RAIN

(By Gary Garrison)

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.—Tropical storm Candy smashed into the Texas coast early Sunday night, lashing the Austwell area with 62-mile-an-hour winds and threatening to bring high tides, torrential rains and flooding.

The storm, which developed suddenly in the Gulf of Mexico off Brownsville at mid-day Sunday, was due to bring as much as six inches of rain to the eastern part of Texas as it moved inland.

The center of the storm which was expected to hit Corpus Christi, veered slightly to the east and moved toward the San Patricio Bay and Matagordo Bay areas early Sunday night.

High tides accompanying the storm washed out two bridges on Mustang Island and police put up a barricade to halt traffic on the John F. Kennedy Causeway from Corpus Christi to Padre Island.

Tornado warnings were issued for more than 30 counties in South Central and Southeast Texas by mid-afternoon Sunday as twisters developed ahead of the approaching tropical storm.

Tornadoes were spotted along the coast from Corpus Christi to Bay City and as far inland as Victoria and Cameron as the turbulence developed. One twister southeast of El Campo overturned several trailers and damaged several buildings but no injuries were reported.

All small craft along the Texas Coast were warned to remain in port and persons were warned to leave the south part of Padre Island because of expected tides of two to four feet.

At Austin the Texas Department of Public Safety partially activated its emergency operations center in anticipation of needs to coordinate relief activities in case of major flooding along the coastal area. Personnel of the department's division of disaster relief and the state Health Department were manning the center.

All state agencies belonging to the state Disaster Council, federal agencies and local governments in the coastal area from Kingsville to Beaumont were on a standby basis.

Gov. John Connally was in constant touch with the emergency operations center.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1968]

HURRICANE PICKS UP SPEED AND HEADS FOR TAMPA—GULF COAST BATTERING DOWN—TIDES CAUSE GIRL'S DEATH—FIVE ARE MISSING AT SEA

TAMPA, FLA., June 3.—Hurricane Abby indirectly caused the death of a small child

today and left five other persons missing at sea. The storm then picked up speed and took aim at the populous Tampa Bay area.

A one-year-old girl, April Geans, was swept away in storm tides when she broke away from her grandmother at Key West as the fringes of the season's first hurricane lashed at the beach.

Abby, building in intensity as it moved toward land, stalled in midafternoon in the Gulf of Mexico, setting back its predicted arrival at the Florida coast until dawn tomorrow.

In addition to the threat of the Hurricane's 75-mile-an-hour winds, Weather Bureau forecasters said there was a possibility of a tornado in an area from Fort Lauderdale to Tampa. Torrential rains preceded the storm.

At 6 P.M., a Weather Bureau advisory said the storm was located near Lat. 26 degrees N., Long. 83.5 degrees W.—directly west of Marco Island and about 145 miles southwest of Tampa.

The hurricane tracking Center predicted that it would resume its 10-mile-an-hour movement to the north-northeast with the possibility of some intensification. The forecasters said, however, that the season's first hurricane was expected to be a minimal one.

HIGH TIDES EXPECTED

Tides were expected to be two to four feet above normal in the Tampa area in advance of the storm. Gale force winds extended outward 150 miles to the north and east over water.

Hurricane warning flags were flying from Marco Island, 170 miles north, to Tarpon Springs.

Gulf Coast residents waited until nearly noon to begin storm preparations. Then they pitched in with plans worked from years of hurricane experience.

At Fort Myers, in the middle of the warning area. Red Cross and civil defense officials planned to open five hurricane shelters in schools.

Motels began filling with persons who had left their beach homes on resort islands strung along the coast, including Sanibel, Captiva, Anna Maria and Longboat Key.

Homestead Air Force Base south of Miami began flying out F-4D jet fighter planes to the Columbus (Miss.) Air Force Base, MacDill Air Force Base at Tampa began evacuating its 95 F-4C fighter-bombers to Columbus and the Birmingham, Ala., municipal airport.

The storm forced postponement of the Coast Guard's search for the sloop *Celerity* with two couples aboard and the commercial fishing boat *Sandy*, carrying John Adamic, 61 years old, of Marathon in the Florida Keys.

The northeast edge of the storm dropped heavy rains across the Florida Keys and on the heavily populated Miami area, already soaked by a record May rainfall of more than 18 inches.

The storm crossed western Cuba last night and started moving up the Gulf of Mexico, hitting the Dry Tortugas this morning.

The Cuban radio reported that the hurricane had forced the evacuation of 700 persons in low-lying areas of Pinar del Rio Province in the west. No casualties were reported, but several houses were reported blown down and one concrete bridge washed out.

NEAR-HURRICANE BATTERS TEXAS—CANDY CAUSES \$1 MILLION DAMAGE

CORPUS CHRISTI.—Tropical storm Candy caused \$1 million damage, the Weather Bureau estimated today after she boiled out of the Gulf of Mexico yesterday.

Damage came from winds of near-hurricane force and from rains, said Russell Mozeney, chief of the Corpus Christi Weather Bureau office, who made the loss estimate.

Mozeney also said eight barges were beached and damaged and a drilling rig was sunk.

One man reported rains of more than 12 inches.

Other sources reported boats and a fishing pier damaged.

Most of the wreckage was up the coast from Corpus Christi, largely in the Austwell area.

Residents of Corpus Christi, however, hardened by the wide-spread destruction of Hurricane Beulah a year ago, paid little attention to the storm. It did almost no damage to Corpus Christi.

The unexpected storm headed through the heartland of Texas and was causing weather upsets as far north as Oklahoma by dawn.

One tornado spawned by the storm unroofed two houses and destroyed a barn at Lindale, near Tyler, but caused no injuries.

The center of the storm reached land at Austwell, 60 miles up the coast from Corpus Christi.

Bob Hopper, owner of Hopper's Landing on San Antonio Bay five miles south of Austwell, said he emptied 12 inches of rain from his gauge and that more rain fell.

Hopper said he clocked winds of 72 miles an hour—three miles less than hurricane force—before his equipment was blown away.

Mozeney said most of the crop damage was to cotton and grain sorghums although some rice suffered damage.

The weather official said a drilling rig sank a mile off the shore and tides of four feet beached eight barges, one loaded with iron.

Hopper said 10 towboats and barges and a few other vessels suffered damage at his harbor.

A 740-foot public fishing pier at Port O'Connor was severely damaged by winds clocked at 65 m.p.h.

The Red Cross opened an emergency shelter in a high school to care for some families whose homes were flooded.

One of the heavier rains was 7.20 inches at Dime Box, between Houston and Austin.

BRENDA MOVING AWAY FROM BERMUDA AREA

MIAMI.—Hurricane Brenda moved away from Bermuda today, spending her 75-mile-an-hour wind fury on open ocean.

Brenda was traveling east-northeastward from her midnight position 275 miles from Bermuda at an estimated rate of 20 miles an hour, the Miami Weather Bureau reported.

The hurricane was to slow up later today, but little change in size or intensity was forecast.

Highest winds in the hurricane were estimated at 75 m.p.h. in the center with gales extending out 150 miles to the southeast and 75 miles to the northwest of the center.

FEDERAL IN JERSEY COST \$140 MILLION—FEDERAL ESTIMATE COVERS SIX STRICKEN COUNTIES

TRENTON, June 3.—The Federal Government estimated today that floods had caused \$140-million worth of damage in six counties of northern New Jersey, according to the State Commissioner of Conservation and Development.

The Commissioner, Robert A. Roe, said the figure had been presented by the Federal Office of Emergency Planning and the Small Business Administration at a meeting here with state officials, but the Federal agencies made no statement on the proceedings.

The meeting, which Gov. Richard J. Hughes attended, was called by the White House after the Governor had requested that the President declare the region a disaster area so that grants and low-interest loans can be given to victims.

That request will be acted upon, Mr. Roe said at a meeting next Monday, after there is more detailed investigation by various Federal agencies in cooperation with their counterparts in the state.

The State Legislature, meanwhile, approved and sent to the Governor a \$5-million emergency-aid bill designed to repair public fa-

cilities, which Mr. Roe said accounted for \$10-million of the \$140-million estimate.

The remaining \$130-million in damage was suffered by private businesses and private homeowners. The figure includes only structural damage to houses, not items such as furniture and clothing.

The flood levels continued to drop today, and scores of families moved back into their homes.

The police in Little Falls reported that everyone had returned to his house. The Lincoln Park police, who had said yesterday that 150 people were isolated from their homes, reported today that almost everyone was back.

Wayne appeared to be drying out more slowly than other towns. Oscar Aquino, director of health, said that while about 65 families returned, another 160 people were still unable to live in their houses.

Despite a brief downpour in the afternoon, and threatening skies during most of the day, the flood levels quickened their pace of retreat.

RED CROSS PROVIDES FOOD

Mr. Roe said the Red Cross was providing food in stricken areas and was considering the possibility of distributing blankets and clothing to residents whose possessions were destroyed by muddy water.

The flood waters, which began with six to seven inches of rain last Wednesday, were considered the worst in the state since 1903. Two thousand people were evacuated, factories were closed and eight persons, including seven children, were killed.

Among the eight were two boys, one 12 years old and one 13, whose canoe went over a dam on the Pompton River Saturday evening. Search operations continued today without success, and they were presumed to have drowned.

Mr. Roe also said that he would soon present to towns in the regions a proposal for a \$500-million flood-control program.

SOME OPPOSITION CITED

The plan, the 19th to be recommended since 1888, would include a complex of dikes and dams along the Passaic, and a huge lake at the confluence of the Pompton and Passaic Rivers.

Municipalities and other local interests have blocked past flood-control proposals, according to Mr. Roe, principally because of the loss of land.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. BAUMAN

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House in saluting one of our most conscientious and dedicated assistants, Bob Bauman, as he leaves his post this week after 15 years of outstanding service to begin the practice of law in Maryland.

I personally have been grateful for the many courtesies which Bob has extended to me during my 6 years in the House. As manager of the telephones in the Republican cloakroom, he has brought efficiency and good humor to a most difficult task. Let me also say that I have always had deep admiration for his devotion to the principles of constitutional government and the splendid example he has set as a leader in youth groups interested in good government.

While we shall miss Bob in the days ahead, we recognize that he is moving ahead to new opportunities and greater challenges—and we are happy for him. Certainly he approaches the practice of law with a unique background and a higher respect for the legislative process and the legal profession in general—and I predict a brilliant future for him.

America needs more young men of his caliber—and I wish him success and happiness in all his future endeavors.

ASTRONAUT CHARLES DUKE ADDRESSES AMERICAN LEGION IN CHARLESTON, S.C.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege for me to place in the RECORD at this time a very thoughtful and important address by Astronaut Charles Duke delivered to the convention of the South Carolina Department of the American Legion in Charleston on June 29, 1968.

Charles Duke is a distinguished son of South Carolina who has rendered great service to his country. He has performed another worthy service with this address.

Speaking of the place of freedom and patriotism in our lives Astronaut Duke said:

The challenge of the Constitution is to seek and earn its privileges by living up to the responsibilities of free citizens. Today, so many people forget this. They ignore their responsibilities and concentrate on getting their rights regardless of how this affects the rights of others.

The astronaut reminded us of something many people forget—that the space effort has made and will continue to make enormous contributions to the society that supports it. His address lists just some of these important contributions. He points out, for example, that the annual saving that could be realized from a truly accurate 5-day forecast of weather conditions over the United States could provide an estimated annual saving of over \$6 billion, or more than the cost of the space program for any single year. Such a forecast should be possible as an eventual result of our space program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to read this vital speech.

The address follows:

INTRODUCTION

Congressman Rivers, Sen. Thurmond, Sen. Kollings, Congressman Dorn, Cmd. Horton, Mr. Keesee, Chaplain James, distinguished guests, fellow Legionnaires, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to be here today and have this opportunity to address your convention celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. I don't believe I have ever had the experience of appearing before such a distinguished group. I am really quite flattered that you would want to listen to me what with all these outstanding public speakers on the platform with me. With so many of the S.C. congressional delegation present, I cannot pass by this opportunity to

thank them for their continuing staunch support of this country's armed forces. In this day when it is supposedly fashionable to discredit the military, when it is encouraged to evade the draft, when it is "in" to support the enemy, your words and deeds in our behalf give courage and hope to all patriotic men who serve their country. As one member of the armed forces who appreciates your dedication to this country and for thousands of others like me, I salute you.

To me, the American Legion is a unique organization. You foster and support two of the finest principles that man can strive for. These principles are freedom and patriotism. These words have a particular significance for me and I would like to give you some of my feelings about them. I am quite certain that unless we can foster a strong love of country in our citizenry, then we will pass on into oblivion like other civilizations before us.

Freedom is a relative thing. We say we are a free nation. Yet the citizens of the United States, like the citizens of any other nation, are limited by the laws that govern the land. We are not free, for example, to kill or to steal or to break the speed limits on the highways or to slander the good name of others. We experience more freedom than any other nation in the world because our laws are made by those whom we have elected—we have the freedom to vote—we have the freedom to speak our minds and help to change that which we do not like. Our Government was created of, by, and for its people. That is the greatest freedom we can have, for we know all too well that a country without laws would be a country governed by "survival of the fittest". Many of our freedoms are so obvious that we forget we have them. You can board a plane to Miami or Anchorage without a passport or police protection. You can write your congressman, tell him off, and sign your name, but he doesn't have to listen to you. You can put your money in the bank or throw it away. You can spend your evenings watching TV or discussing the world situation.

All these and other freedoms we enjoy are backed up by the Constitution of the United States, a document that also makes demands that are the most difficult and the most rewarding. It calls for discussion, moderation, and united effort among informed citizens. When it was written and accepted it amounted to a revolution in political thought, introducing as it did for the first time the principle of equality in representative Government, and uniting the divergent views and interests of thirteen independent States under the executive, legislative, and judicial power of one Government.

The challenge of the Constitution is to seek and earn its privileges by living up to the responsibilities of free citizens. Today, so many people forget this. They ignore their responsibilities and concentrate on getting their rights regardless of how this affects the rights of others.

The opportunity is ours to create and continue to cultivate an informed citizenry—to be clear in our minds about what makes a good candidate, what the major issues facing the public are, how legislation is introduced, how our own local, State, and National Governments are run—to know more exactly what we're doing when we go to the polls and to participate more fully in running our own affairs. These opportunities are our heritage and their fulfillment our obligation as American citizens.

Just as we talked of "freedom," in the same breath we must talk of "patriotism"—an asset we must never lose. Too often we try to base our patriotism on things apart from ourselves, but, for all practical purposes, our country is only as strong as its individual citizens.

Our patriotism can be inspired by the beautiful "piece of geography" that we call

the United States; our patriotism can be inspired by the star-spangled beauty of Old Glory; and our patriotism can be inspired by the recollection of those Americans who have "sacrificed their lives and fortunes" to make our country great. But as we gaze at the beauty of our land and stand in reverence of our flag and recall the stories of the great men and women whose efforts have helped to fashion our American way of life, we come to that searching question—what can I, an average American citizen, do for my country? I believe that each individual is innately blessed with certain talents and capabilities, and it is up to each of us to determine how and where we are going to use these talents.

The truly patriotic persons of today are the ones, like yourselves, who not only appreciate our heritage but who are endeavoring individually to do something in the present to lay a better foundation for America's future.

We at NASA like to think that we are helping to lay a better foundation for America's future through our space program. Those of us in the NASA Astronaut Office properly have but one major professional concern; that is to help to develop and to learn to fly, to the best of our ability, the spacecraft that we are provided from public funds.

However, we would be quite naive if we were to suppose that the American people would continue to support an expensive program that does not provide the promise of tangible benefit and economic return to the society which fostered it.

Just as I have a parochial concern for the success of the space effort, many others must also have "tuned vision" if they are to perform their tasks properly. The scientist explaining the nature of the universe tends to think that the accumulation of knowledge for knowledge sake is sufficient justification for the vast expenditure on space exploration (provided, of course, the exploration is in his field of endeavor):

The corporate executive is satisfied if the technological development provides new products and processes which will reflect in corporate profits. The economist will applaud if the program expenditures provide the proper level of stimuli to keep the GNP increasing at the proper rate. The social scientist will be mortified if the expenditures result in decreasing unemployment and the attainment of other social objectives. And so forth—and so on.

This is obviously a vast oversimplification of the motivation of different influential professional groups and I'm sure each of them could cite examples of where public funds could be better used to satisfy his own worthwhile objectives.

The major point to be made, however, is that the space effort to date has made and will continue to make enormous contributions in many areas to the society that supports it. But often these contributions are difficult to measure in terms of dollars and cents of immediate return. But a certain measure of risk-taking is involved in order to insure future return.

The current space effort is basically a research program, and as both industry and government have dramatically discovered in the last 20 years, research can and does pay handsome dividends. In fact, a survey of many of our most important companies shows that a majority of the products they are currently offering on the market were not in their product lines 10-15 years ago.

Even though the space program has been going strong for only 10 years, there are many areas where research for the space program has generated products and techniques of benefit to our society.

Let me list a few of the items that have come from space sponsored research.

1. Your television sets and radios are op-

erating longer and more reliably because of research in heat-proof electronic systems for spacecraft. This research has almost eliminated the old vacuum tube in favor of transistor circuits.

2. Teflon has become a household word centered in the kitchen because of its applications as a non-stick device to cookware. Teflon is a derivative of the national space program.

In industrial applications, companies are using new lightweight plastics and metals developed by space researchers. It is now possible to fabricate in space higher quality metal and optical equipment. This is because the absence of gravity creates a better environment for the processes involved. New energy sources such as the solar cell which were developed for satellites have also found their way into industrial applications. The solar cell by the way is a device which converts sunshine energy into electrical energy.

One of the most gratifying aspects of the space program has been its impact on medical technology. In many hospitals throughout the country, patients in the intensive care units have biomedical sensors attached to them which monitor all vital body functions. These sensor readings can be patched into a large computer console which gives one nurse the capability of adequately taking care of a large number of patients. Medical technology is also taking advantage of the microminiaturization of instruments and components which was pioneered by the space program.

By the time the first of my compatriots steps onto the moon, men will have spent almost 10 years learning how to survive in the environment lying just beyond this planet's blanket of atmosphere. The cost of making that important step has been great. But studies indicate that the direct economic benefit to the world of maintaining and extending this effort could mean a tangible return of billions of dollars a year, for, in addition to "spin off" products for the consumer, we are learning how to combat some of the problems plaguing our planet.

In this regard, an accurate five-day forecast of weather conditions over the U.S. alone could provide an estimated annual savings of 6.75 billion dollars when applied to agriculture, lumber business, surface transportation, retail marketing, and water resources management. Keep in mind that the \$6.75 billion is an annual saving—more than any single year cost of the national space program.

This accurate forecast is possible through the use of our weather satellites which give almost constant coverage of the weather situation around the globe. Satellites also are providing vehicle orbital navigation and communications systems.

It is apparent then that the space program and space research has created basic new industries for our economy and is creating many thousands of productive, useful jobs for our people. And these are jobs for people of every skill in every kind of work.

Now I'd like to go on to the program which is near and dear to my heart. This is Project Apollo. Of course, Project Apollo is this country's effort directed at landing a man on the moon. This is one of the most complex and exciting tasks ever undertaken by man. It has been in work for almost ten years and has required the efforts of thousands of dedicated men and women. We are on the verge of our first manned flight using the Apollo hardware. This flight will be in earth orbit and is designed to check out the command and service modules prior to the lunar mission. Succeeding missions will also be in earth orbit to verify and refine rendezvous procedures. The first attempt at a lunar landing should come late in 1969.

I would now like to show some slides and a short movie of a launching of the 2nd Saturn V. The Saturn V will be the launch vehicle that will boost the spacecraft onto the lunar trajectory.

Thank you for your attention, ladies and gentlemen. It has been great getting back home again. I would like to conclude by saying I feel the progress we have made so far—from the manned spaceships to planetary probes—from past achievements to the adventures of tomorrow—demonstrates that our space program will continue to serve us well and will be a tremendous asset to this country.

FORGOTTEN MAN

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, basic to our having a sound economy is our having a sound national farm program.

I have many times said—and I repeat it again—the farmer has been the "forgotten man." There does not seem to be an awareness of the plight of our farmers and the economic dilemma facing them.

No organization more extensively reflects the views of the farmers of Illinois than the Illinois Agricultural Association. That there may be a more widespread understanding of the farm problem and consideration given to the proposals of the farmers themselves for dealing with the problem, I am inserting a letter I received from the Illinois Agricultural Association under date of June 25, 1968, and a copy of their news release of June 27, 1968, which emphasizes the points raised in the letter, as follows:

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Bloomington, Ill., June 26, 1968.

This Board of Directors is deeply concerned about the current economic situation in agriculture and a number of recent developments that have an influence on farmers.

At a time when most of the nation's peoples are sharing in record economic well being, farmers are faced with difficult and severe economic problems. Current prices for many commodities relative to the prices that farmers must pay for production items and living costs are at depression levels. Illinois net realized income per farm reflecting these price levels dropped by about 20% last year. Many of the current prices lend little encouragement to farmers that this situation is likely to improve in the near future.

At the same time that farmers are confronted with sagging prices for their products, they see the costs of the items that they must buy to produce the food and fiber for a growing nation increasing at an alarming rate. Many of these cost increases have been stimulated and perpetuated by irresponsible fiscal and monetary policies of our government which have fanned the flames of inflation. We commend the Congress for taking a necessary first step in ordering a reduction in spending and an increase in taxes to slow down this inflationary spiral.

Farmers are not only concerned about the current economic situation but about the lack of public understanding of the significance of the production capability of American farms. Americans are the best fed and the best clothed people in the world. Americans spend a smaller portion of their income for their food than any other people. The American farmer has made a tremendous contribution to feeding the hungry people of the nation and of the world, not only through his production but through the sharing of his know-how. Even in view of this contribution to the economic strength of our nation, there are those who, either by direct accusation or implication, say that

agriculture is to blame for those who remain hungry in the United States or that farmers are unconcerned about the plight of these people.

Agriculture is ready, willing and able to efficiently produce an abundant supply of quality foods and fibers for a growing nation and world. We have demonstrated our ability to produce for both our current and future markets. American farmers can produce for the future if they are permitted to change as the needs of consumers direct. Farmers should not be inhibited by bureaucratic red tape administered by those who wish to make agriculture some type of public utility. Those who worry about hunger at home and abroad would do well to concern themselves with the problems of distribution of this bountiful production rather than point accusing fingers at those who produce it. To create a climate in which solutions to these problems can be found, we urge the following action:

1. CONTROL OF INFLATION

a. We urge the Congress to demand that the cuts in spending which have been directed by recent congressional action be accomplished.

b. We further urge the Congress to continue to critically appraise all government spending in an effort to bring the current inflationary surge under control. Such effort should set an example which all American business, labor and agriculture should follow.

2. EXPANDING MARKETS

a. We urge the Congress to authorize an extensive study of U.S. trade policies which should be designed to achieve a dynamic U.S. trade program. Such a study should include: (1) Methods of removing non-tariff trade barriers that have been erected against U.S. products, (2) the possibilities of special trade relations with our neighbors in North America, our Atlantic allies, and our trading partners of the South Pacific, and (3) reconstituting the Tariff Commission so that it could take prompt and appropriate action when industries, including agriculture, are experiencing expanded imports which are injuring that industry.

b. We urge Congress to oppose efforts to impose import restrictions on individual industrial and agricultural products which would bring retaliatory restrictions against U.S. products.

c. We urge Congress to oppose all efforts to divide markets or legitimize trade restrictions through international commodity agreements. We are deeply concerned that the Wheat Trade Convention recently ratified by the U.S. Senate will encourage expanded foreign wheat production and mean a loss of U.S. wheat export markets affecting not only the farmers but the U.S. balance of trade and thus the entire nation.

d. We urge the Congress to insist that the Food for Freedom Program be aggressively administered and pursued in an effort to help less fortunate nations and as a means of developing sound mutually advantageous trade between nations.

e. We urge the Congress to insist that aggressive negotiations be continued with other nations in an effort to reduce trade restrictions around the world.

3. FARM PROGRAMS

a. We urge the Congress not to extend the Agricultural Act of 1965. It is under this Act that agriculture finds itself facing the most depressed level since the depression. It was at the encouragement of those who administer this program that farmers expanded production in 1967 which in large part has brought the current price problems in agriculture. We believe it would be indeed a mistake to perpetuate a program under which such conditions have developed.

b. We urge the Congress to begin consideration now of sound legislation which would assist in bringing about the necessary adjustments in agriculture in line with the

long term needs for food and fiber and consistent with the need to conserve our natural resources. We believe this can best be done through a voluntary land retirement program based on total cropland and not on the histories of individual crop production which is both unfair and unsuccessful in bringing about needed long term adjustment.

4. PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

a. For many years the Illinois Agricultural Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation have tried to gain widespread public understanding of the vital role agriculture plays in the nation's economy. We will continue our efforts in this regard. We are deeply concerned about the recent Columbia Broadcasting System "documentary" titled "Hunger in America" and a recent report on Hunger which cast the farmer in a very unreal and unfavorable light. The vitality of agriculture as well as the whole economy is being jeopardized by today's economic and social problems. We respectfully request your assistance in doing what you can to get widespread understanding among other members of Congress of the need for a healthy agriculture and soundness of any legislation which might affect it.

Sincerely,

William J. Kuhfuss, President, Mackinaw; H. E. Hartley, Vice President, Centralia; James P. Cannell, Capron; Perry O. Keltner, Lena; Morris E. Nelson, Altona; John K. Freebairn, Utica; Clair J. Hemphill, Elwood; Howard R. Stuckey, Piper City; Harry Iliff, Minonk; Roger Carr, Avon; Vernal C. Brown, Vermont; Gilbert Fricke, Talula; Paul S. Ives, Wapella; Lyle E. Grace, Urbana; Lyman F. Crumrin, Marshall; K. W. Klarman, Shumway; Wilbert Engelke, Granite City; Carl E. Guebert, Red Bud; Carleton Apple, Enfield; William H. Sauer, Murphysboro, Board of Directors.

IAA URGES ACTION TO EASE FARMER'S ECONOMIC DILEMMA

The Illinois Agricultural Association board of directors has urged Congress to act on legislation that would help ease the economic dilemma facing farmers.

In a letter to all Illinois members of Congress, the IAA board requested support of legislation aimed at controlling inflation, expanding markets, and establishing a sound national farm program.

The board also requested the Illinois legislators' help in getting "widespread understanding among other members of Congress of the need for a healthy agriculture and soundness of any legislation which might affect it."

The IAA board's letter pointed out that farmers are faced with difficult and severe economic problems at a time when most of the nation's people are sharing in record economic well being. The board pointed out that current prices for most commodities, relative to the price that farmers must pay for production items and living costs, are at depression levels.

The IAA board expressed concern about the lack of public understanding of the significance of America's agricultural production capability. The board pointed out that the Americans are the best fed people in the world and that they spend a smaller portion of their income for food than any other people.

"Even in view of this contribution to the economic strength of our nation, there are those who, either by direct accusation or implication, say that agriculture is to blame for those who remain hungry in the United States or that farmers are unconcerned about the plight of these people. . . .

"American farmers can produce for the future if they are permitted to change as the

needs of consumers direct. Farmers should not be inhibited by bureaucratic red tape administered by those who wish to make agriculture some type of public utility. Those who worry about hunger at home and abroad would do well to concern themselves with the problems distribution of this bountiful production rather than point accusing fingers at those who produce it."

The IAA board urged the Congress to take action in four areas:

1. *Control of inflation*—To demand that the cuts in spending directed by recent congressional action be accomplished and to continue to critically appraise all government spending.

2. *Expanding markets*—To authorize an extensive study of U.S. trade policies designed to achieve a dynamic U.S. trade program. The Congress was urged to oppose efforts to impose import restrictions on individual industrial and agricultural products which would bring retaliatory restrictions against U.S. products. They further urged Congress to oppose international commodity agreements and to work for a reduction in trade restrictions. The IAA board called for aggressive administration of the U.S. Food For Freedom program to help less fortunate nations and to develop sound, mutually advantageous trade between nations.

3. *Farm programs*—Urged the Congress not to extend the Agricultural Act of 1965 but instead to begin consideration of sound legislation which would assist in bringing about the necessary adjustments in agriculture in line with long-term food needs and consistent with the need to conserve natural resources. The IAA board suggested that a voluntary land retirement program offers the best method of bringing about adjustment.

4. *Public understanding of the problems of agriculture*—Decried the recent Columbia Broadcasting System program, "Hunger in America," as portraying the farmer in a very unreal and unfavorable light. The IAA board urged Illinois members of Congress "to get widespread understanding among other members of Congress of the need for a healthy agriculture and soundness of any legislation which might affect it."

ACT OF NATIONAL SERVICE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, my good colleague from Tennessee's First Congressional District, the Honorable JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN, was appropriately recognized in the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of June 27 for his work on legislation protecting our flag. I would like to share this editorial statement with the readers of the RECORD:

ACT OF NATIONAL SERVICE

Rep. James H. Quillen, of the First Congressional District, is to be congratulated upon a bill originated and sponsored by him which has now been passed by both houses of Congress and sent to the President for signing.

In essence the bill provides that: "Whoever knowingly casts contempt upon any Flag of the United States by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, burning or trampling upon it shall be fined not more than \$1000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

It is a good thing to have this legislation on the books, primarily because it affirms the viewpoint of both houses of Congress to the

effect that this revered symbol of the nation shall be entitled to respect, regardless of the views of individuals or even groups who find themselves critical of some phases of our current society.

In other words, regardless of the things which will be generally conceded to be wrong with the country, the Flag continues to be the symbol of all that is good about it.

In drawing this bill and getting it passed by his colleagues in both houses, Representative Quillen has added to his record of public service during his tenure in Congress. In an era when in some circles it is fashionable to downgrade and belittle patriotism and love of country the Quillen measure catches the mood of an overwhelming majority of Americans, who continue to be dedicated to the preservation of the best in American life even while they labor for changes in parts of it which well may be considered the worst.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO INCREASE THE CREDIT AGAINST TAX FOR RETIREMENT INCOME

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would increase the maximum allowable credit against the tax imposed upon retirement income from the present \$1,524 to \$1,872 under section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code. The retirement income credit provision, section 37 of the IRC, was originally drafted in 1954 with the intent to provide comparable treatment of beneficiaries of funded retirement programs to the tax-free treatment social security beneficiaries received. Recent social security increases have created an inequality of tax treatment of the two types of retirement beneficiaries. As an original sponsor of the 1954 retirement income credit, my purpose in introducing this bill today is to update that section and maintain its original purpose.

There are two fundamental reasons behind my sponsorship of this bill today: the first is basic fairness and the second is basic economics.

As a matter of fairness and equity our tax laws should not favor beneficiaries under the pay-as-you-go social security system over beneficiaries of private funded programs and other public retirement systems. Those who may not qualify for social security benefits, or those who may have chosen to provide for their retirement years through other means, deserve comparable tax treatment. There are many employer-employee funded private pension plans and many public retirement programs—which are distinct from social security—which merit equal treatment.

Persons under the many public retirement programs that would be restored to equal tax treatment under this bill are, for example, the bulk of our civil servants, our teachers, our librarians, and our policemen and firemen.

As a matter of sound economics we should provide at least comparable tax treatment to retirees under funded retirement programs as we do social se-

curity beneficiaries. Funded retirement programs form the base of a great portion of the retirement plans of many Americans. This fact distinguishes the economy of the United States from that of most other Western nations, and much of our growth and vitality can be traced to this difference.

Today social security is certainly an important part of the retirement plans of most Americans. But it is only a part and when it was initiated it was never proposed as the sole source of retirement income for our people. The discussion today should be around how much of a part it should be.

Now that over 90 percent of all Americans are covered by social security, as their standard of living increases with additional discretionary income available to them, should they and their employers put that money into increasing social security benefits or into increasing the benefits they might obtain through private savings plans and the employer-employee pension systems?

I argue that there are three basic reasons today that the increase of retirement benefits for our people should come from further emphasis on funded retirement programs rather than pay-as-you-go retirement systems such as governmental social security.

First, funded retirement programs can pay larger benefits than a pay-as-you-go system, because over 50 percent of the benefits paid out to the retiree come from the earnings on the investment of the fund. Our private pension plans today have over \$90 billion in their funds. The annual earnings run over \$4.5 billion. These funded plans are being extended to cover more and more people. About 25 million workers are presently covered in a program which was effectively started almost 10 years after social security. It was not until last year that the Congress effectively extended the tax treatment for corporate pension plans to self-employed and their employees. In a few years 50 million or 75 percent of the workers should be covered and the funds should be well over \$200 billion.

The social security system on the other hand, is a pay-as-you-go system which does not contemplate paying benefits out of the earnings of the trust fund. The social security trusts consist of only \$22 billion and is called a contingent fund—to protect the system against unanticipated contingencies such as serious recession. It barely equals the benefit paid out in 1 year, yet it covers over 65 million workers. If the social security system were funded in the same sense that corporate and other private pension plans are required to be funded by our tax and insurance laws, the fund would have to have \$350 billion in it.

In other words, instead of increasing the payroll tax by say \$200 a year—\$100 from the employee and \$100 from the employer by increasing the wage base on which the social security tax is paid from \$6,800 to \$7,800 and increasing the rate of tax, and if that same \$200 a year were paid into a funded pension plan, the benefits could be increased two to

three times the increase provided in the social security pay-as-you-go system.

The second reason which requires us to be cautious about increasing the social security system by having it compete for the same funds which finance private retirement plans is the economic limitations of the payroll tax, which is the method of financing not only social security but unemployment insurance and, in reality, workman's compensation. Many economists have argued that getting the social security tax above 10 percent of payroll endangers the basic system. It is certainly true that all taxes have a point of diminishing returns.

The third reason for increasing the retirement benefits for our people through the funded systems rather than through pay-as-you-go systems lies in the need of any society for capital to finance its economic growth and increased standard of living. The Western European countries, particularly the ones that have been acclaimed for paying higher social security benefits than does the U.S. social security system, constantly look with envious eyes to the great U.S. capital market, because they do not have the capital to finance their growth. Americans through their tripartite retirement systems have much greater retirement benefits per person than these same countries because Americans do rely heavily on funded retirement systems in addition to social security. In the process, Americans have created great savings which are available through the savings and loan institutions—\$150 billion—through the pension plans—\$90 billion—through the insurance companies—\$200 billion—and savings in banks—\$100 billion—to finance the expansion of industry and their own living standards. If a society does not finance a large part of the retirement of its people through savings, it creates serious difficulties for itself.

So when we allow a discrepancy to develop among the various tax treatments of retirement programs, as we have with regard to the Retirement Income Credit we discourage to that extent the use of private funded and other public retirement programs. This may have adverse effects on retirees, as well as cut back on the capital that otherwise would be available to finance the Nation's growth which provides the jobs and living standards of our people.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. BAUMAN

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as Bob Bauman leaves Capitol Hill after more than 15 years of service to House and Senate Republicans, I wish him well in his new career as a lawyer. Bob will be greatly missed in the Republican cloakroom, where he has rendered such able service.

I understand that in his early days on Capitol Hill Bob was a great admirer of the late Ohio Senator Robert A. Taft. As the son of a Taft Republican, I feel a special kinship with him. I hope the good Republican convictions formed in his early years will continue with him in his future endeavors.

A TIME OF TRIBUTE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover paying tribute to those who serve their fellow man as peace officers.

His comments, concerning Peace Officers Memorial Day and Police Week, were given to the 81st session of the FBI National Academy and appeared in the July 1968 Law Enforcement Bulletin.

Mr. Hoover's remarks, entitled "A Time of Tribute," I am sure will be of interest to Members of the Congress and the public:

A TIME OF TRIBUTE

GENTLEMEN: Almost 6 years have passed since the President of the United States signed a public law relating to our profession. That law authorizes and requests the President to issue annual proclamations designating May 15th of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day. It also authorizes the requests a Presidential proclamation each year designating the week in which May 15th occurs as Police Week.

The purpose of Peace Officers Memorial Day is apparent in the name. It is a time of tribute—an occasion on which, through ceremonies and activities, we remember those who, in the line of duty, have been disabled and those who, in Lincoln's words, have given "the last full measure of devotion."

A year ago, in speaking of those known to us and unknown, whose commitment was complete and whose sacrifice was total, I indicated my belief that your presence here—your advancement of our mutual profession through the process of training—is the type of testimonial, such men would most desire. This living memorial grows in strength and dignity with each forward step which assures that our law enforcement representatives today are better trained, better equipped, and better prepared than their predecessors.

It gives me great pleasure to advise that we will now be able to place something more substantial than a floral wreath at the feet of at least some of those who sacrifice themselves in behalf of the public safety.

On April 19, 1968, the President of these United States signed a bill authorizing the payment of compensation in behalf of local officers who are killed or disabled in the course of enforcing Federal law.

This initial step is an indication of increasing awareness on the part of the public that the life of the law enforcement officer is in constant and increasing peril. Bitter testimony to this danger is implicit in the fact that in the course of 1966, our comrades-in-arms who died at the hands of felons numbered 57, while the incomplete total of law enforcement officers murdered in 1967 has reached an all-time high of 74. This may rise still higher as all records from reporting agencies have not yet been received.

We pause in our labors on this spring day to honor the men of our profession who have made the ultimate sacrifice, as well as those who must face the future from a wheelchair or a hospital bed. We pledge that they shall not be forgotten and that their sacrifices shall not have been in vain. I thank you.

MEDICARE

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, medicare—a word still not found in most dictionaries—in 2 short years has become one of the most important words in our everyday language.

Certainly, it looms strong, bright, and full of promise in the lives of the nearly 20 million aged Americans enrolled under its broad health cost protective cover.

Certainly, the word medicare has real meaning for millions of younger Americans who have been relieved of the responsibility and concern over an aged parent without financial resources becoming bedridden for many months while the young person's college bills piled up—or, even worse, that they will have to drop out of college altogether.

On June 30, 1966, just 1 day before medicare became a part of the American way of life, only a little over one-half of Americans aged 65 or over had any type of hospital insurance. And, few among these had comprehensive coverage of hospital bills; even fewer had insurance covering any part of their surgical and out-of-hospital physicians' costs.

Now, under medicare, 19.7 million older Americans have hospital insurance which, after the first \$40, pays all costs—except for personal-convenience items—for the first 60 days and all but \$10 a day for the 61st through the 90th day in each spell of illness or benefit period. Statistically, I am happy to be able to report, the program experience has shown that a very small proportion of beneficiaries have to be hospitalized for anywhere near 60 days in any one illness. As a matter of fact, the average length of stay in a hospital has been slightly less than 14 days.

With hospital charges across the Nation averaging around \$50 per day, the impact of medicare on the financial resources of the aged has been of substantial proportions. To be precise, program statistics show the average reimbursement per hospital claim to be \$527.

When this figure of \$527 is applied to the 10.6 million medicare inpatient hospital admissions since July 1, 1966, what is happening health-cost-wise in the lives of older Americans becomes evident, and gives justification for pride to those of us who fought for passage of the medicare legislation.

But, the hospital insurance part of medicare is not all the story. All but about 1 million of the aged who have medicare hospital coverage are also signed up for supplemental medical insurance, which helps pay doctor bills regardless of where the service is ren-

dered—in the hospital, the physicians' office or the patient's home.

It has been reported to me that since inception of the program some 45 million medical bills—not including hospital insurance bills—most of them for doctor services, have been paid in the amount of more than \$2 billion.

That is quite a sizable amount, as is the \$6.3 billion that has been paid out under the hospital insurance part of medicare—but, 19.7 million people, the program beneficiaries, also is quite a sizable figure.

In this connection, I would remind my colleagues that as we observe the second anniversary of medicare, we should keep in mind that the program is a program for people and that the dollar figures we quote are just yardsticks to measure the length and breadth of the health services received by millions of aged Americans during the first 2 years the program has been in operation.

Medicare is a good word to have in the dictionary.

EQUAL-TIME PROVISIONS

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the June 24 New York Times dealing with suggestions for giving presidential candidates opportunities to present their views over television has come to my attention. The writer argues that they should have such opportunities before the party conventions. Section 315 of the Communications Act, now at issue in this session of Congress, deals only with "equal time" after the conventions. The editorial seems important enough to justify consideration by all Members interested in the campaigns now under way, and I include it in the RECORD:

PRESIDENTIAL TV DEBATES BEFORE THE CONVENTIONS

(By Herbert Mitgang)¹

About a century ago, in September of 1960, Richard M. Nixon and John F. Kennedy met in the first of a series of Presidential debates that showed the American people their personalities, styles and programs. This remarkable confrontation, seen each time by an estimated 65 million television viewers, took place after the nominating conventions.

It's a different political ball game—not to mention a different United States and world—less than eight years later. The state primaries have left no doubt that large numbers of Americans are outraged at the whole course of foreign and domestic policy. They will be even more outraged if the national conventions strip them of any real opportunity to force a change by their votes next November.

The real question now is: Shall the months of July and August up to each party's convention be filled only with paid political commercials and dead political air? Will prime evening time be devoted to the usual TV stuff or will the public get a chance to see the real contenders of both parties—Nixon

¹ Herbert Mitgang is a member of the editorial board of The Times.

vs. Rockefeller and Humphrey vs. McCarthy—debate before the conventions? Watchmen (and women), what of the night?

At this stage of the game, whom the convention delegates will vote for rather than whom the country will vote for is all-important. The delegates can be convinced by the pollsters, whose educated guess work is based on samplings of a few thousand "weighted" opinions that profess to speak for tens of millions of unclassifiable Americans.

They can be convinced by the regular politicians who can control the machinery so effectively that any effort to open the convention will be frustrated.

PRIME TIME DEBATES

Or, they can be convinced by a series of major prime time debates that it is their obligation to study the candidates in close-up, respond to the reaction of the national constituency, and do what the conventions do not always do—choose the best man for party and country.

The decision is up to the networks and the candidates, not Congress and the Federal Communications Commission. All three networks have expressed a willingness to provide free political time for debates between Labor Day and Election Day, as they did in 1960. Since they are always interested in underscoring the fact that they come within the First Amendment freedom despite F.C.C. licensing of stations, they might well be willing in the public interest to extend the offer for debates to include the period between Independence Day and convention time.

The Senate, by a voice vote on May 29, suspended the equal-time requirement (to be accurate, Section 315 of the Communications Act calls it "equal opportunities," which is more flexible), meaning that no-hope candidates like Harold Stassen would not have to be given free reply hours on the air. The Senate resolution was sent to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it now is. The committee chairman, Representative Staggers, holds the key to that lock.

Whether or not he turns it, this joint resolution to suspend in 1968 would not take effect until Aug. 31—after the candidates have been picked and too late to have any effect on the delegates. Ideally, the joint resolution necessary to defuse Section 315 would open the airwaves right after the Fourth of July.

But even if the ideal is too much to hope for, the three networks can proceed boldly on their own to exercise journalistic initiative and courage. A precedent was established before the California primary when Senators Kennedy and McCarthy appeared jointly on A.B.C.'s "Issues and Answers." Although it was not a full-fledged debate, it was an enlightening confrontation that could be amplified without breaching the present law.

For there are several exceptions allowed under Section 315 even if Congress does not suspend at all. Equal opportunities need not be given to minor candidates if the major candidates appear on "bona fide news interview" broadcasts. That is what occurred on "Issues and Answers." The other networks also have similar regularly scheduled "bona fide news interview" programs—C.B.S.'s "Face the Nation" and N.B.C.'s "Meet the Press."

LET THE CANDIDATES APPEAR

Between July 4 and the conventions, the three networks could invite Vice President Humphrey and Senator McCarthy to appear with each other and Mr. Nixon and Governor Rockefeller to appear with each other. The format could be worked out by the networks and the candidates, to include statements, cross talk, and the normal "bona fide" questioning by newsmen.

Governor Rockefeller and Senator McCarthy are willing to debate their rivals

on television. The front runners have only to say yes. If the word "debates" makes the networks queasy, call them "joint discussions." That was good enough for Lincoln and Douglas, before pancake make-up and inglorious living color, over a century ago.

MR. BUFORD BIBLE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a good teacher is one of the most respected persons in our society. He is appreciated by his students, their parents, his coteachers, and indeed the entire community. His reward lasts through generations as his influence is passed from parent to child.

I would like to point out one such teacher, Mr. Buford Bible, who is now in the process of closing his office as principal of East High School, Knoxville, Tenn. He has gone beyond his prescribed duty to help young people in securing a better educational foundation. He also instilled in his students a rare sense of duty, character, and determination.

One of the best tributes to Mr. Bible was a surprise "This Is Your Life" program staged by his senior class. I would like to include in the RECORD excerpts from that occasion:

On January 15, 1905, the silence of a home in Briar Thicket, Tennessee, was broken by the loud wails of a tiny baby boy. Although this birth might have seemed insignificant, the infant born there has since risen to many positions of influence and respect. He has achieved noted successes in the fields of teaching and athletics. All of us here today know and admire this man who has probably touched our lives in more ways than we know.

Because he plans to retire this year, we would like to take this opportunity to extend to him our deepest gratitude and perhaps better acquaint you with some of the people and events with which he has been associated—Buford Alexander Bible, This Is Your Life.

Thus, with these words the audience gave an enthusiastic standing ovation as the startled and shaken principal was escorted to the stage by Bob Richards, senior class president, and Stanley Pippin, senior class treasurer. Mr. Bible was seated on stage after Carol Beeler, senior class secretary, pinned a boutonniere on his lapel and congratulated him with a kiss.

When everyone was seated, Linda Powell began the story of Mr. Bible's early life. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. S. Bible, passed away some years ago, but his sister Chlorice now Mrs. S. H. Rankin; his sister Cecile, now Mrs. Rue Bettis; and his brother, Marshall Bible, South High School basketball coach, were present with amusing memories of their childhood. Jim Bible, Mr. Bible's nephew and a student at East High, represented his father, Homer Bible. Homer Bible and Lyman Bible, brothers of the honoree, were unable to be in Knoxville for the program.

Mr. Bible grew up in Jefferson City, Tenn., and graduated in 1927 from Carson-Newman College in the same city. He did graduate work at the University of North Carolina.

His wife is the former Reba Norman with whom he taught school at Lake City High School.

He received his master's degree from the University of Tennessee and continued his career in education in Knoxville schools in 1936. In 1942 Mr. Bible was commissioned in the Army Air Corps and served until 1946.

Returning to Knoxville High School, Mr. Bible had several successful basketball teams, and his 1950-51 team won still another State championship. In 1951 he went to the new East High School and while there coached the City All-Stars, earned a Distinguished Teacher Award for Mathematics and other honors, and became principal.

In addition to his duties as principal, Mr. Bible taught mathematics part time at the University of Tennessee and will continue on the university faculty now that his days are over at East.

MEDICARE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in January 1967, in a message to Congress, Lyndon Johnson said:

One of the tests of a great civilization is the compassion and respect shown to its elders.

Two years ago this Nation's compassion and respect for its elders was clearly illustrated. On that date, July 1, 1966, medicare began.

Today 19.7 million Americans 65 and over are eligible for help under medicare. Ninety-five percent of them have enrolled in the voluntary medical insurance part of medicare and can expect help in paying doctor bills in or out of the hospital.

Each month \$300 million in benefits is paid under the hospital insurance plan. An additional \$100 million is paid monthly under the medical insurance plan. These statistics clearly indicate that medicare is doing a great deal to reduce the financial threat of illness for the aged. Older Americans now have far more protection against hospital and medical costs than ever before—and this is as it should be.

As President Johnson has said:

America is a young nation. But each year a larger proportion of our population joins the ranks of the senior citizens.

We should look upon the growing number of older citizens not as a problem or a burden for our democracy but as an opportunity to enrich their lives and, through them, the lives of us all.

As we celebrate the second anniversary of medicare, we are really celebrating the enrichment of many lives: the elderly who are already served by medi-

care, those who will be served in the coming years, and the rest of us, whose lives are enriched daily as we watch our elders lead more productive lives.

EIGHTEEN: OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a long time now I have supported action to permit 18-year-olds to vote.

There has been considerable support for lowering the voting age and there are compelling arguments for action.

Now, President Johnson has asked Congress for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age in the United States to 18.

I hope that the new Presidential support will spark action—and promptly.

I recognize that the process for amending the Constitution is properly a slow one—all the more reason that now is none too soon to begin at the legislative level.

Following is the text of a supporting editorial from the June 29 edition of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News:

EIGHTEEN: OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE

Nearly 15 years ago, President Eisenhower asked Congress for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age in America to 18, but nothing came of it. Now President Johnson has formally renewed the request. The amendment he wants is 39 words of sweet simplicity: No citizen's right to vote may be denied or abridged on account of age if he is 18 or over.

We say, as we have for years, that it should be adopted. The reasons, in our view, are many and compelling; the objections have all been considered and rejected. The case is strong enough to stand extended analysis, but we suspect that it is weakened by trying to reduce it to oversimplified slogans like "old enough to be drafted is old enough to vote."

What is involved, in any case, is a fundamental requisite of citizenship that has increasingly been regarded in this country as a right belonging to all and not, as originally, a privilege for those expected to exercise it wisely. The whole trend of our history has been toward universalizing the franchise by eliminating or reducing restrictions based first on property, then on race, then on sex, then on literacy and now, hopefully, on age.

In making his case for the amendment, the President argues that "the age of 18, far more than the age of 21, has been and is the age of maturity in America—and never more than now." We're not so sure that he could prove that, for there are many tests of legal maturity that still apply in many states, not least New York, at 21. But we would share his conviction that the voting right is basic enough so that it should apply at the youngest rather than the oldest point on the maturity yardstick.

But should we go to a nationally uniform voting age of 18 before the vast majority of our states have been willing to do so in their own voting laws? If it's right, we say why not. But there is a practical problem: For an amendment to be adopted, it will need a two-thirds vote in each house of Congress followed by ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures. Will the 47 states that still maintain a 21-year voting age at home ratify an amendment lowering it to 18 nationally? Perhaps not. But we'd like to see

Congress at least start the ball rolling, for at least it will do no harm to confront every state with the issue as directly as possible, and let it be debated and decided on its merits.

Meanwhile, there is nothing to prevent any state from acting on its own to make 18 the voting age and we herewith renew our plea that New York be among the first to do so.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE SUPREME COURT

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in removing the Supreme Court Justices from political actions has been proven a number of times throughout our history. However, criticism of the High Court and its actions continues from time to time. Part of the criticism is unwarranted, part justified.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who feels that it would be a mistake to subject the Justices of the Supreme Court to any form of political review or review by a politically elected body. I am thoroughly convinced of the wisdom exercised by our Founding Fathers in not making the Justices subject to such review.

However, Mr. Speaker, the realm of politics may still be injected through the appointment process in that there is no requirement for prior judicial experience or even that a person be a lawyer to be so appointed.

At my request, Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress researched the question of requiring of certain qualifications for judgeships in our State courts and I think that it is interesting to note that a large number of our State courts have found it desirable to include an article in their State constitutions setting forth certain minimum requirements in the practice of law before one is eligible for appointment even to one of the lower trial courts.

Mr. Speaker, the office of Chief Justice is of course the most important office held by any of the Justices and here again we have in the past seen appointments made to this high office wherein the person appointed has not only not had prior judicial experience but no prior experience as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Ours is a young country, yet we recognize the wisdom that can only be obtained by age, however, Mr. Speaker, I feel that there are certain age limits within which the members of the Court should fall. Particularly is this true with regard to retirement age and after reviewing objective evidence, it is my considered opinion that age 75 should be the limit upon which retirement would be mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a constitutional amendment which proposes that prior to appointment, the persons so appointed must have prior judicial experience. It further provides

that the Chief Justice must be selected from one of the Justices who has prior experience on the Supreme Court and further provides that all Justices must retire at the age of 75 if they have not sooner retired.

SEARCH YOUR CONSCIENCE?

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the June 27 edition of the Wayne County News, Waynesboro, Miss., on riots and crime. Editor W. Harvey Hurt is noted for his strong convictions and for his ability to give clear expression to them.

We share his conclusion that we need not more laws but enforcement of those already on the books.

The editorial follows:

SEARCH YOUR CONSCIENCE?

We are getting a little bored with leaders such as our President who recently appeared on TV asking the American public to search its soul as to why we are having assassinations, riots, sit-ins, college turmoil, draft card burnings, and such.

The public, generally speaking, has been protesting to its Congress and President for years that what was being done in Washington by the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the government would lead to a breakdown of law and order as well as economic chaos . . . and the public still protests. But to no avail, for the ears of government only listen to what they want to hear.

Soul searching by the American public will not stop assassinations. Passing gun-control laws will not do any good. It isn't hard for a man to find a gun to kill another with, no matter what laws are passed. And adding more Secret Service men to the protection of high officials will not prevent these assassinations. Any man, willing to sacrifice his own life, can kill a President.

And don't misunderstand us. We are not being sacrilegious with reference to the terms soul-searching and conscience. We only mean that there are people in this nation whose souls belong to the devil and who have no conscience. Soul-searching by Christian people has little effect on these perverted humans.

As to riots, everyone knows they can be stopped . . . but not by legislation and honeyed TV commentators. Armed troops can easily stop law-defying mobs. The first time that a law-defying mob is dealt with firmly and with bloodshed if necessary, it will definitely stop the murders, burnings, and lootings in cities all over the nation. Convictions and sentences without parole also deter lawbreakers.

Those who advocate civil disorder know full well that if and when the government comes to its senses, arms the police and national guard with "loaded" guns and gives instructions to stop uncontrolled mobs by using any force necessary, these civil disorders can be stopped. If the government wants to, it can do it.

There is no place in our society for mobs to burn, pillage, kill, loot and maim citizens. And both white and colored people want to be protected from such insane demonstrations. Please, Mr. President, no more laws and no more speeches. Just enforce those laws we already have.

LEE LOEVINGER WILL BE MISSED AT FCC

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, a distinguished and diligent member of the Federal Communications Commission stepped out of public life to return to the private practice of law. I speak of Judge Lee Loevinger, a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division.

Judge Loevinger has compiled an outstanding record as a public official. His comprehension of the structure of our bureaucracy is unique. Undoubtedly, he shares some of the frustrations that many of us in Congress experience from day to day in dealing with the executive branch of Government.

Recently, Commissioner Loevinger came to my assistance in a matter involving a constituent and the Federal Communications Commission. I found him to be an extremely understanding and considerate public official. I think all of us should be grateful for his contribution to the Federal Government over the last 7½ years.

A scholarly defender of constitutional rights, Judge Loevinger will be greatly missed by those of us who are concerned about the quality and the viability of the broadcasting industry.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Post, TV critic Laurence Laurent comments on Judge Loevinger's departure. I include this article in the RECORD so that our colleagues may read an objective appraisal of Judge Loevinger's work as a member of the FCC:

LEE LOEVINGER WILL BE MISSED AT FCC

(By Laurence Laurent)

Lee Loevinger is going to be missed at the Federal Communications Commission. He's going to be missed for wildly different reasons by his admirers and his detractors.

His short, five-year term ran out last Sunday. He'd been appointed to fill the unexpired term of Newton N. Minow and rarely has a successor been so different from the man he replaced.

Sen. Norris Cotton (R., N.H.) spotted this difference right after Loevinger had been chosen to move from the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department to the FCC. At Loevinger's confirmation hearing before the Senate Commerce Committee, Cotton remarked: "I almost feel you are the antithesis of your predecessor."

Loevinger's response was a promise, ". . . If I'm going to err, I'd rather err on the side of restraint." He added his belief in "diversity" and "multiplicity of program sources" as the best cure for any ills of broadcasting.

Loevinger proved to be the most prolific scholar in the FCC's history. One of his papers argued against any regulation of religion broadcasting. He said this violates the First Amendment to the Constitution and he supported his argument with 108 footnotes.

Last month, when he received the "Outstanding Achievement Award" from his alma mater, the University of Minnesota, Loevinger addressed himself to mankind's search for utopia. He took in such authors as Plato, Sir Thomas More, Francis Bacon, Johann

V. Andrae, James Harrington, Samuel Butler and Edward Bellamy. He even included Aldous Huxley and George Orwell, explaining these envisioned a "contra-utopia" or a "dystopia."

His review convinced him that "virtually all utopian visions involve more, rather than less, government control than we are accustomed to."

His final speech before leaving the FCC was on "The Sociology of Bureaucracy."

He said: "It seems to me that at this point in our social development bureaucracy is the problem, not the answer." He compared bureaucracy to "a passionless mob which can capture and conquer man unless he is wise enough to subdue it and shape it to his own purposes."

Broadcasters, who usually admired Loevinger for his consistent voting with the conservative members of the seven-man FCC, were frequently mystified by his lack of love for their product. He preferred reading to listening to the radio. He preferred radio to looking at TV shows.

When questioned about excessive crime, shooting and sex on television, Loevinger had a quick answer: "My own private solution is just not to watch the darn things."

And broadcasters are still puzzling over Loevinger's remark that television is "the literature of the illiterate." He added that radio is "the opiate of the middle class." Few could decide whether he was praising or condemning them.

In one paper, he went through the major theories about communications and came up with his own. He called his the "Reflective-Projective Theory" and declared that mass media's most important role is "promoting national unity, social cohesion and a larger concept of community."

Lee Loevinger loves an argument and he doesn't lose many. At the University of Minnesota, he was captain of the varsity debate team and winner of the Forensic Medal.

At the FCC he found a worthy opponent in Commissioner Kenneth A. Cox, who—like Loevinger—is a former law school professor. Their clashes were so frequent that Commissioner Robert E. Lee announced at one FCC meeting that his physician had given him a prescription for "two tranquilizers—one for Loevinger and one for Cox."

Loevinger leaves government at age 55 to take up private law practice in Washington. He declared: "Business is where much of the action is and offers the possibility for great social progress, as it has been largely responsible for bringing us to our present state of technological and economic advance."

He takes from the FCC the "golden rule" that he brought with him: "Do not seek for yourself power you would deny to others."

AUTO-CAID FOR NONAFFLUENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, rather than repair the unsafe auto's for the poor, why not tax the workers and give each of the poor a Cadillac at production cost—no profit.

I ask that a Daily News account of the plan of the Transportation Department follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 2, 1968]

FREE AUTO REPAIR FOR POOR IS EYED

The Transportation Department, in a lengthy report, announced yesterday it plans to study free auto repair and free public transportation service for poor people forced to drive aging, unsafe cars to hold a job.

The Department pointed out that many unsafe and aging cars are owned by low-income wage earners.

The Department would offset this situation by giving the poor wage earner a choice between private and public transportation in getting to work. One of the points to be weighed is free auto repair for the low salary earner.

SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN AID

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, Members of Congress are asked to explain why this Government maintains its foreign aid program. Our colleague, Mr. WILLIAM ANDERSON, of Tennessee, has been kind enough to let fellow Members see letters he has written on that subject to people who live in his district. He puts the case so well that I include in the RECORD copies of two of Mr. ANDERSON's letters on the subject. They follow:

(NOTE.—Letter to a constituent who supports Foreign A.I.D. and who has asked the Congressman for his reasons for voting for the A.I.D. Program.)

DEAR ———: I am in receipt of your recent letter requesting explanatory materials on the United States foreign aid program. I am deeply appreciative both of your effort to bring light to this area where misinformation is so prevalent, and of your difficulty in doing so in the face of general antipathy. I am happy to respond with several items which I believe you will find useful being sent under separate cover.

I fear that for a decade and more appeals to the altruism and the generous nature of the American people have been over-stressed in attempts to gain the requisite support for the foreign aid program; the all too rational and legitimately self-interested basis of the program has been under-stressed for reasons of diplomacy (among others).

In fact, the foreign aid program is an integral part of American international strategic practice. Stated in the broadest terms, a useful concept in understanding the A.I.D. program is as follows: The United States is a "satisfied power"; we prosper with ample natural resources; we trade profitably in every quarter of the globe and are everywhere influential; in short, we desire to avoid major upheavals that would substantially change the structure of world power. We know, however, that in a world in which two-thirds live in underdeveloped nations and over one-half live in malnutrition, there must be rapid *evolutionary* progress if waves of revolutionary, totalitarian fanaticism and desperate, military wealth-grabbing are to be avoided. We know also that there are "unsatisfied powers" who would welcome and stimulate what has been called a "revolutionary fire-storm to sweep the countryside of the world and isolate its cities." Thus, we go about applying United States aid to stimulate that progress, diffuse revolutionary fervor, render totalitarian economic organization unnecessary, and to maintain substantial influence in the three underdeveloped continents.

The goal then is growing world political stability sought by means of underwriting reasonable rates of economic and social progress. Certainly this is not foolish or reprehensible, but neither is it really a matter of disinterested altruism. We are not through A.I.D. seeking gratitude, good will, and good conscience so much as we are seeking a world in which the United States may continue to prosper in security and strength.

One is tempted to observe here that we are, perhaps, bargain-hunting. On an average we spend about \$3 billion yearly on A.I.D. out of a gross national output of \$830 billion (less than one-half of one percent). Certain other nations, including France, spend more on foreign aid *per taxpayer* than the United States. And it is worth noting that where our efforts at stabilization fail and violent totalitarian revolutionaries capture substantial support as in South Vietnam, we may spend over \$25 billion yearly on war, not to mention the cost in lives and human suffering. The A.I.D. program shares many of the difficulties of any effort in preventative medicine; when it succeeds, nothing dramatic happens and very probably dreadful occurrences drift into the speculative realm of history's "might have beens."

Our expenditures in the A.I.D. program are largely "tied" to United States purchases. That is to say that the United States grants foreign credits, for example, to buy 50 tractors from American firms. The tractors are delivered abroad, the United States Government pays the U.S. manufacturer who pays his employees, etc. This money does not leave the nation, and our own economy is stimulated in the transaction. There is further information on this spending pattern in Chapter VI of A.I.D. Program Presentation which I am sending to you. Another item outlines the Tennessee share of A.I.D.-financed business.

None of the foregoing is meant to excuse blunders that have been made in the program; no one had ever attempted a program of this sort before and we had to make our own mistakes in the learning process. And none of the foregoing is intended to denigrate the splendid and spontaneous warmth of the American people who have poured roughly \$120 billion (loans and grants) worth of medicines, machinery, food, items for the common defense, fertilizers, books, training and clothing into needy nations since 1945. This is indeed an unprecedented sustained performance. But it has not been a "giveaway program," and in the crucial realm of international relations, it is pretty clearly not a matter of disinterested charity.

I hope the selected items and these comments will be of use to you in your excellent work. Please call on me again whenever you feel I might be of service.

With kindest regards and very best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM R. ANDERSON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., June 1968.

(NOTE.—Letter to a constituent who opposed foreign aid and who has asked the Congressman for his reasons for voting for the A.I.D. program.)

DEAR ———: Thank you for your recent message concerning the A.I.D. program and its 1969 funding authorization bill, which will soon come before the House.

I appreciate your thought and effort in giving me a forthright statement of your position and I feel that it would be less than a fair exchange if I failed to respond in kind.

I do not intend to oppose the entire Foreign Aid Bill because parts of that program save us both lives and money in the long run. Our aid to Thailand, and South Korea, for example, has brought us very substantial military support from those countries in the Vietnamese war (Korea has sent 50,000 excellent troops). Our past aid to Nationalist China has enabled the world—including the Chinese Communists—to see how much more prosperously non-communist systems in the western maritime world can fare. Because of this latter aid, the Communist Chinese leaders have not been able to complete their victory over all China—there remains an alternative Government of Chinese, strong and prosperous, though small, forever reminding the mainlanders that there is another

road. We were recently able to terminate that economic aid program because it is no longer needed. So I will continue to support some elements of the Foreign Aid Bill while opposing sections that appear wasteful and even counter-productive. As you know, last year's Foreign Aid Bill was cut to its lowest total in more than a decade. This year's appropriation should be cut even more.

Contrary to a great deal of political rhetoric that one hears, the A.I.D. Program is not really a matter of disinterested charity. The all too rational and legitimately self-interested basis of the program has been understressed for reasons of diplomacy (among others). In fact, the foreign aid program is an integral part of American international strategic practice. Very frankly, we exercise substantial and sometimes crucial influence in every populated continent through the combination of coordinated aid, trade, and alliance policy operations.

It is unsatisfying, but nonetheless worthwhile, to note that where A.I.D. is effective no headlines appear and nothing visibly dramatic happens. Where the cabinet or legislature of a developing nation is influenced in a policy decision (on, say birth control measures, the scope of private enterprise regulation, international initiatives, U.S. bases, etc.) by A.I.D. operations and considerations neither they nor we publicize the fact. Where we are successful in stimulating solid rates of economic progress (Iran, Chile, Peru, Turkey, South Korea, Colombia, Nationalist China, etc.) revolutionary rage gradually dissolves, people eat more and go to school longer, stable institutions begin to evolve—in short, nothing news worthy occurs.

Often there is a misunderstanding where this money is spent. Our expenditures in the A.I.D. program are largely "titled" to United States purchases. That is to say that the United States grants foreign credits, for example, to buy 50 tractors for American firms. The tractors are delivered abroad, the United States Government pays the U.S. manufacturer who pays his employees, etc. This money does not leave the nation, and our own economy absorbs the transaction. The Tennessee share of this business in Fiscal Year 1967 was, for example, \$6,900,000.

None of the foregoing is meant to excuse blunders that have been made in the program, and some of them have been little short of ridiculous. The program bears constant critical examination: incompetent officials and ineffective programs must be terminated in regular re-evaluations. Certainly the deferrable A.I.D. programs must be set aside in times of U.S. economic squeeze such as the present. But it strikes me that to cancel the A.I.D. Program altogether would be to relinquish leverage and bargaining power in several important sectors of the globe, and hand our Communist adversaries a golden opportunity, occurrences for which the cost can be astronomical in subsequent defense budgets.

Please continue to let me know your views and reasoning on matters of national legislation, and do not hesitate to let me know whenever you feel that I might be of service.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM R. ANDERSON.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG,
MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. SHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 163d day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

MASS STARVATION IN BIAFRA

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, no one who is concerned for the condition of men in the world today can pass by the accounts of mass starvation in Biafra. The recent civil warfare between the Nigerian Government and the Biafrans has brought the likelihood of starvation to the doorstep of 2 or 3 million people.

Our Nation has of late found it necessary to involve itself in many parts of the world on the justification that misery and wrongdoing must be prevented. Nowhere, I judge from the articles shown below, has misery reached so deep in the world today as it has in Biafra.

So far, it would appear that the woefully small efforts to help are in the hands of private persons, and do not represent in any case a national or international commitment.

I am today asking the State Department of the United States to concern itself with this hideous situation. I am asking them to take up the matter in the United Nations.

In order to give you a better idea about the problem in Biafra, I submit below two news items that appeared together in the June 30, 1968, issue of the *New York Times*, as follows:

BLOCKADED BIAFRA FACING STARVATION

EMEKUKU, BIAFRA, June 27.—Hundreds of thousands of Biafrans face death from starvation in the next several months. Some independent authorities expect the toll to reach more than a million unless emergency food shipments soon reach the area, the secessionist former Eastern Region of Nigeria.

Leslie Kirkley, director of the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief, or Oxfam, a well-known nongovernmental and nonsectarian British relief organization, assessed the situation this way:

"Unless we pull out all the stops in Britain and other countries, we will have a terrifying disaster in Biafra before the end of August. By then, two million may have died."

Mr. Kirkley's organization spends about \$3.25-million (\$7.8 million) a year in relief efforts in 84 countries.

His conclusion was confirmed by physicians, priests and nursing sisters interviewed during a week's tour of refugee camps and villages in Biafra.

Mr. Kirkley, who is on an inspection visit, estimated that the current death toll from malnutrition was 200 a day. There was an especially urgent need, he said, for protein-rich food for children under five and for pregnant and nursing mothers.

Blockaded by sea and surrounded by federal Nigerian forces on land, Biafra's only link to the outside world is a tenuous airlift to nearby Spanish and Portuguese islands in the Gulf of Guinea.

WAR STARTED IN JULY

The former Eastern Region, which has a population of nearly 13 million, seceded in May 1967 and declared itself an autonomous republic. On July 7, federal Nigerian troops invaded Biafra and civil war broke out.

The secession was preceded by a massacre of 30,000 Ibos, the dominant tribal group in the East, in September 1966. Odumegwu Ojukwu, the Eastern leader, has asserted that "sovereignty in the absolute" was essential to protect the region from a bloodbath. The Biafrans have fared poorly in the war,

and have lost Enugu, the capital, and other major cities, to the federal forces.

"I fear that between two million and three million people are going to die," Sister Mary Lorcan of the Holy Rosary Sisters said at Emekuku Hospital, near Owerri in western Biafra. "Even if the war stopped tomorrow hundreds of thousands are condemned to death now. I go out to the Odube camps every fortnight to look for severe malnutrition cases among the children. Last week there were 700 to 800 cases." The Odube refugee camps have about 2,500 people.

SISTERS RUN HOSPITAL

At the hospital, which is run by the sisters, Dr. Alfred Ikeme, a 36-year-old Biafran physician trained at Edinburgh and London stated: "I see 60 to 80 women a day, and one out of three of them has severe protein malnutrition."

The Biafran pediatrician at Emekuku is Dr. Aaron Ifekwunigwe, 32. He explained that the medical term for the condition is "protein-calorie malnutrition." It is known in Africa as "kwashiorkor," a Ghanaian word meaning, "red man" or "deprived one." The term refers to the reddish-yellow hair color that is a prominent symptom of the disease.

Dr. Ifekwunigwe led an inspection tour around the children's wards. All the children had yellowish, almost golden hair, scaling skin, body sores, swollen ankles and legs, diarrhea, lack of appetite and an apathetic lethargic look.

Dr. Ifekwunigwe said: "When the child's body gets swollen and the child won't eat and has diarrhea, it is almost an irreversible cycle. The only proper help is protein, nothing else."

TEN CHILDREN DIE IN 2 WEEKS

"In one compound nearby, we've lost 10 out of 30 children in the past two weeks," said the Rev. Frederick Fullen, an Irish priest at Azaraegbelu. "All of the joy has gone out of life. In the old days, you used to drive with the right hand and wave with the left. Now, the children don't even have the energy to wave."

Of the priests and nuns at Emekuku, half are Biafran and half are Irish from the Holy Ghost congregation and the Holy Rosary sisters. There are at least half a million refugees living in camps in Biafra, about half of them Ibo and half minority tribes from areas now in federal hands.

The priests and sisters say of the village compounds near their parishes that the villages are as badly off as the camps, or worse.

At the Odube camps, at Izombe where there are thousands of Calabar and Ibibio people, at Umuagwu with Ogoni people around Origwe where tens of thousands of refugees who were at Awgu gathered after a Nigerian advance, at Imerienwe, Ogebeke and Nbutu-Ngwa—all in western Biafra—the situation is the same.

About half of the children under 12 seen in the tour appeared to have the signs of kwashiorkor. The same proportion is seen among old people and mothers nursing babies.

At Owerri, reports from the parish priests are sent to the Rev. Patrick Devine, 36, of the Holy Ghost congregation, a large man with a sharp nose and a shy smile. He has worked out with the International Red Cross representative in Biafra, Henry Jaggi, the minimum daily amount of protein food that would have to be brought into Biafra to avert the crisis.

"We need 200 tons of protein food per day as a minimum and 300 to 400 tons per day would probably be more accurate," Father Devine said. "The planes in the Biafran airlift can only handle 10 tons each. Port Harcourt must be opened to ships right away, either by a breaking of the blockade of by a ceasefire."

"The death rate is an upward sloping curve," said Mr. Jaggi. "In a month there will be more than a million dead here, before the end of August, two million are likely to die.

and either we sit still and watch six million people go down the drain within six months or we pressure for a cease-fire."

A cease-fire was also stressed by Dr. Herman Middlekoop, a specialist in rural health who was appointed in March to supervise the help coming in from the World Council of Churches.

"Our present goal, 40 tons a day, will only postpone the death of a few people," he said. "It is like giving a drip feed to a person with a stroke. The catastrophe cannot be averted without a complete cease-fire within a month, opening up all transportation into and within Biafra. The figure of several million people likely to be dead by the end of August is quite correct, and that six million people will die in the next six months without a cease-fire and massive help, I have no doubt."

UNICEF EFFORTS THWARTED

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., June 29.—A spokesman for the United Nations Children's Fund said this week that it had been trying "desperately" to reach the victims of the Biafran-Nigerian war and that supplies were "in position and available."

He added that both UNICEF and the International Red Cross had been trying repeatedly to bring the condition to the attention of the Nigerian Government without success and that their representatives had not been able to obtain permission to reach the victims.

VIETNAM NEGOTIATIONS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

JUNE 27, 1968.

The Editor,

The New York Times.

To THE EDITOR: I am hopeful that this will not be regarded as the shrill cry of a hawk since I am as desirous of ending the war in Vietnam as anyone.

However, I am disturbed by Senator McCarthy's statement that he will speak to Hanoi's representatives in Paris when he visits there shortly.

Though I value our right of dissent as one of the basic rights of our democratic society, I do, as an individual, question the propriety of such an action by Senator McCarthy, even though I am sure his motives are unquestionably sincere. It seems evident to me that there exists a wide gulf between expressing dissent within the framework of our own society and seeking out a meeting with representatives of Hanoi whom we are opposing in the field.

Surely Senator McCarthy should realize that this nation has formal representatives in Paris working toward bringing this unfortunate war to a conclusion honorable to all concerned. From all news media reports, Hanoi's representatives seem quite capable of handling any negotiations.

It must seem to millions of Americans that the Senator is embarked on a course that could be inimicable and possibly dangerous to the efforts now going on in Paris. A single, unguarded statement or overzealous remark in the "informal" discussions he proposes could upset the most careful efforts now being made to reach an agreement acceptable to both sides.

As one with a fairly comprehensive knowledge of American history, I cannot recall another such plan seriously made by a legislator or citizen.

A simple extension to what Senator McCarthy proposes to do could open the door to a whole flood of meetings by other members of the Congress and presumably even to private citizens who might claim the same privileges as those of members of the Congress, acting on their own.

I sincerely hope that Senator McCarthy will reconsider this proposed step, the advantages of which will seem dubious, to say the least, to so many of our citizens.

EUGENE P. CONNOLLY.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO COMMENDS LOUIS P. FARINA FOR OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress an outstanding public service rendered by my good friend of many years, Mr. Louis P. Farina, deputy commissioner, Bureau of Parking, Chicago Department of Streets and Sanitation.

Mr. Farina, as chairman of the Special Task Force Committee on Flip Top Rings of the International Municipal Parking Congress, has succeeded in finding a solution to the alarming problem of beverage can ring tab top usage in parking meters and other receptacles designed for operation by lawful coins.

The unlawful use of ring tab tops has recently reached unprecedented rates and caused millions of dollars of damage in jammed meter mechanisms and lost public revenues, not only in the United States, but in Canada and other countries as well.

The special task force committee headed by Mr. Farina held meetings in secret session so as not to alarm the public. Treasury Department representatives, major can companies, major parking meter companies, and officials representing local cities and municipalities participated in this all-out effort to solve the serious ring tab top problem.

As a result, major can companies have pledged to change the form and shape of the ring tab tops; the major meter companies have agreed to correct slot sizes to more nearly conform with lawful coinage; and desensitized mechanisms designed to reject all ring tab tops and foreign objects are being installed.

I want to congratulate Louis Farina for the initiative he has taken, for the fine leadership he has provided for the task force committee, and for the major contribution he has made to solving this vexatious problem.

It is dedicated public servants like Mr. Farina who insure that the needs and wants of the American people are met and that their best interests are always protected.

Mr. Farina, who is 44 years old, has spent the better part of his lifetime serving the people. He attended De Paul University and John Marshall Law School in Chicago, and subsequently served as a special investigator for the Illinois De-

partment of Revenue during the administration of Gov. Adlai Stevenson. Additionally, Mr. Farina has served as city field director of Mayor Daley's Citizens Committee for a Cleaner Chicago. He has been associated with many civic and fraternal organizations, is past commander of the American Legion Advertising Men's Post No. 38 of Illinois, and is present commander of the Disabled American War Veterans Business and Professional Men's Chapter.

Commissioner Farina was recently awarded the Star of Solidarity and appointed cavaliere by the Republic of Italy for his interest in Italo-American affairs. He was also made a Knight of Malta by former King Peter of Yugoslavia and Knight of the Templar by Franz Joseph of Austria for his civic contributions to local, national, and international affairs.

During World War II, he served as a medic in the Armed Forces of the United States, and received the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and three major battle stars.

Presently, as deputy commissioner of Parking, Lou Farina oversees the operation of 76 municipally owned parking facilities, the parking enforcement patrol of the bureau of parking meter maids, and the 35,000 off-street parking meter plant.

I am proud of Mr. Farina's contribution as chairman of the special task force committee, and I congratulate him and all of his committee members for their distinguished public service. It is particularly commendable that many, many citizens from the United States have served on this committee, including the following from Illinois:

Mr. James V. Fitzpatrick, commissioner, Department of Streets and Sanitation, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. James J. McDonough, first deputy commissioner, Department of Streets and Sanitation, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Michael Robinson, deputy commissioner, Department of Streets and Sanitation, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Lilburn Boggs, U.S. Secret Service, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. William R. McConochie, De Leuw Cather & Co., 165 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. C. H. Grube, treasurer, Chicago Transit Authority, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Ralph Johnson, 113 North Euclid Avenue, Oak Park, Ill.

Mr. Gerald B. Morrow, city treasurer, Aurora, Ill.

Mr. Edwin F. Whiteside, traffic engineer aide and housing inspector, Village Hall, Wilmette, Ill.

Mr. H. A. Guthrie, city clerk, City Hall, Waukegan, Ill.

Mr. Dean A. Porter, finance director, City Hall, Evanston, Ill.

Mr. Francis Whitcomb, City Hall, Elgin, Ill.

For his outstanding contribution to solving the ring-tab-top problem, Lou Farina received a letter of commendation from the Director of the U.S. Secret Service, Mr. James J. Rowley. This letter, as well as a press release issued by the International Municipal Parking Congress, follow:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
U.S. SECRET SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1968.

Mr. LOUIS P. FARINA,
Deputy Commissioner, Department of Streets
and Sanitation, Bureau of Parking,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. FARINA: Reference is made to your letter dated June 3, 1968, advising me that the major can companies have altered the shape of the ring tab tops used on beverage cans to prohibit their further use in parking meters and other receptacles designed to be operated by lawful coins.

In that connection, I wish to commend you for the excellent job you have done in bringing all the interested parties together and instituting action which will help to solve the problem of insertion of these rings into parking meters and other coin operated receptacles. Your action and that of the business interest concerned is a fine example of mutual cooperation between business and local government in searching for a solution to a problem of vital concern to all municipalities throughout the country that rely on revenues obtained by the use of parking meters.

Without the initiative taken by you and the IMPC's Special Task Force Committee in bringing the interested parties together, the resolution of this problem would have been extremely difficult. I extend to you and members of your organization the commendation and congratulations of the Secret Service for resolving this very vexatious problem. The Secret Service continues to be interested in this matter and is anxious to cooperate with you and your organization in any way possible.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. ROWLEY.

PRESS RELEASE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MUNICIPAL PARKING CONGRESS WORKSHOP, TORONTO, CANADA, JUNE 15 TO JUNE 20, 1968

President Harry Orr of the International Municipal Parking Congress, in a meeting in Toronto, Canada, issued to the membership June 19, a final report from the Special Task Force Committee on flip top riags.

This committee was organized in the summer of 1966 after a report by the members of the Executive Committee on the alarming increase in the usage of flip top ring tabs in parking meters throughout the United States and Canada as well as other parts of the world. A new innovation in ring tabs, while a boom to the major can companies, was an acute hazard not only to the Municipal parking meter industry but to other related agencies threatened with the use of foreign coins or objects which are not legal U.S. currency.

This committee conducted meetings in several major cities throughout the United States under the Chairmanship of Louis P. Farina, Deputy Commissioner of Streets and Sanitation and Director of Chicago's Municipal Parking Program. Co-chairman of the Committee was Merritt A. Neale, Director of the Pittsburgh Parking Authority.

The purpose and objective of this committee was to have private discussions with major can companies, major parking meter companies, and representatives of the U.S. Treasury Department, who are responsible for the enforcement of the law covering use of objects in lieu of U.S. currency. Meetings were held in secret session so as not to alarm the public and cause further usage of these ring tabs in parking meters.

Director James J. Rowley of the Secret Service Division of the U.S. Treasury Department commended Mr. Louis P. Farina, chairman of this Special Task Force Committee, and the International Municipal Parking Congress membership on the cooper-

ative venture of all concerned in helping to solve this most acute problem.

This committee, after discussion and investigation of this problem, conducted tests and inquiries throughout the United States, and this cooperative spirit of the International Municipal Parking Congress helped to solve this problem which was causing the industry a potential loss of \$25-million a year. The most important results attained were:

1. A pledge was given by the representatives of the major can companies to change the form and shape of the tab to the extent that it would not hamper its production and usefulness in the industry but would solve the problem of their being used in meters. Ring tabs are to be of such design as will not allow them to enter a meter to give free time.

Although the use of the flip top rings did not always permit free time, the most significant damage being the jamming of the meter mechanism which caused extensive expense for repair and replacement. The major can companies have stated that the change of their dies and the adding of more material to compensate for the change-over is causing approximate expenditure of \$15-million over a period of several years. Some of the major can companies who participated and have agreed to this new arrangement are: American Can Company, Continental Can Company, Crown Cork and Seal Co., National Can Co., Reynolds Aluminum Co.

Others are being encouraged to follow the same line so as to conform to this change-over. This change-over was pledged in a spirit of cooperation and public relations and solely on a moral issue. Chairman Louis P. Farina commends the efforts of the major can companies and extends to them congratulations on this spirit in helping to alleviate this serious problem which confronted all municipalities throughout the world. For without their uniting efforts, expense and cooperation, this problem would not have been solved.

2. The major meter companies have agreed to correct their slot sizes so as to more nearly conform to the U.S. currency as well as to the currency which affects other machines and usage of meters. The slot openings as well as new mechanisms developed by the major meter companies will help also to alleviate not only the problem of ring tabs but other foreign objects. The membership of the International Municipal Parking Congress was encouraged to reevaluate their meter plants for this purpose.

Two of the major meter and maintenance companies have invented desensitized mechanisms which now will reject all ring tabs and foreign objects used in lieu of U.S. currency in giving time. These mechanisms are now being installed in some of the major cities in the United States. Chicago is one of the cities. Desensitized units are installed and made part of the present existing meters. However, this jamming of parking meters until the new tabs are manufactured and distributed is still of concern.

These meter companies also contributed to the effort to solve the problem, and they too were commended by President Harry Orr and Chairman Louis P. Farina. The results of these new innovations are presently being shown on the convention floor for the International Municipal Parking Congress membership so they may avail themselves of these preventative measures.

3. Many municipalities as a result of their problems, now have stricter enforcement of the law and stiffer penalties for use of foreign coins in meters. This law has been brought to the attention of the public and citizens have been asked for their cooperation. The Federal Government, U.S. Treasury Department, informs us that the following law now in effect will be used in the prosecution of all offenders.

USE OF SLUGS

"Section 491, Title 18, United States Code make the use of slugs or foreign coins in this machine a Federal offense punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment of not more than one year, or both. Local municipal laws are now being evaluated to help enforce stiffer penalties."

In conclusion, the entire membership of the International Municipal Parking Congress is indebted for this breakthrough, and we along with Mr. James J. Rowley, Director of the U.S. Treasury Department commend the efforts of this Special Task Force Committee of the International Municipal Parking Congress and its member cities who participated in the discussions and tests have led to the basic solution of this problem.

Listed below are the members of this most important committee:

Mr. Merritt A. Neale, Co-chairman of Committee, Public Parking Authority, 200 Ross St., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219.

Mr. Arthur Lomax, Deputy Director, Department of Traffic, 620 Lister Building, Hamilton, Ont., Canada.

Mr. C. E. Ward, Metropolitan Traffic & Parking Committee, 802 Second Avenue S, Nashville 10, Tennessee.

Mr. Francis May, Traffic Engineer, City of Fort Lauderdale, P.O. Box 1181, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Mr. Theodore G. Lorenzen, City Treasurer, Davenport, Iowa.

Mr. Harry F. Orr, President of International, Municipal Parking Congress, Director of Parking, 100 West Madison St., Tampa, Fla. 33602.

Mr. William D. Heath, Executive Director, D.C. Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, 499 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

Mr. Thomas J. Coyle, Director, Parking Operations, 910 Municipal Services Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 19017.

Mr. Edward J. Conroy, Executive Secretary, White Plains Parking Authority, 225 Main Street, White Plains, N.Y.

Mr. Francis Whitcomb, City Hall, Elgin, Illinois.

Mr. William R. McConochie, De Leuw Cather & Company, 165 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

Mr. Richard A. LaBaw, Director, Department of Off-Street Parking, City of Miami, 40 N.W. Third Street, Miami, Florida 33128.

Mr. Robert Develle, City Hall, New Orleans, La.

Mr. John S. Hyle, Manager, Office of Metered Parking System, 250 Alton Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

Mr. Bruno Verducci, Executive Secretary, Parking Authority of the City of Newark, 605 Broad Street, Newark 2, N.J.

Mr. Matthew R. Corey, Chief, Bureau of Enforcement, Department of Traffic, City of New York, 28011 Bridge Plaza North, Long Island City, N.Y. 11101.

Mr. Ralph G. Lewis, Jr., City Traffic Engineer, Chattanooga 2, Tenn.

Mr. Lilburn Boggs, U.S. Secret Service, P.O. Box 1077, Chicago, Ill. 60690.

Mr. James V. Fitzpatrick, Commissioner, Department of Streets and Sanitation, Room 707—City Hall, Chicago, Ill. 60690.

Mr. James J. McDonough, First Deputy Commissioner, Department of Streets and Sanitation, Room 707—City Hall, Chicago, Ill. 60690.

Mr. Michael Robinson, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Streets and Sanitation, Room 709—City Hall, Chicago, Ill. 60690.

Mr. Dennis Gately, City Hall, Gary, Ind.
Mr. C. H. Grube, Treasurer, Chicago Transit Authority, Merchandise Mart, P.O. Box 3555, Chicago, Ill. 60654.

Mr. Gerald B. Morrow, City Treasurer, Aurora, Ill.

Mr. Gerald E. Longo, Spt. Parking Authority, Stamford, Conn.

Mr. Robert G. Bundy, General Manager Parking Authority, City Hall, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Mr. Edwin F. Whiteside, Traffic Engineer Aide & Housing Inspector, Village Hall, 1200 Wilmette Avenue, Wilmette, Illinois 60091.

Mr. Alvin A. Acton, Traffic Engineer, 824 Newark Street, West Palm Beach, Florida.

Mr. H. A. Guthrie, City Clerk, City Hall, Waukegan, Illinois.

Mr. Ralph Johnson, 113 N. Euclid Avenue, Oak Park, Illinois.

Mr. Dean A. Porter, Finance Director, City Hall, Evanston, Illinois.

Mr. Charles D. Fayling, Manager, Parking Meters, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., The Rockwell Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15208.

Mr. Louis P. Farina, Chairman of Committee, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Streets & Sanitation, Bureau of Parking, 54 West Hubbard St., Chicago, Illinois 60610.

Issued by Harry Orr, President, International Municipal Parking Congress.

RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA WOULD BE A TRAGIC BLUNDER

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate as we prepare to adjourn for the Fourth of July period that the House pause for just a moment to give thought to the independence of others in this troubled world. It is appropriate, too, to consider the total absence of independence and freedom that exists on the vast portion of the Asian mainland that is now Communist China.

I know that the Members have been following closely the trickle of reports that are coming out of Communist China in the past few weeks, reports that indicate hopeless chaos, turmoil, and revolt among the people of China struggling against their Communist oppressors. It is all the more disturbing to me to note that the administration is once again floating trial balloons to test the resolve of the people of the United States; to ascertain if they can, whether or not Americans will tolerate diplomatic recognition of the insane, paranoic regime of Mao Tse-tung or acquiesce in the admission of that despotic government to the United Nations.

I, for one, would like to make it positively clear that it is my opinion that any slight step toward accommodating this war-bent regime would be a tragic blunder on the part of the United States. There are indications that the Mao regime is on the brink of total collapse; may already have collapsed for all we know. What kind of government will follow, no one has the slightest idea. No one in our State Department can possibly hazard an intelligent guess. So, to think of asking Communist China into the U.N. or to consider having diplomatic contact with the Peking regime is out of all reason.

The few, relatively free nations still existing in Asia look to the United States for support in their cool relations with Peking. We dare not undermine those nations by even hinting that we are se-

riously considering overt, friendly gestures to the butcher regime of Peking.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY recently made a statement on this subject which deals with this sub rosa effort of the administration to "build a bridge" to Communist China and the Senator's statement is worthy of our attention. I hope every Member will read it before we adjourn here today.

The statement follows:

WHAT IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY ON COMMUNIST CHINA?

(A statement and question by U.S. Senator GEORGE MURPHY)

I am increasingly concerned over indications that the Administration may be subtly attempting to alter established U.S. policy toward Communist China. Many news reporters have described a recent speech on Communist China by Under Secretary of State Katzenbach as a "trial balloon" designed to test public sentiment on the possibility of changing America's policy toward Communist China.

However, Mr. Katzenbach's speech is not the first so-called "trial balloon" on the subject. Since the beginning of this year several high Administration officials have been making strangely conciliatory comments about Communist China.

I think it might be useful to review this series of Administration statements to determine if a pattern is indeed developing, a pattern indicating that a change in America's posture toward Communist China is in the offing.

In his State of the Union Message in January, President Johnson said:

"Turmoil continues on the mainland of China after a year of violent disruption. The radical extremism of their government has isolated the Chinese people behind their own borders. The United States, however, remains willing to permit the travel of journalists to both of our countries to undertake cultural and educational exchanges; and to talk about the exchange of basic food crop materials."

As far as I have been able to find out, this is the first statement in which anyone in the Administration discussed the possibility of "exchanging food crop materials." I wonder exactly what the President meant by that statement? What sort of food crop materials would the United States, the greatest agricultural nation in the world, need from Communist China? The only agricultural product of China which is known to be in surplus and in great demand in the rest of the world is opium—and we certainly don't need any of that.

I am confident that the President's State of the Union Message is an accurate statement of the Administration's intent—even though I do not see what agricultural products China will trade to us. I certainly hope the President's statement is not the forerunner of a request for the shipment of American surplus agricultural products to mainland China. The past two Democratic Administrations have made a habit of bailing out such troublemakers as Sukarno, Nasser, Toure and Nkrumah with loans and gifts of America's surplus agricultural products. I certainly hope the Administration is not now thinking of extending this foolish policy to our self-appointed enemies in Communist China. I certainly hope we will be sure our own people all have adequate diets—and I note some people have wildly suggested 20 percent of our people go to bed hungry—before we attempt to feed the Chinese Communists.

The next indication of the possible change in Administration thinking on China was the Vice President's unequivocal statement in April of this year, extending the Administration's "bridge building" theory—which had previously been applied primarily to Eastern

Europe—to Communist China. This was rather an amazing about face, for only six months before the Vice President was issuing warnings about "militant, aggressive, Asian Communism, with its headquarters in Peking, China." Following his change of heart, the Vice President said:

"I look forward to the day when the great Chinese people no longer victimized from within, take their place in the modern world. Surely one of the most exciting and enriching experiences to which we can look forward is the building of peaceful bridges to the people of mainland China."

If the Vice President intends merely to express support for the idea that the Chinese people will eventually regain their freedom, then none could fault his statement. However, such statements must be considered in context of the events and policies of the day. "Bridge building," in the current Administration's vernacular connotes an attempt to increase trade with Communist governments now in power. In my opinion, this is hardly the time to seek increased trade with Communist China. Although we may wish to reaffirm our traditional friendship for the Chinese people this is no time for U.S. initiative which might legitimate the current Chinese Communist rulers or help them overcome China's grave internal problems.

Finally, two top officials of the Department of State, Mr. Katzenbach and Mr. Eugene Rostow, made speeches on the same day elaborating on what the President and Vice President have already said about the possibility of improving our relations with Communist China.

The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Katzenbach, speaking at the National Press Club on May 21, 1968, hinted that this country might loosen its trade embargo against Communist China if Peking would ease its opposition to commerce with the United States. One recent example of America's "new flexibility" on trade and financial matters, I am told, was the granting of a license to the Radio Corporation of America permitting RCA to pay about \$600,000 to the Chinese Communists for services rendered by the Peking authorities in accepting RCA messages from overseas customers primarily located in the Middle East. According to newspaper reports, this transfer of funds is the largest ever authorized under the Foreign Assets Control Act of 1950. I believe Members of Congress would be very interested in the details of this transaction and in an explanation as to why the Administration chose this particular moment to authorize payment of over half a million dollars to the Red Chinese when our balance of payments situation is so critical.

Mr. Katzenbach, the number two man in the State Department, further stated that the Administration would accept "just about any gesture" as an indication of Peking's interest in improving relations with the United States. I am amazed that such a statement would be made while the Administration is trying to negotiate an end to the Vietnamese war and when it is well-known that Peking is urging Hanoi to prosecute that war with renewed vigor. I am appalled that such a statement would be made when more Americans have been killed in Vietnam with the aid and support of the Red Chinese in the past four weeks than in any other previous four-week period during the entire Vietnamese conflict.

Mr. Katzenbach's speech contains some other rather remarkable language. He says for instance that: "The military threat posed by Peking can be, and perhaps at times has been, exaggerated." I am amazed to find Mr. Katzenbach making such a statement when his immediate superior, Mr. Rusk, has repeatedly stated that one of the main reasons for our intervention in Vietnam is to prevent Chinese Communist expansion into all of

Southeast Asia. I am amazed to hear such a statement from the Under Secretary of State just a few months after the Secretary of Defense justified the expenditure of \$5 billion for an ABM (anti-ballistic missile) system designed to protect us from the growing Chinese Communist nuclear threat. Such glaring inconsistencies makes one wonder whether the right hand of the Administration knows what the left hand is doing.

Mr. Katzenbach further states that the Department of State understands Communist China's "legitimate needs for security and friendly relations with neighboring countries." This comment implies that Peking has a benign and peaceful record throughout the world. Mr. Katzenbach blithely overlooks the fact that since 1960 Communist China has made at least two open military attacks on India, created disturbances in Macao and Hong Kong, nearly conquered Indonesia from within, launched widespread subversion in Africa, continually probed the Taiwan Straits, and has encouraged both the disgraceful conduct of Chinese Communist diplomats abroad and the mistreatment of foreign diplomats and newsmen in Peking.

The Under Secretary's statement about Communist China's "friendly relations with her neighbors" seems to contradict many previous pronouncements made by both Democratic Administrations since 1960 in opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The U.S. has repeatedly, and I think rightly, pointed out that the government in Peking is not peace-loving. The Chinese Communists clearly do not concur in the obligations which the UN Charter imposes upon members. I would question whether Mr. Katzenbach's remarks are not most untimely, for during the past few years Communist China has aggressively attempted to put its openly stated theory of world revolution into effect. As a result a growing majority of United Nations members now oppose Communist China's entry into the world body, whereas previously the number of states voting with the United States against Communist China was decreasing. So once again this Administration appears to be wavering in its support for a policy which has finally won the enthusiastic backing of friendly states, a policy which the U.S. has firmly endorsed since the Chinese Communists attacked United Nations forces in Korea in 1950.

The Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. Eugene Rostow, speaking in Cincinnati on the same date as Mr. Katzenbach, stated: "We have ourselves pushed aside barriers which once existed in our policy. . . . We have made clear our willingness to welcome Chinese scientists, scholars, and journalists to the United States, and have encouraged our own academics to establish contact with their counterparts on the mainland of China. To facilitate these contacts, we have eased restrictions on travel to Communist China. Few applications for the validation of passports for travel to Communist China have been refused in recent years. . . . We have taken other steps as well."

I think Members of Congress would like to know what the "other steps" referred to by Mr. Rostow are. I would like to know the reasons behind the Administration's change in tactics toward the Chinese Communists. I would like to know what has prompted the Administration to begin thrown bouquets at the Chinese Communists. Is there some startling piece of news about Communist China which policymakers in the State Department and in the White House know which other Americans are not privy to? If there is, the Administration should share this news with the American people! If there is not, I suggest that this is a most peculiar time for America to begin courting the Chinese Communists.

As of a few months ago there was great

uncertainty among China scholars as to who was actually in control in Peking. This Senator is still uncertain.

Does not the continuing conflict on the mainland make it impossible to predict now whether the Communists will be able to retain centralized control of that huge country? Is it not quite possible that China will disintegrate into regional rule by warlords? Is it not even possible that the Chinese people will regain their freedom to choose a better form of government? If so, this would hardly appear to be the time to alter our China policy. It would seem to be a time for continued watchful waiting.

Friendship is a two-way street. Have the Communist Chinese taken any initiatives indicating they wish to improve relations with the U.S.? Oddly enough, both Mr. Katzenbach and Mr. Rostow express doubt in their speeches that the Chinese Communists are interested in friendly relations with the United States. For instance, Mr. Katzenbach said: "Contact, exchange, detente—all threaten not only the objectives of Peking's foreign policy, but the whole ideological fabric which this generation of leaders has woven together. . . . such a move—the desire for expanded and improved peaceful contacts between the two countries—appears still to be lacking on the Chinese side."

If Peking is interested in improved relations with the United States, it has an excellent opportunity to demonstrate good faith by helping us find a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam. If, however, the Chinese Communists continue to withhold their cooperation on this question of life and death importance to all Americans I consider it most inappropriate for our government to extend America's hand of official friendship.

Certainly the American people are entitled to a clear statement of the Administration intention towards Communist China. I see no reason why we should be obliged to read the fine print of numerous speeches to gain an impression of Administration thinking on such a crucial issue. Unless the national security would be adversely affected, I call upon the Administration to issue a clear, comprehensive policy statement on Communist China.

REPORT ON CIGARETTES

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has made its annual report to Congress on cigarettes.

I am torn between two recommendations to my colleagues about this report. On the one hand, it would be a shame for them to waste their valuable time reading and from this standpoint, I should recommend against bothering with it. But on the other hand, it would be a shame for them to miss this prime example of what happens when bureaucrats meddle into areas where they haven't the least competence.

Aside from a recommendation to ban all broadcast advertising of cigarettes—a recommendation obviously calculated to grab headlines in newspapers—there is little new in this report to Congress. There are a lot of statistics and numbers. There are a lot of speculations. But there is no medical evidence, new or otherwise,

that demonstrates that cigarettes harm smokers.

There are many statements that fail to state the full facts. For example, there is a table of how much advertising was spent on cigarettes in the years from 1963 to 1967. The implication of this table is that the industry has vastly increased its advertising. I do not have any figures to support it, but I would bet that a good part of this increase is in the simple rise in the cost of advertising.

Again, the FTC has put forward its peculiar logic that when an advertisement says the smoke of a particular brand of cigarette is milder, that this is a health statement.

On the basis of such logic, the Commission has recommended that television and radio advertising for cigarettes be banned. What the Commission has actually done is to single out a specific product—out of all the products in our economy—and said that although this product is a legal one, and legitimately advertised and marketed, it cannot be advertised on either radio or television.

The Commission has not stated what its criteria for selecting the product are. It has not demonstrated that cigarette smoking is, in scientific fact, harmful. Nor has it demonstrated that cigarette advertising on television or radio plays any significant role in getting people to start smoking cigarettes.

What about automobiles? Some 50,000 people a year are killed by automobile accidents, probably hundreds of thousands are permanently crippled. Yet I hear no howl and cry from the FTC to ban radio and television advertising of automobiles.

Who among us can estimate the physical and property damage caused by excessive use of alcoholic beverage, the broken homes, the impairment of morals. As of this date, I find no concern by FTC in this critical area of public health.

Tobacco is grown in 26 States and Puerto Rico by 650,000 farm families. There are 425 tobacco factories, located in 35 States, directly employing 75,000 men and women earning annual wages of \$352,875,000. Farm income from tobacco is about \$1.5 billion. State, Federal, and local taxes are running at the rate of \$4 billion annually.

Make no mistake about it: The answers to smoking and health questions will come from such facilities as these. The answers will not be found in reports to Congress by a set of bureaucrats who are out of their depth.

That there is a lack of scientific evidence that cigarettes cause human disease is plain to those who study the question with an open mind. There is no doubt that much more research needs to be done, for it is only in the laboratory that questions about smoking and health will be resolved—not in bureaucratic propaganda reports.

The tobacco industry's contributions to independent research to establish the facts are well known. The research being conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is also a long step in the right direction.

Much of this research is being done in the State of North Carolina, in the Re-

search Triangle. This magnificent set of research facilities should be a source of pride to all Americans, as it is to North Carolinians. Here, thousands of the best scientific minds in the world are at work on many problems, as well as smoking and health.

IN SUPPORT OF GUN CONTROL
LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, much of today's discussion about gun control legislation brings to mind similar discussions of yesterday about legislation to outlaw racial segregation in various areas of our national life.

"You cannot legislate morality," we were told. Passing a law against a practice which is an intimate component of people's lives will not necessarily compel them to change. And the failure of the 18th amendment with its attendant evils of bootlegging were cited as obiter dictum for substantiation.

Today, this same argument that we cannot legislate morality or a change in the entrenched habits of men is being offered again by the opponents of gun control legislation. They submit that the strict control of the sale and ownership of guns will not deter criminals or wipe out crime or put a brake to violence in this country.

To a limited extent, their argument possesses some merit. But the terrible need for some form of gun control law is not mitigated by its uncertain ability to overnight guarantee a totally peaceful society. As long as men are governed by the passions of racial extremism, as long as the pus of the criminal mentality festers in the body politic and as long as some men believe that the ultimate responsibility for protecting their family resides within their being, then the potential prospect for violence is one of awesome omnipresence.

But what gun control legislation is designed to do is precisely what the laws against murder, the laws against rape, laws against robbery and burglary, and the laws against aggravated assault are purposed to accomplish.

Laws do not stop criminal behavior. But they do regulate its expression.

In 1966, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there were 10,920 murders. These 10,920 murders were part of the 3,243,000 violent crimes committed in that year—murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft.

Did laws against these crimes prevent their execution? They did not. But let us consider what a rapacious jungle of unbridled violence would have engulfed this Nation if there had been no such laws. Without those laws, we would have lived in a condition of unresolved conflict.

This is why we must appreciate that laws act as an educative force to mold

young minds to accept law and order as the highest precept of society's existence. We do not achieve 100-percent compliance in this effort, but we have succeeded historically in maintaining a society more orderly than disorderly.

Society's inclination to obey its laws depends upon the moral commitment men themselves are willing to make toward the law's fulfillment. Laws are made by men for men—all men. There can never be any such thing as selective obedience of the law or society's temple of law and order will crumble into a Sahara of anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a word about the Negro community which I represent to some extent and its relationship to gun control legislation.

It is fashionable in many circles of racial bigotry to subtly indict the Negro community for the rising "crime in the streets."

Along with the recent two horrible assassinations of our beloved Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the rising tide of so-called black crime has been implicitly introduced into the arguments for gun control legislation. Hysteria has been whipped up and logic has suffered grievously.

Let me point out, however, that it is the Negro community which is most savagely victimized by crime. If, in some communities, a majority of the criminals are Negro, then it is equally true that an overwhelming majority of the victims are Negro. The highest crime rates in every major city in America are in the black ghettos, not the white enclaves.

In New York City, for example, according to a report several months ago by that city's police department, six of that city's 80 police precincts—7 percent—commit one-third—33 percent—of all violent crimes in New York City.

And where are those six precincts located? In the ghetto slums of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and the South Bronx.

And so ghetto black mothers and children who today are violently attacked by guns in their communities desperately need the identical protection of tough law enforcement and gun control legislation as much, we are told, as suburban mothers and children deserve these benefits.

Gun control legislation will not automatically prevent crime. But gun control legislation can make it more difficult for the convicted felon, the criminally insane, and the recidivist to buy or own a gun. Gun control legislation can stop the interstate commerce in gun traffic. Gun control legislation can limit the ability of organized crime to make a profit out of selling these purveyors of destruction. And gun control legislation will unquestionably help to reduce crime.

We must never delude ourselves into believing that a new law will ipso facto transform our society into a paradise of happy togetherness merely because we pass that law. The law's ultimate effectiveness depends upon its uncompromising enforcement and its hallowed obedience.

The law is only the matrix that can cement the powder and water of human behavior into a concrete foundation for social stability. This is why the passage of gun control legislation is mandatory in this Congress.

FOURTH OF JULY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on this Fourth of July holiday I call on all Americans to join me in some old-fashioned flag waving and celebrating. It is Independence Day and it is a day to remember that our Government deserves the support of all of the people. This has been my attitude, regardless of whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat, whether I agree with all his policies or not. This holiday transcends parties and issues. It is a great day for a great country.

Three items in the news recently, I think, reflect the unique greatness of the country and reflect the spirit which shows that this land will continue to be great.

On July 1, the new Immigration Act went into effect, greatly liberalizing the quota system which has traditionally deprived thousands of an opportunity to come here. Why is this new act such a marvelous symbol of this country? Because it shows that America is, indeed, the land of opportunity, and that there are uncaptured people in every country on the globe who affirmatively want to come here and live in America. If all manmade laws and barriers were to disappear, you would see the greatest avalanche of people from all over the world arriving at our shores.

A recent report in the Wall Street Journal by a team of respected social scientists shows that, in spite of all the recent domestic troubles, there is less strife in the country now than in past decades. Professors from Brandeis, Princeton, Pennsylvania, and California show demonstrably that civil violence and tension was indeed greater at almost any time in the last century than it is now.

We are not by nature a violent people nor do we support violent customs. On this anniversary of the founding of the Republic, we can proudly rededicate ourselves to nonviolence in our dealings with each other.

Finally, a news item in the Washington Star held my attention: it showed that Americans donated \$14.6 billion last year in charity to worthy causes—to religion and to education, to the arts and to the poor. No other country has this tradition of giving, this tradition of generosity. Nowhere else is there such a spirit of philanthropy among all the people.

Look at the sacrifices made by our young people who volunteer for the Peace Corps and for VISTA and for other social service agencies; look at what they do for the world and for all our people. We

hear many complaints, but I am convinced the present generation is the best we have ever had. Generally, it is the most dignified, it has the most respect for itself, and it has genuinely done the most for others and itself.

With thoughts like this in mind, then, I approach July 4 enthusiastically. It is a day of celebration for all of us.

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL
CONDUCTED JUNE 1968

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the information and interest of my colleagues the results of my latest survey of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

To date more than 20,000 questionnaires have been tabulated. This is enough, we believe, to virtually constitute a referendum on the issues considered, and is a most effective antidote against pressure propaganda.

The above-mentioned information follows:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED
JUNE 1968

1. Do you agree with those who advocate that the police should shoot at looters and arsonists who fail to desist when challenged? Yes, 93%; No, 7%.

Here is reflected the overwhelming popular resentment against law breakers and violence. The people of our district (and we can assume of the whole nation) want a speedy return to law and order and respect for proper authority. The rights of the offended are more important than the rights of the offenders.

2. In order to get peace in Vietnam, do you feel the United States should agree to the North Vietnamese demand that a coalition government to include Communists be set up in South Vietnam? Yes, 31%; No, 69%.

The majority seems to feel that we will have lost the war in Vietnam if we negotiate a settlement that allows the Communists a place in the government of South Vietnam and that all our sacrifices of men and money will have been in vain.

3. Should we cut off federal scholarship and loan funds to college students guilty of participating in campus rioting? Yes, 93%; No, 7%.

The public is quite willing to help students of needy families to secure educational advantages. But the great majority is fed up with subsidized students participating in riots and demonstrations which destroy property and interrupt orderly educational processes. If change is necessary, there exist proper and dignified methods of achieving such objectives. After all, one thing we are trying to do is to develop good citizens, not law scuffers.

4. Would you vote for a "negative income tax" (guaranteed annual income) for families regarded as poverty stricken? Yes, 17%; No, 83%.

Detailed plans of how the guaranteed annual income will work are not generally known and we cannot be sure if it would put an end to most other welfare programs. But a large majority revolts at the idea of mailing monthly checks to people simply

because they can prove a lack of money. To most it is simply a fancy name for the dole.

5. Under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty, member countries can withdraw from the NATO Alliance next year. Should the U.S. withdraw and bring its troops back from Europe? Yes, 43%; No, 57%.

In our previous poll 88% felt that the U.S. has over-extended itself on foreign commitments, but many of those apparently feel that NATO is so important in maintaining the balance of power against the Soviet Union that they are willing to keep our troops in Europe at either present or reduced force levels. This question provided the closest division of opinion on our poll.

6. Do you believe that a tax increase and decreased government spending are necessary to prevent more inflation and to strengthen the dollar? Yes, 62%; No, 38%.

In our February Poll 73% opposed the enactment of a 10% surcharge on personal and corporate income taxes. Most said taxes are high enough and that the main thrust should be towards reducing expenditures. In this poll when the two elements were combined, the majority voted for a tax hike coupled with a budget limitation to save the dollar. I voted for that package when the House passed it 268 to 150 on June 20. I found no one who wanted higher taxes, but even though it is an election year, a strong majority in the House felt that our fiscal fitness demanded responsible action.

7. Do you believe that definite and decisive action should be taken by the U.S. government to obtain the return of the USS Pueblo and its crew from North Korea? Yes, 87%; No, 13%.

The overwhelming majority apparently believes that the prestige of the U.S. was seriously impaired when we did not retaliate promptly to the seizure of the Pueblo. Likewise they say that the slogan of 1898, "Remember the Maine," has now become, "Forget the Pueblo."

8. Do you think that the election of our next President will be decided in the House of Representatives? Yes, 12%; No, 88%.

This question indirectly probed how seriously people regard the third party candidacy of George Wallace. According to our Constitution, if no candidate obtains a majority (over 50%) of the electoral votes, the House of Representatives will choose the President from among those three candidates who got the highest number of electoral votes. Many competent political observers believe that the contest between Republicans and Democrats will be so close that Wallace may get enough electoral votes to prevent either major party candidate from obtaining a majority of the electoral votes to prevent either major party candidate from obtaining a majority of the electoral votes, so that our next President could be elected by the House instead of the people.

9. Should our interstate highway program be curtailed to some degree until we have regained fiscal fitness? Yes, 63%; No, 37%.

Despite the fact that our federal highways are financed by special taxes on gasoline, oil, tires, etc., and not from the general treasury, we see here another example of the people's distaste for continued heavy spending. Such spending does add to the nation's boiling inflation, and many feel that highway construction could be reduced until unemployment becomes heavier.

10. Would you have permitted the Poor People's March to come into Washington, D.C.? Yes, 24%; No, 76%.

This question was poorly phrased. Some respondents had in mind the Solidarity March of June 19, while others were thinking of the Poor People's Encampment at Resurrection City. Had the question been only on the Solidarity March I think more would have approved it and less would have favored allowing the camp-in.

11. Should we sell up-to-date arms and aircraft to Israel? Yes, 60%; No, 40%.

Although most are sympathetic to Israel's future welfare and are alarmed over increasing Communist influence in the Arab world, a sizable minority fear that such sympathy could involve us in an arms race in the Near East with the Soviet Union.

12. Which do you think is the single most important problem facing the country today? (Please check just one.)

(a) War in Vietnam, 29%.

(b) High Cost of Living, 5%.

(c) Poverty, 3%.

(d) Crime and Lawlessness (including riots, looting, etc.), 63%.

These results support those of Question No. 1 and parallel the findings of many recent nation-wide public opinion polls: Crime is the major concern of the American public today.

13. If your present inclination is to vote Democratic in November, who would you prefer to be the nominee? (Please check just one.) Humphrey—; Kennedy—; McCarthy—.

This questionnaire had just gone into the mails when the late Senator Kennedy was tragically assassinated. Consequently the possible answers were so badly confused we decided to nullify the question and not publish any results.

14. If your present inclination is to vote Republican in November, who would you prefer to be the nominee? (Please check just one.) Nixon 51%; Reagan 15%; Rockefeller 34%.

On a question such as this, straight reporting and no commentary is about all that is in order.

RED CHINA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been disturbing increase in the number of statements emanating from varying sources in the present administration hinting at a change of policy toward Red China. In this connection I commend the reading of an article by John D. Lofton, Jr., appearing in the Manchester Union Leader of June 29, 1968.

Interestingly, in a recent poll which I took in New Hampshire's first Congressional District, in more than 10,000 replies, 64 percent opposed the admission of Red China to the United Nations, 25 percent favored it, and 11 percent were undecided.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES CONSIDERING RED CHINA TIES?

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

Is the Johnson-Humphrey Administration considering the recognition of Red China?

Well, they just might be, but they haven't said anything official on it and that's made Sen. George Murphy (R.-Calif.) pretty hot under the collar.

The senator has noticed several high ranking administration officials sending up trial balloons on the subject and has asked Johnson and Company to issue a comprehensive policy statement on Communist China.

"I see no reason why we should be obliged to read the fine print of numerous speeches to gain an impression of administration thinking on such a crucial subject," the California Republican told his Senate colleagues recently.

The way Senator Murphy sees it, Balloon Number one was sent up by none other than LBJ himself in the State of the Union message last January when he told the Con-

gress: "Turmoil continues on the mainland of China after a year of violent disruption. The radical extremism of their government has isolated the Chinese people behind their own borders. The United States, however, remains willing to permit the travel of journalists to both of our countries to undertake cultural and educational exchanges; and to talk about the exchange of basic food crop materials."

(What sort of food crop materials would the U.S., the greatest agricultural nation in the world, need from Red China, asked Senator Murphy in disbelief. "The only agricultural product of Red China which is known to be in surplus and in great demand in the rest of the world is opium—and we certainly don't need that," he quipped.)

HUMPHREY BALLOON

Balloon Number Two was sent aloft by Vice President Humphrey in April of this year when he said: "I look forward to the day when the great Chinese people no longer victimized from within, take their place in the modern world. Surely one of the most exciting and enriching experiences to which we can look forward is the building of peaceful bridges to the people of mainland China."

Balloons Number Three and Four were launched simultaneously on May 21 by Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach—and Eugene Rostow, under secretary of state for political affairs.

Katzenbach speaking to the National Press Club hinted, among other things, that the U.S. just might loosen its trade embargo against Red China if Peking would ease its opposition to commerce with this country.

One example cited by Senator Murphy of our "new flexibility" policy toward Red China was the granting of a license to the Radio Corporation of America to pay about \$600,000 to the Chinese Reds for services rendered by Peking authorities in accepting RCA messages from overseas customers primarily located in the Middle East.

According to newspaper reports, this transfer of funds is the largest ever authorized under the Foreign Assets Control Act of 1950.

Under Secretary of State Katzenbach, the number two man at State, further stated that the administration was prepared to accept "just about any gesture" as an indication of Peking's interest in improving relations with the U.S. He also opined that "the military threat posed by Peking can be, and perhaps at times, has been exaggerated."

OVERLOOKS ATTACKS

This observation, Senator Murphy notes, blithely overlooks the fact that since 1960 Red China has made at least two open military attacks on India, created disturbances in Macao and Hong Kong, nearly conquered Indonesia from within, launched widespread subversion in Africa, continually probed the Taiwan straits, and has encouraged both the disgraceful conduct of Red Chinese diplomats abroad and the mistreatment of foreign diplomats and newsmen in Peking.

Speaking in Cincinnati the same day as Under Secretary Katzenbach spoke in Washington, Eugene Rostow was putting down a similar line: "We have ourselves pushed aside barriers which once existed in our policy . . . We have made clear our willingness to welcome Chinese scientists, scholars and journalists to the U.S., and have encouraged on our own academics to establish contact with their counterparts on the mainland of China. To facilitate the contacts, we have eased travel restriction on travel to Communist China. Few applications for the validation of passports for travel to Communist China have been refused in recent years . . . We have taken other steps as well."

MORE BALLOONS

With no real reaction to the first four balloons it looks as if the administration is starting to send them up again.

In an interview with the New York Times last Sunday (June 23), Vice President Humphrey, in responding to a question having nothing to do with our China policies, volunteered the notion that "we must initiate a constant, persistent effort to open up China, and to get away from the isolation of China to peaceful engagement with her . . . In trade, I don't just mean cultural exchanges, I don't mean just journalist exchanges, doctors and educators—I mean, commerce."

Senator Murphy summed up the whole idea of trade with Red China when he put it this way: "If Peking is interested in improved relations with the U.S., it has an excellent opportunity to demonstrate good faith by helping us find a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam. If however, the Chinese Reds continue to withhold their cooperation on this question of life and death importance to all Americans I consider it most inappropriate for our government to extend America's hand of official friendship."

THEY GAVE US AN INDEPENDENT AMERICA—CAN WE KEEP IT?

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. George J. Burger, Sr., vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, gave me an article "The Price They Paid." This is an authentic résumé or abstract of the sacrifices made by the courageous men who signed the Declaration of Independence. The facts about the hardship and suffering of these patriots who subscribed their names to this document are little known to the American people today. It was common knowledge to these men at that time that they were risking everything they held dear by being a part of the leadership in this epochal movement.

At this time of unrest, with the Nation facing trouble from within, articles of this kind should be broadly distributed to our people. This one is made available with the compliments of the National Federation of Independent Business of San Mateo, Calif., an organization that is dedicated and devoted to the principles that have made America a strong and great Nation.

The pioneers who have gone before have left America a heritage of which we can be proud to perpetuate this freedom and independence is the legacy of all of us.

The text of "The Price They Paid" is included as a part of my remarks:

[Compliments of the National Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif.]

THE PRICE THEY PAID

Have you ever wondered what happened to those men who signed the Declaration of Independence?

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors, and tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary Army, another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the Revolutionary War.

What kind of men were they? Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were mer-

chants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well educated. But they signed the Declaration of Independence knowing full well that the penalty would be death if they were captured.

They signed and they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the seas by the British navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts, and died in rags.

Thomas McKeam was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family almost constantly. He served in the Congress without pay, and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him, and poverty was his reward.

Vandals or soldiers or both, looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson Jr., noted that the British General Cornwallis, had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters. The owner quietly urged General George Washington to open fire, which was done. The home was destroyed, and Nelson died bankrupt.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she was dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and his grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, returning home after the war to find his wife dead, his children vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and a broken heart.

Norris and Livingston suffered similar fates.

Such were the stories and sacrifices of the American Revolution. These were not wild-eyed, rabble-rousing ruffians. They were soft spoken men of means and education. They had security, but they valued liberty more. Standing tall, straight, and unwavering, they pledged: "For the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of the Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

They gave us an independent America. Can we keep it?

HON. BILL NICHOLS APPOINTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT AUBURN UNIVERSITY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with the Members of the House today the news that our colleague from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] has been appointed to the board of trustees at Auburn University. His appointment was made today by Governor Albert Brewer.

Our colleague holds two degrees from Auburn University, but in those days it was called Alabama Polytechnic Institute. He was also captain of the 1939 football team, and played on the 1937 team that beat Michigan State in the Orange Bowl. Since then, he has worked hard for Auburn and for education in general in Alabama. He served on his city board of education for 15 years, and championed the cause of education in his two terms in the state legislature.

Auburn University is a great land-grant university. It has a proud history and a promising future. I know it will become even greater under the able leadership of our colleague [Mr. NICHOLS] who has just been appointed to serve on Auburn's board of trustees.

OUR FOREMOST DOMESTIC
PROBLEM IS CRIME

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to observe that our foremost domestic problem is crime.

The national crime rate has risen by a fantastic 88 percent in the period between 1960 and 1967 while during the same period our population has increased only 10 percent.

The permissiveness in our society has resulted in a general air of defiance of the law on the part of many of our citizens, especially our young people.

The "cop on the beat"—once admired and respected—today is all too often the target of abuse.

Restrictions placed on law enforcement officers have made it far more difficult to present cases that will stand up in court. The recent Supreme Court decision upholding state "stop-and-frisk" laws is a step in the right direction, but only a small one.

Recent enactment of the omnibus crime bill of 1968 is another progressive step.

But much more must be done—and done quickly.

In an effort to do something to speed up the war on crime, I am introducing today a package of bills that, hopefully, Congress will act on quickly.

Gambling and narcotics convictions are made especially difficult because under present Federal law an officer must announce his intentions before entering premises to be searched. This gives a suspect plenty of time to dispose of evidence.

I am introducing a bill today that would allow a Federal agent to enter premises unannounced if he feared evidence was likely to be destroyed.

Narcotics and gambling are big business today, and those who run such enterprises have managed to wiggle their way into legitimate business.

I am introducing two bills dealing with this problem.

One would prohibit investment of income derived from criminal activities in any business enterprise involved in interstate or foreign commerce.

Another would prohibit investment of intentionally unreported income derived from one business in another.

Auto theft has become such a major racket that congressional action is imperative. Therefore, I am introducing a bill that would allow a Federal agent to stop a motor vehicle to inspect the serial number of its body and motor if he had reason to suspect it had been stolen.

In view of the Supreme Court's ruling on State "stop-and-frisk" laws, I am introducing a bill that would permit search and detention of persons suspected of involvement in or knowledge of a Federal crime.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to maintain a continuing study and investigation of all aspects of organized crime. I am, therefore, introducing legislation to create a Joint Committee on Organized Crime whose duties would include continuing investigations, collection and distribution of information, and recommendations on legislation.

It is my earnest hope that these bills will receive the prompt and favorable consideration demanded by the urgency of the present situation.

A CHALLENGE TO OUR ABILITY TO
PROPERLY UTILIZE OUR MAN-
POWER

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the "information explosion," the unremitting drive to reach new horizons of technological advancement, and the very dynamism of our economy, have combined to pose a very distinct challenge to our ability to properly utilize our manpower resources.

Indeed, in many areas, our sophisticated technocracy has outdistanced our ability to fulfill manpower commitments, as reflected in a careful analysis of the problem by the Edward Warren Organization, a planning and consultant firm engaged in the recruitment and placement of financial, systems and planning professionals.

By the mid-1970's the male population between the ages of 35 and 45 will decline by more than 1 million. Yet growth projections indicate that the demand for executives in this age bracket will be one-third as great in the next decade as it is today.

Even now, there are definite shortages of skilled personnel. Industry is confronted with a shortage of 40,000 systems analysts, 50,000 programmers and 20,000 systems managers. By 1970, the problem will be even more acute. In systems analysis alone, the shortage will increase to approximately 110,000.

Systems analysis, the Edward Warren Organization points out, is one of America's fastest growing professions. At present, there are some 60,000 excellent opportunities for qualified analysts, and it is anticipated that this demand will continue for the next 10 years.

Within the framework of the accounting-financial field, where there are some 500,000 accountants, there are normally about 24,000 job openings every year. However, due to attrition, the annual demand for qualified accountants is estimated at closer to 75,000.

In light of these highly revealing statistics, the need for proper utilization of professionals in these fields takes on

profound significance. Firms such as the Edward Warren Organization therefore, are playing a key role in recruiting top-flight personnel for industry.

The leadership displayed by the Edward Warren Organization reflects the background, experience and capabilities of the principals of the firm, Leslie W. Stern and Edward H. Lubin.

Both are thoroughly schooled in personnel administration, general management, economics, finance, planning and information systems. They have represented some of this country's largest corporations, and have brought to their work a keen insight into these companies' special personnel requirements.

The Edward Warren Organization works closely with management to determine the precise requirements for a particular job, draws an accurate portrait of the best professional for the job, and then recommends those individuals the firm considers most suitable for the position.

By bringing to bear its excellent recruitment talents, the firm saves management the costly and time-consuming task of locating the right professional for the position. I submit that this is truly an invaluable service to industry.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON RECOMMENDS
LOWERING OF VOTING AGE TO 18

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has given this body a message setting forth, with clarity and force, the reasons for amending the Federal Constitution to lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

I have advocated this change for many years. While serving in the Michigan State Senate in 1964, I was the sponsor of a constitutional amendment, which if passed, would have changed the minimum voting age to 18.

In recent years, this Nation has witnessed a significant growth in the maturity of our younger citizens. The concern and enthusiasm of young people in national affairs is becoming more and more apparent. Young Democrats and Young Republicans are noticeably active in every election.

The work of young people in the Peace Corps, the VISTA program of the war on poverty, in operation Headstart, and other projects, has demonstrated an increasing eagerness and willingness to accept responsibility.

At the age of 18, most young people are fresh out of high school, and are richly endowed with a knowledge of and interest in civic affairs. This knowledge and enthusiasm too often stagnates and withers during the present 3-year period before they are allowed to vote.

The arbitrary age of 21 as the age of maturity dates back for many centuries. It is certainly outdated today, when young people at 18 can legally marry, drive a car, serve in the Armed Force,

be tried as an adult for crimes, sign legal documents, and bear firearms.

An 18-year-old today is classified as an adult by life insurance companies, by Webster's Dictionary, and by the Federal Government in the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Two States—Georgia and Kentucky—have already lowered the voting age to 18. Alaskans vote at 19 and Hawaiians at 20. The voting records of these younger persons is far superior to the general average, according to well-documented studies.

These are crucial times for our country. Our system of government is being subjected to tests of the utmost severity. I believe that we will greatly strengthen our Nation and our system of government by extending the franchise to those young citizens in the 18 to 21 age group.

For these reasons, I urge prompt action on the President's proposal.

DR. PALYI WARNS HUGE DEFICIT AFFECTS NATION'S MORAL FIBER

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McCLORY Mr. Speaker, the economic policies of the Johnson-Humphrey administration are endangering our entire national existence. In addition, these questionable policies may be contributing to the social unrest which is sweeping the country.

The eminent economist, Dr. Melchior Palyi, explains the dangers and ramifications inherent in a policy which results in a current national deficit of \$25 billion. Dr. Palyi's article, which appeared in today's—July 3, 1968—Chicago Tribune, is reproduced as follows:

THE UNITED STATES SPENDS ITSELF INTO FANTASY LAND

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi, consulting economist)

Do people realize what a federal budget deficit of 25 billion dollars—the result of the government's overspending in fiscal 1967-68—means to each one personally?

People know, of course, that the treasury must fill the gap between expenditures and revenues by borrowing somewhere. It has borrowed 7 billions from the "printing press," called the federal reserve system. The rest, 18 billions, had to be taken out of the capital market. Its resources have been preempted accordingly and you will notice it soon, if you haven't yet.

If you need a mortgage loan to build a house, commercial credit to finance your business inventories, or an instalment loan to buy a car—write the politicians you have sent to Washington and tell them in well chosen words how "grateful" you are for the record high interest charges you have to pay. They have raised, and keep raising, your costs by depleting the nation's capital supply.

You think you gain by higher interest rates on savings accounts? Do not let yourself be hoodwinked by such rubbish. Ten years ago your savings account may have brought 3 per cent, while prices were rising at an annual rate of 1½ per cent, leaving you a real return of 1½ per cent. Now, a 4½ per cent rate on the same accounts means that you can barely keep your capital alive in view of the accelerated depreciation of the currency.

That brings us to the next point. Every

one of the 7 billion dollars the government has, in effect, borrowed from the federal reserve banks is "high-powered money," the kind that serves as the credit base on which the super-structure of deposits is built. One dollar of "high-powered money" may carry six or more dollars of balances on which checks can be drawn. This overfilling of [privileged] pocketbooks well ahead of the growth of the national income is what drives up your cost of living. The currency's purchasing power declines. It is as simple as that and it all stems from the federal budget deficit.

The inflation process has many specious and vicious ramifications. It affects even the moral fiber of the nation, in addition to unbalancing the economy's wage-price structure, generating wild speculative excesses, and bringing the dollar ever closer to the threatening breakdown.

Rather naively, some people find consolation in the thought that the alternative—ever higher taxes—would be even worse than the deficit. In reality, the government is forced to raise taxes in order to restrain inflation. Well, a 10 per cent surtax became the law of the land on the same day on which the 25-billion-dollar deficit was announced. In other words, the average American family loses when the great-society-spenders are running amok, and loses again when they are running for cover.

A world of huge budget deficits is a world of illusions, of utopian expectations. Therein lies the ultimate root of the widespread disaffection, alienation, and social unrest.

DESEGREGATION TAX

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RARICK Mr. Speaker, taxes are soaring on everything these days.

In St. Tammany Parish, La., the taxpayers must even pay a tax to desegregate their public school system by Federal court mandate.

The new progressive plan—since freedom of choice did not forcefully attain the desired race mixing—was to close the Negro schools and force all the children into the already overcrowded white schools.

The Slidell Times editorial for June 27 shows the taxpayers cost of this guinea pig experiment.

Maybe the schoolboard can recoup some of the tax loss by selling the buildings for a profit to the Federal Government?

Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Slidell-St. Tammany Times (Slidell, La.) June 27, 1968]

HOT OFF THE PRESSES: HIGH COST OF DESEGREGATION

Desegregation bears a considerable price tag.

In order to accomplish a measure of it, federal district court in New Orleans has ordered the closure of five Negro schools in St. Tammany Parish.

Two of those schools do not belong to the school board, do not belong, that is, to the people of the parish.

But the other three represent what will now be an idle investment of some \$607,000. They and the price tags are: Sun School

\$107,000; Mandeville Rosenwald \$300,000; and Madisonville Rosenwald \$200,000.

The Sun School has been in use for only two years.

EDUCATIONAL TV

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RARICK Mr. Speaker, the educational TV programming from the Honolulu, Hawaii, June 23 Star-Bulletin and Advertiser should cause supporters of public broadcasting, merely because of the appealing phrase "education," to sit up and take notice.

Education can be constructive or destructive—depends on whose running the show and the desired objective. In the case at hand it appears revolutionary.

I include the TV programming as follows:

FROM PROTEST TO RESISTANCE

On educational Channels 11, 10, and 4 "Net Journal charts the changing character of radical dissent in America, "From Protest to Resistance," Sunday night at 5 p.m.

The program focuses upon three advocates of dissent, among the original freedom riders in Mississippi eight years ago, who typify the movement's new direction:

Mario Savio, who led the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964. He now contends that the issue is "political power" and is running for the California State Senate on the Peace and Freedom ticket.

Stokely Carmichael, former director of SNCC, who espouses Black Power and calls upon Negroes to oppose the draft reciting "hell no, we won't go."

David Harris, who has left Stanford University where he was student body president, to devote his complete efforts to the Resistance, an anti-draft group that counsels young men on their legal—and moral—rights with regard to Selective Service.

The pageantry and frustration of earlier dissent is framed during scenes from the Spring Mobilization, which drew 500,000 marchers in cities from New York to San Francisco in April, 1967; and scenes from Stop the Draft Week, a series of confrontations with draft boards during which civil disobedience was met by force from police and federal troops, especially at the Pentagon demonstration, which climaxed last October. Now feeling that these marches were merely "acting out impotence," young men such as David Harris are moving increasingly toward resistance, seeking, in Savio's words, "a movement for white liberation."

The radicals contend that the current political and social order lacks an outlet for dissent. Among Negroes, conversely, the Black Power Movement has imparted "community and cohesion," according to University of Wisconsin history professor William Appleman Williams. But some dissenting action involves members of both races: at present, the Peace and Freedom Party has both Negro and white candidates.

The new activists are contrasted with those youths who have recently emigrated to Canada. Interviewed in their new retreats, they contend that "radical politics is playing a silly game," and call Canada "a very nice jail." Harris argues, "if you're going to fight dragons, you might as well fight them where they live."

Cameras follow Savio, Harris, and Carmichael as they propound their views from lecterns, pass out leaflets, consult with friends, participate in demonstrations, and

relax during private moments. But the question which remains, according to Berkeley philosophy professor Herbert Marcuse, is "whether we're in a pre-revolutionary situation."

Hawaii ETV Network will rebroadcast "Net Journal: From Protest to Resistance Monday night at 8 o'clock.

Thursday night at 8 o'clock a different view of dissent is developed on the N.E.T. series "The Dissenters." Irving Howe, one of the leading American proponents of democratic socialism talks with Donald Fouser. Mister Howe, editor of Dissent magazine gives his opinions on a domestic Marshall Plan to aid the cities and the poor; the effect of the Vietnam War on domestic policy, democratic socialism as an alternative to capitalism, and the "New Left."

CRIME

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week I read into the RECORD the sentences given in District court for the previous week for crimes committed with dangerous weapons. A new list is now available, and is just as shocking.

The sentences given in District courts last week are listed below. I hope that these disclosures will spotlight this major part of the crime problem. Only when criminals receive sentences equal to their criminal acts will we see any real decline in the incidence of crime.

These sentences all involve the use of dangerous weapons—a point which should be kept in mind as the Congress considers new gun legislation.

Judge John J. Sirica: An 18-month minimum sentence for second degree murder, and concealing a dangerous weapon.

Judge William B. Jones: A 20-year-old man committed under the Youth Corrections Act for assault with intent to kill, armed robbery, and concealing a dangerous weapon.

Judge Luther W. Youngdahl: A 2-year minimum sentence for robbery, assault with a dangerous weapon, and concealing a dangerous weapon; a 6-month minimum sentence for assault with intent to kill and concealing a dangerous weapon.

Judge George L. Hart: A 6-month minimum sentence for assault with intent to kill and assault with a dangerous weapon; another 6-month minimum sentence for assault with intent to kill and assault with a dangerous weapon; and a commitment of an 18-year-old under the Youth Corrections Act for rape and assault with a dangerous weapon.

Judge Joseph C. Waddy: A 3-year minimum sentence for robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon.

Judge Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr.: A 2-year minimum sentence for robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon; a suspended sentence for assault with a dangerous weapon and concealing a dangerous weapon; and a 3-year minimum sentence for assault with intent to commit

robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon.

Judge Leonard P. Walsh: 8 months for concealing a dangerous weapon.

Judge Howard F. Corcoran: A sentence suspended for robbery, assault with a dangerous weapon; and a 19-year-old sentenced under the Youth Corrections Act for robbery, assault with a dangerous weapon, and concealing a dangerous weapon; another sentence of a minimum of 1 year for assault with a dangerous weapon and assault on a police officer; and another sentence under the Youth Corrections Act, this time for an 18-year-old, for robbery and concealing a dangerous weapon.

Judge William B. Bryant: A suspended sentence for robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon; 10 months minimum sentence for robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon; suspended sentence for robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon; a 1-year minimum sentence for second degree murder.

These were the sentence given out in District courts last week for serious crimes involving the use of weapons and murder. To recap, there were two cases of second degree murder. One murderer received a 1-year minimum sentence, the other 18 months. Four men were sentenced under the Youth Corrections Act in spite of the fact that they were 18, 19, and 20 years old and committed serious crimes with weapons—one being convicted of assault with intent to kill. There was one 6-month minimum sentence for assault with intent to kill, and the balance were mostly for robbery and assault with dangerous weapons.

Surely the judiciary of this Nation—and especially of this city of Washington—must come to realize the seriousness of the crime problem and the result of light sentencing. The FBI has for years reported the fact that repeaters account for most of the crime in the United States, and especially for the serious crimes. And any crime committed with a weapon is a serious crime which could and often does result in a death or injury to innocent people.

I have introduced legislation to require a mandatory 5-year sentence, not subject to parole, for any individual convicted of violating Federal law using a weapon. I am asking the members of the District Committee of the House to consider similar legislation for the District of Columbia. If there is any question of the need, one only has to review the sentences listed above, and the ones I reported in the RECORD last week.

OUR FLAG

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the flag of our Nation is just 191 years old, but the spirit which it embodies is as old as the desire of men to live as free people in harmony.

I think that Leonard Young, a fifth grader at Central Elementary School in Andover, Mass., has captured this spirit in his contest-winning Flag Day essay. I include his words at this point in the RECORD:

OUR FLAG

Our flag stands for our whole country. It stands for all the government in Washington and different important people. But most of all it stands for everyone in the whole United States. It is a symbol of all the brave people who have fought and died for our country. It is a symbol of freedom, liberty, advancement, and glory. Everyone should respect it for these reasons. The flag should be honored and treasured above all other things. We should be proud of our flag and its nation.

Everyone played his part in making this nation. Every citizen has a special job that no one else can do. We want a country that is peaceful. So when we think of our flag, we should always, to the best of our ability, do all we can for everyone.

TRIBUTE AND COMMEMORATION OF THE BALTIC STATES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1968, marks the proud 15th anniversary of the founding of the independent Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In 1918, the world saw the reestablishment of these three states after over 120 years of oppression by Czarist Russia. The period between World War I and World War II saw rapid economic and social development by these 800-year-old countries.

But 1968 also marks the sad 28th anniversary of the Soviet Union's aggression and subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In the bloody weeks of June and early July of 1940, the Soviet Union, given a free hand by its non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany, seized control of these three independent nations.

Spurred by mass arrests and deportations, the Lithuanians rose up in revolt against the Soviets during the German advance into Russia and established a free provisional government. But this freedom movement was crushed by the new horror of Nazi oppression and occupation. In 1944, the tides of war changed, and the Soviet armies returned to the Baltic States. Thus for the last 28 years these nations have been under the heel of tyrannies which have killed tens of thousands of their patriots and deported over 10 percent of Lithuania's population.

I join with the many Americans whose homeland lies in these Baltic States in marking these two anniversaries: one bright and one dark.

These Americans who are descendents of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, many of whom reside in my area of Cleveland, Ohio, have become great citizens of this Republic. Through their spirit and heritage, they have contributed to the American democracy.

I join with free men everywhere in praying that the liberty of their homeland may soon be restored to them.

REPORT TO THE CONSTITUENCY
OF THE FIRST DISTRICT OF
MASSACHUSETTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I will shortly be mailing my quarterly newsletter to my constituents, presenting the results of my questionnaire on current issues from Vietnam to gun control. This newsletter also discusses the tasks before us in the coming weeks. For the information of my colleagues, I am placing this newsletter and the results of the questionnaire in the RECORD:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

DEAR FRIEND: Many unexpected, dramatic and genuinely tragic events have occurred since I last wrote you. The most recent and most deeply disturbing of this succession of events was, of course, the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. I am sure that everyone joins with me in extending deepest sympathy to Senator Kennedy's family and in praying that our nation can overcome the terrible violence that has plagued us in recent years.

The turmoil of the past months has imparted even greater urgency to the task of governing the country. Crime control and gun legislation, budget cut and tax increase and other major legislation have all demanded a great amount of energy and attention. In addition, the regular press of correspondence and speaking engagements has been more hectic than ever before. This business has delayed publication of this newsletter and the results of the February questionnaire, which appear on the next page.

Response to the questionnaire was excellent. I want to thank everyone who has taken time to answer it, and I am especially grateful to the academicians who worked with me on the questions and the volunteers at the University of Massachusetts who tabulated the results.

The war in Vietnam still continues to influence every action of the Congress, and like every other American, I am hopeful that the peace talks now going on in Paris will bring a just and an honorable settlement of this conflict.

During this session the Congress has taken effective action in many areas, but a tremendous amount of work remains to be done. We must still come to grips with the major issues facing the nation; the disturbing increase of crime and disrespect for law, the uncertain state of the economy and the great unrest and divisiveness throughout the country.

This is going to take the honest and concerted effort of every member of Congress. You can be certain that I will continue to exert every possible effort to see that this work is carried out as efficiently and as economically as possible.

Corinne and the children have now left the bustle of Washington and will spend the summer months in the beautiful Berkshires. John has just graduated from Deerfield Academy and plans to attend Boston College this fall. Both Michelle and Sylvia, who are sophomores at the University of Massachusetts, have jobs in Pittsfield for the summer and Gayle will be helping her mother.

As I have done for the past several months, I will continue to maintain an active speaking schedule in the First District and I look forward to seeing you at some of these functions.

With best wishes, I am
Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

Tabulation of results of February questionnaire sent to the First Congressional District

1. Which of the following explanations for our involvement in the war in Vietnam do you approve:

To prevent the spread of communism	3,775
To protect the security of the United States	2,628
There is no valid reason for our presence	2,523
To protect the people of South Vietnam from alien rule	1,778
To contain China	1,103
It is American aggression	555
None of the above	370

2. Which of the following courses of action in Vietnam would you recommend?

Step up military pressures	2,784
Gradually reduce military activities and withdraw troops	2,426
Stop the bombing of North Vietnam	1,278
Immediately withdraw U.S. troops	1,029
None of the above	529
Hold military activities at present level	527

3. Do you favor enactment of the Administration's tax proposals which would mean a 10 percent increase on the amount now paid in income taxes by individuals and corporations?

Yes	2,551
No	3,751
Undecided	1,817

4. Do you believe that a tax increase must be accompanied by a further reduction in Government spending in order to be effective?

Yes	5,261
No	950
Undecided	1,946

5. Would you support increased Government expenditures for domestic programs while paying for the war in Asia?

Yes	1,567
No	4,611
Undecided	1,946

6. Regardless of your answer to the above questions, given today's circumstances, in which areas, (if any) of Government spending would you impose reductions?

Space program	3,857
Public works	2,298
Poverty program	2,070
Urban rebuilding programs	1,919
Defense	1,522
Aid to education	861
Foreign aid	650
Water and air pollution	591
No reductions	344

7. Which of the following policies do you favor with respect to our relations with Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe?

Increased non-military trade and other reciprocal steps toward closer relations	5,670
A policy of minimum contact and relations with these countries	1,639
Neither of the above	309

8. Legislation passed by the House of Representatives proposes to fight the rising rate of crime in this country by providing federal grants to state and local governments for the development of programs to improve police, court and correctional systems. Do

you feel this is an effective way for the Federal Government to fight crime?

Yes	3,434
No	840
Undecided	3,809

9. What is your opinion regarding laws pertaining to privately owned arms, such as rifles, shotguns, pistols and revolvers?

Present laws are not adequate for protection of the public	5,206
Present laws are adequate for protection of the public	2,318

10. If your answer to 9 above was that present laws are not adequate, please indicate any of the following additions to the law which you favor:

Prohibit purchase of such weapons through the mails	4,747
Require that all persons owning such weapons be required to register them with state or local authorities	4,468
Other	211

CRIME STATISTICS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Alan S. Krug, a former economist at Penn State, offers interesting statistics on crime which were reported in an editorial in the Baton Rouge, La., State-Times.

The editorial follows:

WHAT A CHAP NAMED KRUG FINDS

Alan S. Krug is a former economist at Penn State.

He also is a student of the statistics of crime and has done substantial research in the relationship between crime and firearms. His sources range all the way from the Uniform Crime Report of the FBI to confidential conversation with card-carrying criminals he would meet in the dark corners of sleazy bars, with way stops between for insurance company, research divisions of universities, state and local law enforcement divisions and other gatherers of data on crime.

The year 1966 is the last one for which comprehensive figures are complete and available. Mr. Krug says that the national tally sheet, from all sources he's taped, show there were recorded 3,243,370 serious crimes in the United States that year.

Of this total, 109,734 of these 3.2 million serious crimes (3.4 per cent) involved firearms, the weapons duly noted including zip guns, gangster weapons (mostly submachine guns are meant by this), toy guns and fake guns (carved from wood or soap to appear as guns). Mr. Krug adds that rifles and shotguns figured in less than half of 1 per cent of the 1966 total of 3,243,370 serious crimes in the U.S.A.

He goes on to say that the grand total of crimes in 1966, from trivial to petty to serious, was in excess of 31 million incidents.

Serious crimes involving firearms amounted to 35,000 of 1 per cent (0.0035) of the grand total of criminal acts that year. Of the grand total, crimes involving rifles or shotguns amounted to 0.005 per cent.

What Mr. Krug's findings show is that if firearms were to be utterly eliminated from human society and no substitute contrived by the lawless, the United States still would have 96.6 per cent of its serious crime and 99.6 per cent of its total crime.

Those who argue that stringent restrictions on firearms would reduce crime substantially are misleading those to whom they

address their words. Most of them know it, too. The facts and they are there to be found, contradict the position utterly.

Mr. Krug finds, too, and duly reports that statistically there is no significant difference in crime rates between those states having general firearms licensing laws and those that do not. He also duly reports a finding, putting all sources together, that the incidence of homicide is not related to the availability of firearms.

It hardly takes research to comprehend, on this latter point, that when human inhibitions against killing are overcome, whatever weapon is readily available will be used.

**JIM BATTIN REPORTS FROM
WASHINGTON**

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newsletter:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JIM BATTIN, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

DEAR FRIENDS: The Excise Tax bill has now been approved by Congress and signed into law by the President. *The pinch on taxpayers will be felt in the next paycheck and in many more to come.* Before that bite starts coming out of your salary or profits, consider other areas that will feel the belt tightening and maybe the pinch won't be quite as bad. The taxpayer, of course, will bear the brunt of this legislation, as he does on every tax bill; but the freewheeling, big-spending federal government has to suffer through this one too. This fiscal legislation was approved by a wide majority of the Congress, but only because the economy had made it practically an emergency measure. It will raise personal and corporate taxes 10% and it will require the Johnson Administration to trim spending by \$6 billion. The bill was unpopular in Congress last year and would never have passed, but this year skyrocketing inflation, soaring interest rates, mounting trade deficits, a serious gold drain and a dollar in serious jeopardy left little choice. At the time the President signed the bill, making it law, it was still unpopular with the Administration. *It was bitter medicine and the President and his Administration were reluctant to take the cure.* There was not much choice on their part either because without the tax increase the Johnson Administration would have faced history as the reign that devalued the dollar. *Things were that bad.*

Now Congress must be charged with seeing to it that the Administration's obligations are carried out to the letter of the law. The Internal Revenue Service will be sure to see that withholding rates are increased immediately. Those of us who voted for the tax increase and spending reductions, even though we didn't support the spending that made this legislation necessary, will be making certain that the President and federal Department heads make the required spending cuts.

Next week the Administration has a prime opportunity to make good the promises of fiscal responsibility. The foreign aid bill which would funnel almost two and a half billion dollars out of our country will be presented to Congress. It seems to me that this is the most likely area for cuts since we are already asking the citizens of the United States to pay their part in saving our economy. The other nations of the world which have benefited by our wealth should also sacrifice when times are bad. But from past experience, I don't really expect the Adminis-

tration to make reductions in foreign aid. If the President refuses to cut expenses in this area, then Congress should act to do the job for him. *The Administration is asking too much for foreign aid to support a foreign policy that has been a proven, miserable failure.* This year foreign aid is in trouble.

There is a good chance that the bill could be outright defeated on the floor of the House. On the Senate side the Foreign Relations Committee is balking at the military aid section. Foreign aid passed last year by only an eight-vote margin and it isn't attracting any new boosters in this, an election year. This year there isn't just the traditional opposition in Congress. Many legislators who have previously voted for foreign aid in the hope that they could buy peace are looking around the world and seeing that we have wasted our money. The give-aways have amounted to \$122 billion over the past 20 years. In that time we have had to borrow the money which the federal government spread around the world and that added an additional \$52 billion in interest charges—a net of \$174 billion.

Every year when the foreign aid bill comes up, I find examples in the Comptroller General's reports of some of the things this money is being spent for. This report is always a good argument for reducing the spending—in fact, for scrapping the entire program. Here are some recent examples: \$11,000 to Canada for a study of fish odors; \$15,000 to determine the geographical movement of mentally unstable persons in Norway; \$33,000 to study Australian crickets; \$40,000 for Australian scientists to discover why Aborigines perspire the way they do; \$23,700 for a study of the life cycle and behavior of ostriches in Africa.

These examples may sound preposterous. They are unbelievable, but they were actually part of the Administration's budget and hidden in obscure parts of the many thousand pages until they were found this year by a research committee of Republicans. Now that Congress has given the President a mandate to cut spending, the budget should be returned to the Bureau of the Budget to give the Administration the opportunity to find all of the programs like these that should be eliminated.

Sincerely,

JIM BATTIN.

DAVID M. McCONNELL

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues for a moment to the recent appointment of David M. McConnell of Charlotte, N.C., as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 45th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council convening this month in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. McConnell will serve not only as a member of our delegation, but also as a Special Advisor to the Council with the rank and appointment of Ambassador of the United States, and he is eminently qualified to do so. Allow me to review his credentials:

David McConnell is an attorney who possesses a broad background in the field of international affairs. Prior to World War II, he was counsel to the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Reorganization and an administrative assistant

to U.S. Senator James F. Byrnes of South Carolina, who later became our Secretary of State.

During World War II, he served as provost marshal and protocol officer with the Nationalist Chinese Army under Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell in China, Burma, and India. He was Chairman of the International Conference at Ramgarh, Bihar Province, India, in 1942, which prepared the Treaties of Military Command and Criminal Jurisdiction of Forces in China, Burma, and India. For this service, he was later awarded the U.S. Legion of Merit and awarded the Order of Cloud and Banner by Chiang Kai-shek.

After World War II, he was chief of legislative branch of the War Department General Staff. Later, he was a co-draftsman of the Declaration of Nuremberg and the Post War Treaty with the Republic of the Philippines.

In closing, may I say that I think it is clear to everyone that we will have a capable, very qualified man representing us at this important Conference in Geneva this month.

CAUSE FOR SHAME

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for 14 years now Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University has been seeking to gather information on the infamous forced repatriation to the Soviet Union of Russians who were in Allied hands at the end of World War II. Some accounts of this highly immoral operation have leaked out to the public, but the bulk of material on the tale of perfidy resides with our own Department of the Army. The seriousness of the tragedy can be judged from the fact that some of those to be returned to the Soviet Union committed suicide rather than face the tyranny of the Soviet leaders. As the Chicago Tribune in its lead editorial of June 30 indicates, the Army is reluctant to make public details of this transaction in which the United States and Britain backed down and acceded to the wishes of the tyrant Stalin.

As the Tribune also points out, millions of Germans were expelled from their homes in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other countries although they had resided in these areas for hundreds of years. Many men, women, and children died as a result of the expulsion.

Although this issue of forced repatriation took place over 20 years ago, it is still an issue which has pertinence today. It will be remembered that the Communists wanted the prisoners of war captured by the Allied forces in the Korean war returned to North Korea and Red China. When given the chance to make their choice, many thousands elected not to return to their Communist homelands. This issue might well be subject of debate during the present Vietnam war. Ho Chi Minh could demand that POW's from North Vietnam now in the hands

of the South Vietnamese be sent back to North Vietnam. The one sure way to insure that there will never be a repetition of the tragedy of World War II is to have a complete airing of the scandalous policy pursued by the United States and Britain at that time. An investigation by a congressional committee publicizing this black mark in our foreign policy at that time would guarantee that our diplomats, if only from a selfish viewpoint, would shy away from being party to a future forced repatriation scandal. But if they can refer to the Yalta cover-up and the successful shielding over these many years of those responsible, some of them might be tempted to try this policy again.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the editorial, "Cause for Shame," from the Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1968, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

CAUSE FOR SHAME

Twenty-three years after the Yalta conference there are still some things about which the United States government finds it advisable to remain discreetly silent. One of these is slave labor after the end of World War II. Another is the forced repatriation of Russians rounded up after the defeat of Germany. A third is the mass expulsion of Germans from their ancestral homes in eastern and east central Europe.

Stanley Resor, secretary of the army, has been constrained to refuse the demand of a member of the research staff at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace for access to documents relating to the roundup of Russians and their transportation back to the Soviet Union.

The application, made by Julius Epstein, who hoped to include the material in a historical work, cited the "freedom of information" act which became effective last year. It permits documents to be declassified if there is no danger to national defense or security.

Resor had an excuse for dodging. The documents, he said, were an international compilation over which the United States did not have sole jurisdiction. The British, he said, would have to be consulted. Meanwhile, he suggested that Epstein "exhaust" other administrative procedures for getting a look at them. Epstein says he has been trying for 14 years.

Some 900,000 anti-communist Russians were shipped home from Germany after the war, with the certain prospect of becoming inmates of slave labor camps or facing a firing squad. President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill of Britain countenanced this operation at Yalta.

They also agreed with the soviet dictator, Josef Stalin, that Russia was to have "the use of German labor" as a form of reparations. In deference to their own sensibilities, the two western humanitarians buried the provision in a secret protocol.

The stipulation that the western powers were to hand back to Stalin his runaway subjects placed American and British military authorities in the role of slave catchers, rounding up refugees from Soviet tyranny.

Hundreds of thousands of German soldiers taken prisoner after their country was defeated were transported to forced labor in the Soviet Union. Years after the end of the war broken survivors were still coming home to Germany. Britain and France also availed themselves of German forced labor. The British had at least 500,000 prisoners at work for them, and a third of these had been supplied from United States and Canadian prisoner-of-war camps.

Equally savage was the fate of the Great

Germans who had been living for hundreds of years in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, as well as the Germans of East Prussia, parceled out at Yalta to Poland and the Soviet Union, and of eastern Germany, handed over to Poland.

It has been estimated that 18 million Germans were forced out of their homes and set on the road westward. More than 2 million men, women, and children are believed to have died in the expulsion.

Churchill, who originally declared that "the expulsion of the Germans is the most satisfactory medium to liquidate the German East," changed his tune after shocked voices in England were heard to say that this uprooting of human beings was the most enormous official atrocity in the world's history. He then saw fit to describe the program which he had sanctioned as "tragedy on a prodigious scale."

None of this, of course, makes Hitler or the Nazis the more admirable. The sad fact is that in war nations which proclaim themselves moral often adopt the most evil practices of the enemy they condemn as immoral.

The thwarted Hoover Institution author concedes that the documents denied him could embarrass a lot of people, but argues that embarrassment is not a sufficient reason to continue suppressing them. History, after all, has been embarrassing rulers and statesmen and showing up their feet of clay since the beginning of recorded time.

FOREIGN AID IN VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1968, a speech containing a number of allegations against the Agency for International Development in their Vietnam operation. I was concerned about these reports and took the time to look into each case individually. I would like to have the results of my investigation printed in the RECORD so that our colleagues may be acquainted with the facts in each instance.

To the allegation that 10,000 blacksmith anvils were ordered by AID for South Vietnam in 1965 and are now in storage in a Saigon warehouse, I found the following:

First. In 1962, AID purchased 500 toolkits for farmers to enable them to do simple repair and construction work. A small anvil was included in each kit. These kits were distributed and the contents used.

Second. In 1964, AID purchased another 1,168 toolkits, each containing one anvil. All have been distributed.

Third. These are the only anvils ordered by AID for Vietnam. And, according to the mission in Saigon, the only anvils on hand in Government warehouses are 100 belonging to CARE.

I also found the allegation that a huge quantity of winter flying suits was purchased with AID funds, was shipped to Saigon and is now in storage in warehouses to be unfounded. AID has not financed or provided any winter flying suits for Vietnam. AID did purchase from U.S. military excess stocks—and issued

to Montagnards—some heavy field jackets and jumpers.

A third statement to the effect that AID has requested \$1 billion in economic aid for Vietnam was, of course, a gross exaggeration. As can readily be seen from the President's foreign aid message and AID's summary presentation to Congress for fiscal year 1969, the request for economic aid for Vietnam is \$480 million.

RUSSELL DOWNING: IN MEMORIAM

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Russell Downing, my constituent and friend, was a very well-known member of the theatrical community in New York City.

While his forte was the business of the theater and motion picture industry and he had been appointed by Mayor John V. Lindsay, my predecessor as Congressman for the 17th Congressional District, to represent him in developing the film industry in New York, was also very active in community and civic matters.

He was probably best known as the managing director of the Radio City Music Hall, that great landmark of entertainment on the Avenue of the Americas at Rockefeller Center.

His passing leaves a void not only for his family and associates but for all those interested in wholesome entertainment.

The following obituary from the New York Times of Saturday, June 29, gives some measure of the man:

RUSSELL DOWNING OF RADIO CITY DIES—WAS PRESIDENT OF THE MUSIC HALL FROM 1952 TO 1966

Russell V. Downing, who retired in 1966 as president and managing director of Radio City Music Hall, died yesterday in his home at 424 East 52d Street. His age was 67.

Mr. Downing continued until his death as a member of the board of directors of the theater. He joined the Music Hall as treasurer in 1933 and became president in 1952.

Mr. Downing was appointed in 1966 by his friend Mayor Lindsay to represent him in developing the film industry in New York.

In an interview at his retirement, Mr. Downing estimated 200 million people had seen stage shows and films at the Music Hall. The average annual total in the 6,200-seat house, he said, was almost 6 million.

FACED WITH COMPETITION

The Music Hall, he said, had gained a large measure of its patronage as a result of its "family entertainment" policy. Maintaining that policy had become increasingly difficult, Mr. Downing said, as Hollywood, confronted with television competition, turned increasingly toward "adult" themes.

In an interview in 1964, Mr. Downing said, "Our aim at the Music Hall is to present clean shows, assembled for appeal to general audiences in attractive surroundings."

"Above all," he added, "we've held down admission prices, as expenses mounted and other theaters were dying everywhere."

"Our tourist trade," he went on, "centers on our traditional Christmas and Easter shows. Then in the summer it starts again as they pile in from all over—South America, Africa, local people and suburbanites, every

state in the Union. Our local people from a radius of about 55 miles, come to us mainly during the in-between times."

Mr. Downing was born in Yonkers on Aug. 11, 1900, and attended the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia University. In World War I he was in the Officers Training School.

RISE IN HIERARCHY

He was treasurer for several Companies before becoming treasurer at the Music Hall shortly after its opening in 1932. In 1942 Mr. Downing was named vice president and in 1948 executive vice president. He also had been an officer of the Center Theater until its demolition in 1954.

He had been a member of the board of directors of Rockefeller Center, Inc., and was a member of the board of directors of Rugoff Theaters, Inc.

Mr. Downing, a friendly yet forceful 6-footer, was chairman of many benefits in recent years, particularly for the American Musical and Dramatic Academy, the National Hemophilia Foundation and New York Polyclinic Medical School and Hospital, of which he was a trustee.

Mr. Downing was active in the Kiwanis Club and the United Service Organizations, which presented its annual Armed Forces Day Award to him in 1964. He was a director of the New York Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Manhattan Kiwanis Foundation.

Surviving are his widow, the former Sally Rush, and a sister, Miss Elsie Downing.

Funeral arrangements were incomplete last night.

EULOGY FOR THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the 6th of June 1968, Auxiliary Bishop Thomas Grady of Chicago delivered the following address on Ed McElroy's newscast on WJJD radio in Chicago, following the death of Senator Robert Kennedy of New York.

WJJD radio is to be highly commended for the superb public service job they performed on the Senators death.

The text of the address delivered by the Most Reverend Thomas J. Grady, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, follows:

MacLean, Virginia, beyond town is a pleasant area along the Potomac River. It is wooded with tall, old trees whose leaves turn in the sun, flickering the light and shadows that fall below. On the gentle hills, between the trees there are green meadows and paddocks. White fences trace out estates; the homes are hidden. MacLean is a place for gracious living.

Robert Kennedy lived there with his wife and ten children and horses and ponies and dogs and pets. Robert Kennedy loved his wife and children. He loved life brimming and full. He loved the keen edge of life. He loved to roar down the Colorado River in a rubber raft—to climb the high white ski slope to take danger and the wind in his teeth as he flashed down the hill.

With his long hair flopping on his forehead, he was like a boy—a boy who had successfully managed a Presidential Campaign, who had been Attorney General of the United States, who was a United States Senator, who was bidding for his country's highest office.

He was a rich man, but he loved the Harlem Negro, the migrant worker of California,

the Mid-West farmer, the Detroit factory worker, the Florida shrimp-fisher. He was able, and he was willing to serve them all.

The life he loved so much he wanted to share well and equally with all Americans; with the men of all the world.

Robert Kennedy is dead. America has dimmed a bit. Life has dimmed a bit.

MICHIGAN PARTICIPATION IN THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, Michigan currently has a delegation of Boy Scouts from our cities affiliated through the Town Affiliation Association and People-to-People agency, living in homes in British Honduras, our partner state under the Alliance for Progress.

Last August, seven Scouts from British Honduras lived in the homes with Scouts in the Ann Arbor area, and now a slightly larger number of our Scouts went to this beautiful country to help teach crafts and skills to the growing Scout organization there. Our boys went there on June 29, and will move from one community to another until August 1, when they will participate in the national Scout camp for 2 weeks, again exchanging a knowledge of skills with the Central American Scouts who have been a part of the British Scouting movement for 51 years.

The National Association of the Partners of the Alliance hopes to organize town affiliations linking cities in States already affiliated with Central and South American States and nations through the Alliance for Progress. Michigan is pleased to pioneer new programs which can be helpful elsewhere.

Fourteen-year-old Alfredo Martinez is now attending a workshop in creative writing at Olivet College in Michigan on a full scholarship provided by the college to the winner of a national essay contest the Michigan Partners recently conducted in British Honduras. He met all the Michigan Scouts now in Belize, as the nation will be called after it becomes independent, before they left their own homes, and our Scouts will visit his home in Orange Walk Town.

Exchanges of students and letters, as well as the development of the economy through investments, tourism, and so forth is important to Partners of the Alliance or any other international programs, since the future of every nation will depend upon the ability of future generations to understand each other and work together.

I would like to congratulate Alfredo Martinez for winning the essay contest, Jay Oakley, from Ann Arbor, for heading the Michigan delegation of Scouts, and all the Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, high school and college students participating in various exchanges of letters and people and scholarship programs.

We are pleased that Michigan already has about 20 sister-city affiliations with nations in various parts of the world and is currently starting additional people-

to-people affiliations of this kind. We are especially pleased that Michigan, where the first State council of people-to-people was organized in November 1965 at the Ann Arbor City Hall, has developed a high degree of cooperation among communities in our own State even if their partner cities are in different nations and has developed a close cooperation between people-to-people, the Michigan Partners, and many other programs which deal in various ways with international friendship by means of citizen volunteer efforts.

MEMORIAL DAY REMARKS OF JACOB B. BERKSON

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day Mr. Jacob B. Berkson of Hagerstown, Md., was chosen to speak at ceremonies at the Washington County Courthouse as the representative of several county veterans' organizations.

Mr. Berkson is a former member of the Maryland House of Delegates, a former magistrate and former county attorney. His remarks on our current problems and American ideals are very interesting and challenging, and I would like to place them in the RECORD at this point:

LOOKING AT THE NATION ON THIS MEMORIAL DAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is the text of a Memorial Day talk delivered by Jacob B. Berkson in behalf of various county veterans' organizations in front of the Washington County Courthouse on Sunday. Berkson is a former member of the Maryland House of Delegates, a former magistrate and former county attorney.)

On Memorial Day 1968 we pause to honor our fathers, brothers, friends and neighbors who gave their lives that we and our government may live and prosper.

They whose names are inscribed in bronze before the Court House are remembered now because the American Legion, the VFW, and other patriotic Veterans organizations labor in the vineyard of good deeds, and the local newspaper takes the time to record the customs and traditions that have made this nation great.

Every citizen has a stake in his government. But government has become big and complex and impersonal and it is difficult for little people like you and me to be heard by our government and yet a man who is called upon to lay down his life for his country has a right to know the reason for his sacrifice. Those we honor today rest in peace. Their voices are stilled. We who are alive are not at peace. Our voices must not be still. Otherwise their sacrifice would have been in vain. So we shall speak for them today.

It seems to me we are living in an age of insanity.

We were raised to believe in honor, duty, and country. We were taught that honesty is the best policy, that our country is the greatest in the world, that here all people will have equal justice under law. And in exchange for the privileges of liberty and freedom each citizen has a responsibility to serve our country in war and in peace.

When we were children, our country was

at peace with China, Russia, France, Vietnam, and the rest of the world.

What has happened in this world since you and I were children?

You remember when we were school children, we collected money to save the Chinese people from starvation. We saved the Chinese from destruction by the Japanese in World War II. Now more than 500 million Chinese march to the verse of Communist dictators who have taught the Chinese people to hate us and to work to destroy us. What did we do to deserve this treatment?

Our fathers fought in World War I to save France from the Hun. Our brothers fought in World War II to save France from the Nazis. Thousands of American and British boys are buried in France. Yet the President of France has insulted us, and worked against us, and attempted to destroy the value of the U.S. dollar in recent years.

The U.S. saved Russia from German destruction by supplying her with war material in World War II and by fighting Germany on two fronts. Russia rewarded us after World War II by forcing us to fight a cold war around the world and at times a hot war. Still our government approves and permits trade with Russia. We still supply her with war material. Banks which we control lend Russia money to build factories. She uses factories to build tanks and guns which she ships to her allies who use the tanks against American boys. Surely it is insane to trade with Russia. Is there a distinction between strategic and nonstrategic material when trading with an enemy? Whatever we ship her enables her to use other resources for War purposes.

If those nations for whom we have done so much have treated us so badly, what have our own leaders done for us? During the last presidential campaign the successful candidate made a solemn commitment to the American people that he would not send American boys to Asia to fight in a war that should be fought by Asian boys. Contrary to this commitment American boys were sent to Vietnam in Asia. This was done in the name of a commitment to a foreign nation. It has proven to be a commitment to tragedy, death, destruction, and insanity. We have destroyed villages and people and our government says we do it to save them. We kill people to save them. It is insanity.

If our leaders have committed us to a land war in Asia, should they not commit themselves to winning it? Is it conceivable that this nation which went from near destruction at Pearl Harbor to victory in the South Pacific, to victory against fanatical Japanese dug into concrete bunkers and jungles at Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Okinawa, Iwo Jima, the Solomons, the Philippines and to victory over tough Germans and Italians in Europe and Africa—is it conceivable that we cannot defeat a tenth rate power like North Vietnam. Why did we win all our other wars, but the ones since World War II?

When we were in service we knew that our country would attempt to rescue us if we got captured. Yet the USS Pueblo was captured months ago by another tenth rate power—North Korea and her crew is still captive of the enemy. Was there an attempt at rescue? Why was this ship placed in such a position of peril without protection from other ships or from air defense? Could this have happened when Theodore Roosevelt was President of the U.S.? No nation would have dared capture a U.S. warship, whether it was in her own waters or not. America used to be respected by foreign governments. She was respected because she was strong, and was not afraid to use her strength. Because she had leaders who lived up to the American tradition.

We were taught to honor authority. But today we see a rebellion against authority all over the world. We see the hippie standing for filth, slovenliness, and lack of discipline,

the draft dodger standing for no responsibility to our country and the corrupt politician interested in his own enrichment, and not in doing what is best for America.

The problems which face us today are enormous.

The colored in our nation have been exploited for generations. They have not been treated as equals. Now they tell us they want their freedom and now or they will burn down our cities. We must recognize this is a problem and each of us must help to solve it, especially our leaders. It will not go away. It will not get better by itself, only worse. Those leaders who advocate the status quo and keeping the Negro in the ghetto do not understand the lessons of history. This is a revolution. Guns cannot destroy ideas. If we do not work to solve these problems we will live in an armed camp, and fear and anxiety will be with us every day of our lives. We must learn to live together as brothers or we shall all perish as fools.

There is a treatment for insanity. It is difficult, long, and expensive, but if we are to pass on to our children and our posterity the ideals for which America stands—Equality, Justice, Brotherhood, then we had better undergo some treatment. The inmates cannot run the asylum, the prisoners cannot take over the prisons, the students cannot run the universities, the spoilers cannot govern this nation.

America is beautiful. Our heritage, our schools, our mountains, our streams, our forests, our farms must be preserved, protected and developed, and our precious children must be permitted to enjoy the America we have fought and died to preserve.

Is it not clear that we are fighting a war for survival?

When you honor today those who died for our country, you bring honor also to yourselves. You say to the world. We have not forgotten. We shall not forget your sacrifice. You have not died in vain. Although the world may seem to have gone mad and we are living in an age of insanity, the memory of your supreme sacrifice has inspired us to keep alive the ideals of democracy and we shall pass on the torch of freedom to our children. God grant us the courage and wisdom to survive this age of insanity.

JACOB B. BERKSON.

DAVID MOFFATT McCONNELL

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the President has exercised great wisdom in his choice of David Moffatt McConnell, of North Carolina, to be a member of the U.S. delegation to the 45th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council convening in Geneva, Switzerland, in July–August 1968.

It is my privilege to know Mr. McConnell, who will also be a special adviser to the Council, with the rank and appointment of Ambassador of the United States, as a personal friend of many years' standing.

David McConnell has distinguished himself in many fields of endeavor over the years, bringing great credit not only to himself but to all who have had the opportunity to be associated with him. His list of accomplishments is lengthy and noteworthy, both in civic and political affairs. Since his contributions will

be enumerated by other colleagues, I will let it suffice to say that the President could not have chosen a more dedicated or a more able American citizen to represent the United States at this forthcoming United Nations Economic and Social Council session than my good friend, Dave McConnell, of Charlotte, N.C.

I applaud the President's wise selection.

BRITISH SOCIALISTS GO FASCIST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the action of the British Socialists in barring free speech in the Parliament only serves to show the free world the collapse of that once gallant empire.

Dictatorship is a nasty word—especially if it approaches the truth. And the rank and file Britisher does not realize yet he is under control of the Red-Black bloc of the United Nations and not the Queen.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit a clipping from the New York Times for May 25 and a report by Mr. Gwynne-Evans for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 25, 1968] COMMONS OUST A WOMAN M.P.—TORY, 72, IS BARRED AFTER SHOUTING AT HOUSE SPEAKER

LONDON, May 24.—For 15 minutes last night, Dame Irene Ward, a 72-year-old Conservative member of Parliament, stood in the House of Commons shouting, "Dictatorship!" at the speaker.

Finally the speaker, Dr. Horace King, ordered the sergeant-at-arms to escort Dame Irene from the chamber. The speaker barred her from the Commons for five days.

"I am striking a blow for freedom," Dame Irene told newsmen. "A free Parliament no longer exists in Britain. The British people, under the surface, are boiling."

She was protesting the Labor Government's tactics in attempting to put through a large amount of legislation, including attempts to limit debate on major bills, scheduling of a large number of simultaneous committee meetings and frequent all-night sessions.

COMPLAINT ON DRINKING

Twice this week Members of the Commons have been kept on the benches throughout the night in sessions lasting more than 17 hours. Laborites as well as Conservative legislators have been angered by the Government pressure.

The case of another woman Member of Parliament who complained that her colleagues spent too much time drinking was referred to a committee today.

Winifred Ewing, the Common's only Scottish nationalist member, had written in her local newspaper that "the customary stance of some M.P.'s while at the House is closer to the many bars than the bar [entrance] of the House."

William Hannan, a Labor M.P. from Scotland, said that the letter was a breach of parliamentary privilege and the Speaker, Horace King, referred the matter to the Committee on Privileges.

If the committee finds against Mrs. Ewing, it could have her publicly censured in the Commons.

GROWTH OF DICTATORSHIP IN BRITAIN
JANUARY 7, 1968

(By Mr. J. Gwynne-Evans)

"The resources of civilization are not yet exhausted" said Mr. Harold Wilson after his threats had failed to prevent the House of Lords from exercising their undoubted right and duty to revise and delay legislation of the Commons which they consider hasty or unwise. These dictatorial threats are especially abhorrent from a Party that has lost the majority support of the electorate, as indicated by a series of disastrous by-elections.

Hats off to the Lords who refused to bow to the Labour threats, the feeble left-wing advice given by many national newspapers and the anti-Rhodesian ravings of Peers like Lord Alport. Lord Salisbury acted with astuteness, courage and perseverance, and the fight goes on. The Labour Government may well be brought down before their threats against the second chamber take effect.

Lord Alport's heavy words, "If we are to help to prevent the tragedy for Rhodesia . . . we must . . . apply sanctions as whole heartedly and effectively as possible", are devoid of humanity and very foolish, for he is well aware that South Africa will send armed forces into Rhodesia should the desired economic disruption result in a breakdown of law and order in the country. Curious also that he contradicts Sir Alec Douglas-Home's statement after visiting Mr. Ian Smith that "negotiations with Rhodesia are possible and desirable". Lord Alport's broadcasts from Francistown against the Rhodesian Government, though seldom heard in Rhodesia, are well known. Is he going to defect to the Labour Party? I sent him a copy of the extremely moderate Rhodesian "Report of the Constitutional Commission" (Whalley Report) which advocates eventual parity between the races in Parliament. No acknowledgement or good word for this far-reaching compromise has reached me. Lord Alport told the Sunday Times that Mr. Smith has no power to guarantee any constitution. Even Hitler couldn't bind his successors. So what is the point of the statement?

Why did Lord Carrington, leader of the Conservatives in the Lords, whilst ably resisting threats from Mr. Wilson, go out of his way to antagonize Prime Minister Ian Smith, in his speech winding up the debate for the Tories? He said ". . . do well without the advice of Mr. Smith . . . I certainly do not wish to bring comfort to Mr. Smith". What is the point of giving something with one hand, viz. opposing mandatory sanctions, and then taking it back with the other, viz. insulting the chief elected representative of the Rhodesian people. The effect of this stupidity is to nullify the feelings of many Rhodesians that the advent of Conservative power in Britain would increase the overall chances of an agreement between the two countries and that it would be wise to go slow on all measures likely to bring about a complete break between them. Such statements are very frustrating to people like myself who are working to keep Rhodesian connections with Britain going, such as the retention of the Union Jack on the Rhodesian flag and the continuation of loyalty to the Queen—but as "Queen of Rhodesia" under an independent Rhodesian Government. If Lord Carrington would realize that sanctions are no more likely to bring down the Rhodesian Government than are Labour threats proving effective in muzzling the Lords, then he will have gone some way in helping to resolve the Rhodesian problem.

Conservatives are slowly but surely coming to realize that economic chaos in Rhodesia will not help one bit, Britain, Southern Africa or the Western World, in this vital strategic area. But too many of them are resisting the conclusion that sanctions are bound to fail

to topple the Rhodesian Government whilst South Africa is economically strong. Their thinking is therefore inconsistent and muddled. A large increase in economic and other pressures might conceivably encourage the wholly undesirable (from Britain's view) result that the Rhodesian Front would aim to replace Mr. Smith and some of his front benchers with stronger right-wing men. Such a change would hardly promote the aims that these sanction-supporting Conservatives want for Rhodesia; on the contrary it would put finis to moderate solutions. So these sanction-supporting Conservatives are doing a grave disservice to the cause they espouse, which is presumably the "five-principles". The best way to foster these principles is to give encouragement to Mr. Ian Smith, who is a moderate in the Rhodesian Front, to believe that the advent of a Conservative return to power in Britain is likely to result in the abolition of sanctions and an agreed settlement. Less than this is clearly encouraging the Rhodesian Front to get rid of its more moderate elements. I don't know who your advisers are, but they are playing on a very sticky wicket indeed if they think that the continuation of sanctions is likely to put another Party in power in Rhodesia, other than the Rhodesian Front. Should sanctions be lifted, then such another party more in keeping with the desires of Conservatives, would have a chance to grow.

Sir John Hunt, M.P. was reported in the press a short time ago as saying "it would be a disaster if sanctions were removed from Rhodesia". This is a callous and stupid statement from a fine man. Would Sir John Hunt succumb to sanctions if he was a Rhodesian himself? He didn't give in to Everest, so he certainly would not. Nor will the Rhodesians.

The statements of sanction-supporting Conservatives like Lord Alport, Lord Carrington, Sir John Hunt and many others, have the effect of antagonizing further the embittered and strained feelings of the average Rhodesian for Britain and so act as a powerful hinderance to a negotiated settlement. Whilst sanctions are round their necks there is only one thing most Rhodesians worth their salt can do and that is to go on fighting them with a growing contempt for their British parents who have turned against them.

None of the pink "liberal"-minded politicians of any Party in Britain ever provide facts which in the general run, taking all the ex-colonies together, show that the ending of white rule in Africa has been for the benefit of the indigenous population. If they could prove that Nigeria, Southern Sudan, Ruanda, Congo, Ghana, Somaliland, Zambia, are better off today than under the white rule their case for trying to remove it from Rhodesia would be a lot stronger. Tanzania is now coming under Chinese Communist influence with the £87m. Zambia-Tanzania railway.

The arrogance of Lord Caradon!—"Our finest achievement," he said, "was not in making an Empire, but in ending it." House of Lords 25th January, 1968. So all the efforts and sacrifices of numerous past generations who in India built railways, roads, dams and irrigation canals, harbours and towns, medical services, hospitals, and who ended the terrible evils of thuggee and suttee, and who gave India her civil service, army and parliamentary system and a common language, and above all peace; all these achievements spread over two hundred or so years are inferior in quality, according to Lord Caradon, to the process of handing over power. Shades of the two million, one hundred thousand British dead whose graves are now registered in India!

Except in the minds of "liberals" there is little to boast about in the handing over of power. Far more lives of the indigenous populations have been lost during and soon

after the process, than during the long periods of British rule, probably even including the losses incurred during the two world wars. In 1947-48, the partition of India cost between three and a half to five million Indian lives. Not much to boast about here! In the Southern Sudan, Arabs have massacred one and a half million negroes since independence and the killing still goes on (unremarked upon of course by Anti-Empire types). In Ruanda one hundred thousand Watutsis were massacred in a short time after independence. The Nigerian civil war is nothing to boast about. Losses of one million dead is the estimate of one observer. In the neighbourhood of Dar Es Salaam the majority of Arabs were massacred by the negroes soon after Lord Caradon's "finest achievement."

With the marvellous reasoning power of the "Lib-Lab-Cons" indicated in the two paragraphs above, it is little wonder that sanctions are put upon Rhodesia by sanction-supporting types of all parties.

Time for conservatives to end sanctions.

CONGRESS SHOULD BAR FUNDS FOR
PUBLICLY FINANCED SST

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News recently carried an excellent column by James J. Kilpatrick which concisely and accurately outlines by own feelings about the development of the supersonic transport in America.

As I have pointed out time and again in this Chamber, it would be tragic for Congress to place its approval on further development of the SST until we have more detailed information on the effects of this vehicle upon human beings. We also are in dire need of assurances from the appropriate agencies of Government that limitations will be placed on the designs of the SST so that we do not invite the reoccurrence of those tragedies we have witnessed in the testing stages of this aircraft.

It is my own feeling that Mr. Kilpatrick sums up, in an expert fashion, the thinking of a good number of people throughout the country today on this subject, and I should like to share his article with my colleagues.

Mr. Kilpatrick's article follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD BAR FUNDS FOR PUBLICLY
FINANCED SST

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—Winston Churchill once remarked that the replacement of the horse by the internal combustion engine "marked a very gloomy milestone in the progress of mankind."

The observation may be applied emphatically to development of the SST—the supersonic transport airplane. If this project represents progress in any sense, it is progress to the rear, purchased largely by tax dollars taken from persons who never will fly in the aircraft and will only be irritated by it. It is a particularly arrogant manifestation of man's obsession with hurry-hurry-hurry.

Within the next few weeks, a decision will have to be made in Congress on an appropriation for the SST in the coming fiscal year. The administration has asked \$223 million. At a time of massive federal deficits, the

budgetary crisis alone should demand that the item be deleted.

The SST is a commercial proposition, pure and simple. It is an airliner intended for private use and private profit. Why should the taxpayers be compelled to finance such a venture? Of the roughly \$700,000,000 already plowed into the SST, private capital has provided barely \$50,000,000.

In theory—in very doubtful and speculative theory—the taxpayers may recover their investment some time in the next century out of royalties on sales of the SST. The prospect is pie in the sky.

Proponents of the SST say that the United States must plunge ahead or risk the loss of world aircraft markets to the Anglo-French Concorde or to the Soviet Union's TU-144. The argument is getting weaker all the time. Recent reports indicate that the Concorde is in deep trouble; costs are skyrocketing, orders are few, and the plane—a small one by today's standards—is far behind schedule. The Soviet version offers no significant competition.

Philosophical objections are more compelling still. The SST would carry 280 passengers at a cruising speed of 1,800 miles per hour. Revenue projections are based upon a load factor of 58 percent, or about 162 passengers. The object is to get these particular hurry-hurry travelers from, say Chicago to London in three hours instead of seven. Big deal.

The SST would fly at 64,000 feet. At that altitude, it would create a sonic boom path 64 miles wide. What is contemplated, in brief, is that perhaps 10,000,000 persons on Earth would be subjected to the irritation and property damage caused by sonic booms, in order to serve the convenience of these few humans up above.

The booms are an unavoidable aspect of supersonic flight; and the sole advantage of the SST is its speed. Take that way, and the SST offers nothing that the jumbo jets of 1970 will not provide.

What price progress? How much time really would be saved? What value would it have? The House Appropriations Committee, pondering the whole picture, might boil the issue down to the old wartime question: Is this trip necessary? The answer is plainly, no.

POSTMASTER GENERAL CHAMPIONS CAUSE OF NATION'S POSTMEN

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson is convinced that there is no question about the capability of postal employees to give the Nation excellent mail delivery service—that is, if they are provided with the tools they need to do the job right.

General Watson bemoans the lack of recognition for our dedicated postal employees—and I quite agree with him.

The Postmaster General discussed postal affairs before the American Newspaper Women's Club. Following is an account of his remarks in the June 28 edition of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star:

WATSON CHAMPIONS CAUSE OF NATION'S POSTMEN

(By Jean Powell)

The nation's postmen have at least one champion—their boss, W. Marvin Watson.

He came out and said so in front of an audience that could quote him nationwide.

Postmaster General Watson and his wife were guests of honor at last night's cocktail party given by the American Newspaper Women's Club at the 22nd Street clubhouse.

"You won't find me saying they can't do the work," he declared emphatically. "They can if they have the right tools."

The postmaster explained that if the number of postal employees were cut back to the 1966 level, the people in the new suburban areas which keep springing up around the country might have to come to the post office to pick up their mail.

The Texan who succeeded Lawrence O'Brien two months ago has traveled 20,000 miles, and "I've shook hands with more than 10,000 post office employees" since he took over the post.

"Postal employees get little recognition," Watson said. "See if you can remember when anyone said anything kind about postmen." He cited a survey, however, that shows that 95 percent of the people in the United States are satisfied with the mail service.

During a question-answer period, Watson told the group the one big problem in mail delivery is failure to use the ZIP code.

THE TRAVEL REVOLUTION

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Charleston, S.C., was greatly flattered when the Conference of Southern Governors convened there to discuss mutual problems and to hear some of our country's leaders share their thoughts and anxieties.

One of the leaders of our American business community present at the Charleston function was the new president of Pan American World Airways, Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby.

Mr. Speaker, I have just completed reading a copy of Mr. Halaby's talk, "The Travel Revolution," and I commend it to other American businessmen as an excellent prototype for their future involvements in public speaking.

It was only a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, that, as many of our colleagues will recall, "Jeeb" Halaby was the dynamic, forward-thinking Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. If we did not always agree with "Jeeb" in those days, at least we knew he was busy thinking of, or doing something, to make our airways safer and more secure.

The Government's loss was Pan Am's gain and today Mr. Halaby carries on in the pioneer tradition of Juan T. Trippe, recently retired as chairman of Pan Am's board after more than 40 years' service, and in the footsteps of Harold E. Gray, his predecessor as president and now chairman of Pan Am.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I make Mr. Halaby's speech part of the RECORD:

THE TRAVEL REVOLUTION

(An address by Najeeb E. Halaby, President, Pan American World Airways, before the Conference of Southern Governors, June 18, 1968, Charleston, S.C.)

This seems to be a year for viewing with alarm rather than pointing with pride on

the American scene. I plan to give you more good news than bad in briefly outlining the promise and the problems of American transportation during the years that lie just ahead.

In discussing these promises and problems I will limit my remarks for the most part to air transportation, for aeronautical technology is the leading edge of the mobility revolution which is so rapidly changing both the scale of our world and the relationship of its political units, both large and small.

The factors which characterize any mode of transportation are speed, comfort, reliability and availability. Let us see how the speed of air transportation has changed the scale of our world during one generation.

Just thirty-five years ago we were largely limited to surface travel and we measured the world on a time scale of weeks. This global scale represents your reach in terms of travel time. It is the time it will take you to travel as far as you can on earth before you start coming back to your point of departure. We calculate the scale by dividing half of a Great Circle trip, which is about 12,000 miles, by your average speed over the whole trip.

In 1935, the first Pam Am flying boat crossed the Pacific to the Philippines, cutting the surface travel time of 21 days to 60 flying hours. A few years later the Pan Am Yankee Clipper inaugurated scheduled trans-Atlantic service, cutting the travel time between Europe and the U.S. from six days to just under 24 hours. Meanwhile, domestic airlines had cut a five day transcontinental train journey to an 18 hour flight. We then had what amounted to a four-day world.

This gradual contraction of our travel time scale continued until 1958 when, with the introduction of the modern jets, we suddenly doubled our travel velocities and found ourselves with a twenty-four hour world. It is the remarkable achievement of the aeronautical industry that this phenomenal increase in vehicle speed was accompanied by comparable advances in comfort, in reliability and safety and in the availability of air transportation, in terms of both cost to the traveler and the proliferation of air routes around the world.

The observation that the jet revolutionized air transportation is by now a cliché. What is seldom recognized, however, is that the jet radically affected the standards of all transportation. Jet flight provided a completely new yardstick for man's movement across and around the earth.

If you doubt this, try to reserve a passage to England on the Queen Mary this summer. Or piece together a train journey from Charleston to, say, Dubuque, Iowa. Or agonize while you struggle through an hour of traffic to a big city airport ten miles out of town so that you can catch a jet which will carry you 500 miles during the next hour.

What has happened here is that aeronautical technology has outmoded many of yesterday's concepts of mobility. For long and intermediate-length journeys the competitive struggle was short and decisive. The airplane has in most cases replaced the surface vehicles. In the case of shorter journeys ranging from, say, a hundred miles to our trip out to the airport, the development phase is just beginning.

During the next ten or fifteen years we must completely reorganize our short haul transportation if we are to profit from the opportunities offered by aeronautical technology in the areas of trade, travel and tourism.

This reorganization poses three requirements. It demands continued technological advances. It needs short-term funding and long-term investment. And it requires that the planners and managers of our society—on the federal, state and city levels—the public sector—be aware of what they can expect from and what they must provide for

an advanced technology transportation system.

What are the prospects for air transportation in the immediate future? More of everything—more speed, more travelers, more comfort, greater reliability and safety and a constantly expanding movement of cargo and freight by air. And, if we take proper care of this jet-propelled goose and its golden eggs, we should expect the continued dominance of the United States as the principle architect and builder of the world's air transportation systems.

This rosy prospect is not simply an enthusiast's dream. It is on the way to becoming a reality. Late next year Pan Am will introduce into commercial service the 747 Superjet, an advance technology airplane which is the product of four years of collaborative effort between Pan American and Boeing Aircraft. The 747, while still in the subsonic range, will offer a 10% increase in speed and give us a twenty-two hour world.

With a maximum capacity of 500 passengers and 16 tons of baggage or cargo or 110 tons as a freighter, the Superjet in the Pan Am configuration will carry 365 passengers. It will be the safest and most reliable airplane ever built and it will introduce a new order of comfort and luxury to air travel.

Just a note here. The Superjet is 226 feet long. This is almost twice the distance covered by man's first powered flight. Incredibly, if Wilbur Wright had taken off at the tail of the Superjet on that first flight, he would have landed before he reached the first class seats. I wonder if Wright, visionary that he was, could have looked back over that first airborne hop across the sands of Kittyhawk and possibly visualized that, within a man's lifetime, it would be dwarfed by the shadow of a passenger airplane capable of flying at the speed of sound.

This is not the end of air transportation's story, but simply one of the early chapters. For while we are preparing for the actual operation of the Superjet, with all its advantages, we are aware that even larger planes, capable of carrying as many as a thousand passengers, are well within the state of the art. And at Pan American we are actively planning for an eight-hour world.

This will be accomplished by the SST, which will give us a global time scale that will place all the world's major transportation hubs within the compass of a work day's flight.

This same-day world of the supersonic, in which you will be able to get anywhere you want to go between nine and five, is going to add a new dimension to business travel and a new attraction for the tourist whose goals have always been limited by the travel time involved. If you add to the supersonic's speed and the subsonic Superjet's capacity the availability of airline seats which will be provided by the short and intermediate range 250-passenger airbus now building, you will understand why the aeronautical industry looks upon the next decade or so as the period of the mobility revolution.

Will there be passengers and cargo to fill both these marvelous new vehicles and our present subsonic fleets? The airlines and the plane and equipment builders are investing billions of dollars in their faith that there will be. The predictions are that there will be at least three times as many people flying in 1980 as there are today. This will add up to 768 million air passengers a year. During this same period the air cargo lift will increase seven-fold, from the present 6 billion ton miles to about 41 billion ton miles annually.

These projections make air transportation, now our seventh largest and by far our fastest growing industry, a prime candidate for the role of the greatest single economic lever in this country's 20th Century pattern of development. For the passengers and the cargo carried, the fares and the freight bills paid,

are simply one part of air transportation's contribution to our national economy.

First, air transportation will build foreign tourism in America. And international tourism, the largest single factor in world trade, is America's most neglected industry. We may not have any ancient history and our castles may be dedicated to hamburgers, but we have everything else the tourist could ask for in economy-sized packages. And the U.S. is the one place in the world where you can see this technologically-oriented century as it is. European tourism to the U.S., mostly by air, increased 35% last year. We should continue to encourage this profitable travel flow.

Secondly, air transportation contributes to our foreign trade and our balance of payments. The U.S. aerospace industry, which builds 84% of the civil aircraft flying the free worlds' airlines, now exports 2½ billions of dollars worth of its products every year. That represents 7.2% of all our exports. It is estimated that foreign sales of the 747 Superjet alone will add 3½ billion to our balance of payments by 1975.

And finally, as an employer, the air transportation industry is a domestic social and economic force of major proportions. Between them, the airlines and the aircraft manufacturers now employ well over a million people. If you add to this the employees of all the suppliers and subcontractors and the supporting services such as airports, air traffic control and the communications facilities involved, air transportation obviously must be rated as one of this country's substantial wage and job producers. And as you can judge by our glimpse at the future, the employment growth rate should continue to expand for many years.

The private sector of our economy apparently believes that this is an enterprise which deserves encouragement. Using commercial resources, including the 85% of their own dollar profits which is now reinvested in equipment, the major U.S. trunk lines have projected a 10 billion dollar capital expenditure program in aircraft and supporting equipment between now and 1975.

There are, however, some alarmists in the public sector who apparently believe that you ought to plug the well when you have a small leak in the bucket. Penny wise and dollar foolish, they would restrain trade and discourage travel in order to affect a minor adjustment of scales which are already heavily weighted in our favor. They would abdicate the leadership of a technological revolution in transportation which is one of America's greatest contributions to our century.

The answer to such self-defeating measures is the third of my suggested requirements for the coming mobility revolution. It is the long view and the total view of what transportation can and should mean to the world's most progressive nation. We need, to paraphrase Nathan Bedwell Forrest, the fustest with the bestest to prosper. We need it to survive.

You will notice that we have not yet touched down in this survey of air transportation's promises and problems. We're still in the air and the airport is down there and Big City and its suburbs and industrial parks are just beyond it over there and the Little City is just visible on the horizon. It is at this point of our journey, gentlemen, that air transportation really needs your help.

For we may not get down on the ground for an hour or so. The last few thousand feet may take as long as the journey from a distant city. The reason—too many planes of every description waiting to use inadequate airport facilities.

And when we do land we will probably find that we have to fight traffic and intermodal delays and depend upon outmoded facilities to cover the last few miles of our journey. It is here, at the airport and over

the short haul section of our transportation patchwork, that the jet age becomes stop-and-slow travel. The sudden change in the order of travel times is about 60 to 1 in favor of the aircraft. Even with today's subsonic jets, a New York to London traveler spends about one-third of his total trip time covering the less than 1% of his journey represented by surface transportation. With the advent of the supersonics, the traveler may spend more time getting to and from the airports than he does crossing the continent.

I believe the technology to remedy this short haul discrepancy is on the way. Some of it will be esoteric, like the VSTOL aircraft and the Metroplane busses now on the drawing boards. Some of it will be improved forms of present travel modes, such as high-speed trains and ground effect vehicles. The rest of the system to introduce true mobility to our urban agglomerations may simply be the knowledgeable reorganization of what we have—the planning of freeways and subways and perhaps monorail systems to cut through the surface clutter of our cities.

In all this, the coming mobility revolution depends upon the positive thrust of the public sector—the planners and managers of our federal, state and local political units. Air transportation can do part of the job—just as Pan Am has established a prototype helicopter service from the Pan Am building in the center of New York to Kennedy airport. Large areas of our urban and inter-urban transportation network must be publicly planned and funded. Hopefully, any properly planned advance technology transportation system should eventually pay for itself.

This need for long-range planning is why every state and city should have its transportation board. Thoroughly acquainted with the present state and the future direction of the art, they should match public needs with available and prospective vehicles and systems for a period of as much as two decades in advance. Such an analysis and projection was begun in southern California while I was administrator of the FAA and that state is now coming up with many of the answers to some of the most involved short haul transportation problems in the country.

This same forward looking approach is needed to solve our airport problem. Here, the element of self-interest overrides every other consideration, for the city or area without proper ground facilities for air transportation will be practically isolated and immobilized in the near future. With the coming mobility revolution and the consequent proliferation of air travel and air freight service over both long and short haul routes, the city of the airlines will be the city forgotten.

Recent studies have indicated that a big-city airport can be a largely self-liquidating project over a period of years through users' charges and concession fees. What is needed is long term planning, land acquisition, and financing. Since almost everyone will be an air traveler at one time or another during the years ahead, this would seem to be a logical field for matching federal investments.

I have spoken of the compression of travel time in the jet age. I wish I could point to a comparable compression of our planning time, particularly in the fields of short haul transportation and airport construction. For, there is an urgency here that few people outside the transportation industry recognize. We should be actively planning today for 1980 and the year 2,000. And we should be building tomorrow.

For by 1980 there will be an additional 50 million more Americans pressing their trade and travel demands upon a society which grows increasingly more urbanized. Meanwhile, our Gross National Product should continue to increase at a rate of about 4 per cent annually. Disposable income and the proportion of it spent on travel will increase.

Airline fares and cargo rates, in step with technological advances, will decrease relatively during a period of inflation if labor costs do not overrun productivity. The cumulative effect will be a constantly increasing demand for more mobility.

If this ascending rate of demand ever outstrips our supply of mobility, we will find ourselves facing a barrier to our national growth and progress. Limited transportation could change the very dynamics of our free enterprise system.

We have the technology to meet these demands of our future. The wealthiest nation in the world can surely provide the money. And, I am sure that, with the help of you, who are the ultimate activators of policy of our society, we will find the wisdom and the foresight to solve this major problem of our time.

EDUCATION SYSTEM HAS FAILED POOR PEOPLE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was recently honored by an invitation from the University of Nebraska, at Lincoln, to address the National Seminar for Selected College Deans on Monday, June 24, in Lincoln.

My prepared remarks for this engagement were entitled "Career Education—Key to Our Survival as a Free People," and delivered most eloquently in my absence by Dr. Elizabeth J. Simpson, acting director of the vocational-technical education department of the University of Illinois.

Mr. Lloyd MacDowell, education writer for the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal covered the seminar, and performed an excellent public service in his interpretation of my remarks as they related to vocational education.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call this article to the attention of my colleagues and congratulate Mr. MacDowell on this excellent review.

Mr. MacDowell's article follows:

PUCINSKI: EDUCATION SYSTEM HAS FAILED POOR PEOPLE

(By Lloyd MacDowell)

A root cause of the Poor People's March on Washington is that the nation's educational system has failed those people who are camped in Resurrection City, according to Congressman Roman C. Pucinski, D-Ill.

"It has provided them with no marketable skill—nothing with which to provide them a decent living wage, no sound notions of how to go about looking for a job, dressing for a job, acting on the job, or holding a job," the Congressman said.

"Unemployment is always a tragedy because it is a waste of human resources," he stated. Pucinski told his views in an address prepared for the National Seminar for College Deans and delivered by his consultant on vocational education, Dr. Elizabeth Simpson, acting head of the vocational-technical education department of the University of Illinois. The seminar is being held in Lincoln.

NATIONAL TRAGEDY

"But youth unemployment is a national tragedy."

Since the 1963 Vocational Education Act was passed, the federal contribution has in-

creased from 16% to 26% of total expenditures for vocational education. Pucinski said, and high school enrollment in vocational education has jumped by 42%.

But students with special needs—the ones with the greatest unemployment—have been forgotten, he said. "Fully one-third of our local school districts have no program at all for these hardcore, youthful unemployed."

Only a quarter of the high school students take vocational education, he noted, but only 4% of the vocational students are training for technical fields while those fields are crying for manpower.

Schools call themselves comprehensive, he said, but they operate a shutout system that reroutes the majority of youth to the so-called general curriculum, "in reality the school's excuse for a second-rate education."

AN APPENDAGE

Comprehensive education is "supposed to mean amalgamation," the Congressman stated, "a blending of several diverse themes. Nevertheless, vocational education is treated as an appendage."

He proposed sweeping away the existing curriculum. "Then let's start building again, this time on the assumption that all youngsters will eventually work."

"Let's develop self-awareness in our youngsters, self-understanding of their own abilities, aptitudes and potential."

"This means introduction of guidance and counseling much earlier than at present, probably in the elementary grades."

OPEN LONGER

To serve the community, schools should be open more hours a day, six days a week and students should spend part of their time in the regular work force of the community as paid apprentices or unpaid volunteers, tutors, hospital aides and junior leaders, he said.

At the same time, he suggested, business and industry must come to the school on a regular daily basis as teachers, counselors, curriculum advisers, consultants and inspirational models for future working generations.

"Guidance counselors give detailed instructions on choosing a college, applying for admission or getting scholarships," he pointed out, but almost nothing on choosing a job, approaching an employer, taking IQ and aptitude tests and absolutely nothing about placing students or following them up on the job after graduation."

Congressman Pucinski described a bill, HR16460, which he introduced in April, to increase authorizations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to provide \$325 million for 1969 with increases in succeeding years, reaching \$600 million in 1972 and beyond.

Twenty-five per cent of the new money would be reserved for students with special needs—the academically, socially, economically, physically and culturally handicapped—the hard-to-employ.

Restrictive categories would be removed, enabling the schools to spend monies where they are needed most. States would be required to prepare 5-year plans of their objectives and programs.

LEE MORSE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee Morse, a very able young attorney who has served loyally and ably as chief counsel of the Banking and Currency Committee, is leaving that committee to open

a private practice here in Washington and in Georgia.

I am familiar with the esteem in which Lee Morse was held by those on the Banking and Currency Committee. However, I would like to add that Lee was of great help and assistance to not only the members of his committee, but to all others in Congress who sought his advice and counsel. His services will be missed by me personally as well as his committee and the entire House. I am sure that this bright and able young man will meet with much success and I know I speak for other Members when I wish him the very best in the future.

BLACKBURN BLASTS ADMINISTRATION FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY FOR TAX INCREASE

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, the House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 15414, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. When this measure was before the House, I cast my vote in favor of the conference report because I knew that it was essential to the preservation of our domestic economy that the \$6 billion reduction in expenditures and 10 percent surtax be instituted.

Since that time, I have received many inquiries concerning my position on this measure. For the information of my colleagues and the people of the Fourth District of Georgia, I hereby insert a statement which I presented to the press on this issue:

[News Release from Congressman BEN B. BLACKBURN, June 21, 1968]

BLACKBURN BLASTS ADMINISTRATION FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY FOR TAX INCREASE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman Ben B. Blackburn (R-Ga.) today blasted a "fiscally irresponsible Administration and a 'doormat' 89th Congress which endorsed that irresponsibility" for creating a fiscal crisis in America, a crisis which "had to be resolved partially by a tax increase and a significant decrease in federal spending programs."

Blackburn pointed to the country's spiraling inflationary trend, a trend that will "cut deeply into the payrolls of every housewife, and work a cruel hardship on the elderly, the retired, and others with small fixed incomes."

"However, an inflationary trend, now approaching 5% a year, carries with it a much greater danger—that of forcing a devaluation of the dollar and the subsequent financial chaos this would work at home and abroad," Blackburn continued.

"Today, international financiers are holding dollar demands totaling in excess of 35 billion dollars (with our gold reserves now at only \$10 billion and dropping steadily). These financiers are becoming increasingly unwilling to hold those dollar demands in view of inflationary trends in the United States."

"In addition, the federal deficit this year has been forecast to be as high as 31.5 billion dollars. Such a deficit would be intolerable and could increase inflationary pressures even more."

Commenting on the tax bill passed by Congress on Thursday by a vote of 268 to 150,

Blackburn said that he "recognized that no one wants to have his taxes raised. I certainly do not. But, I think the people of this country fully understand that our fiscal affairs are in serious difficulty.

"The removal of the gold cover exposed the seriousness of our balance-of-payments problem—a problem that could best have been eased by cuts in foreign aid, troop outlays in Europe, and other spending by the government.

"But, the present Administration did not cut spending. It prevailed upon its allies to take temporary steps, such as the dual-price system of gold and the S.R.D.'s. These are only stop-gap measures."

The tax increase was tied to a \$6 billion cut in spending programs. "After 18 months, the 90th Congress has forced the Administration to accept a significant cut in its spending," Blackburn affirmed.

"During that time, I have consistently stated that the Administration must cut back on the lavish spending programs which have led us to this crisis.

"This tax increase will absorb only a part of the huge deficit facing the country this year as the Administration continues, year after year, to pile error upon error and deficit upon deficit.

"Fiscal responsibility will be one of the major issues facing the country this year, and the Congress has shown it has the courage to do what is best for the country, buying valuable time until the American people can make their will known this November."

A CLEAR ASSESSMENT OF GREECE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most complete, balanced, and accurate accounts of recent developments in Greece during recent years appears in the latest issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*. Since the coup of April 1967, much misinformation has been printed and many emotional words have been spoken in defense of the military dictatorship that now rules the country. The following analysis by Elizabeth B. Drew, Washington editor of the *Atlantic*, casts much light on what is happening in Greece today, and why it is happening:

DEMOCRACY ON ICE: A STUDY OF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD DICTATORSHIP IN GREECE

In March, 1947, President Truman sent to Congress a special message urging that the United States help Greece "to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy." The "Truman Doctrine" was followed by the Marshall Plan and another collective arrangement to secure Europe against Communism, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a partnership based on devotion to "the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law." Twenty years and one month after Mr. Truman's appeal for aid to Greece, a small group of colonels, using NATO arms and a NATO plan, overthrew the Greek parliamentary government. King Constantine protested to our ambassador that some "incredibly stupid, ultra-right-wing bastards" had "brought disaster to Greece." Our ambassador cabled Washington that it was "the rape of Greek democracy."

The U.S. government declined to denounce the coup, continued to arm the junta with all but the heaviest military equipment, and has been moving toward a resumption of more military aid and normal relations with

a regime that has suspended constitutional government and is showing no haste in putting it back, jailed thousands and tortured some, and even purged the military force which the United States had built up at a highly visible and heavy U.S. presence—aside, for morality is an elusive and perhaps even dangerous basis for foreign policy, it is worth examining our Greek policy in the terms in which the policy-makers defend it: that we have had no choice, that it is realistic, that it is in our interests, especially our interest in preserving NATO. It is also instructive to see how we got to this point.

An objective statement of the history of the U.S. involvement in Greece inescapably has a ring of liberal paranoia. It is simply a fact, however, that from the time that the United States replaced Great Britain as, in effect, Greece's protector after World War II, a highly visible and heavy U.S. presence—the embassy, the military, and the CIA—cast its lot with Greek royalist-rightist-military circles. We approved prime ministers, interfered in elections, and passed upon military promotions. The CIA considered Greece of special importance for operations in the area, and in the post-war period it trained and controlled the Greek intelligence agency.

The palace and the military were the instruments for overcoming the Communist insurgency and general chaos that followed World War II. During the war, the resistance movement against the Nazi occupiers had been taken over by Communists; a full-scale civil war ensued after the invaders withdrew. An exhausted Great Britain was in no condition to restore order, so the United States, through the Truman Doctrine, moved to offset the real possibility of a Communist takeover. The royal family, returned to its unstable throne by a plebiscite after the war, was considered at the time, even by the substantial numbers of anti-royalists in Greece, as important for restoring unity. There was no center to speak of at that point. The palace secured its power through alliances with the military, the highly protected business oligarchy, and rightist politicians. It saw to it that no prime minister became too independent. The United States saw to it that whoever was prime minister viewed Greece's needs, particularly its need to arm for the cold war, as the United States did. The American ambassador hunted with the King; the embassy staff circulated with rightist politicians and businessmen; all were agreed that Greece must be protected from internal and external Communism; it all worked very well; it was all done in the name of democracy.

In the early 1960s, the growing centrist Center Union Party, headed by George Papandreou, who charged the Karamanlis government with protection of special interests and with failure to address Greece's deep economic and social problems, did increasingly well at the polls. In 1963, Karamanlis became too independent for the royal family's tastes, and he was eased out of office. Papandreou defeated Karamanlis in a 1963 election, but with an insufficient plurality to form a government. He refused a coalition with the Communist-front party, and early in 1964 won office on his own with the highest percentage in modern Greek history. Papandreou installed his son, Andreas, as Minister to the Prime Minister, one of the most powerful government positions. From that point on, Andreas Papandreou became the focus of Greek political upheavals and American participation in them.

Andreas Papandreou was born and educated in Greece, but while at the University of Athens during the 1930s, was imprisoned and exiled for participation in a left-wing student movement resisting the military dictatorship established by the royal family. For the next twenty years, he lived in the United States, married an American, and became an American citizen. He earned a

Ph. D. in economics at Harvard, served in the U.S. Navy during World War II, was recognized as a distinguished economist through teaching at the University of Minnesota and heading the economics department at Berkeley, and was active in the campaigns of Hubert Humphrey and Adlai Stevenson. He returned to Greece to work on economic planning during the Karamanlis government, and then joined his father's government.

Brilliant, arrogant, charming, given to demagoguery, and, particularly at the beginning, politically inept, Andreas Papandreou fought all his battles at once and thereby managed to antagonize concurrently the palace, the military, the conservative business circles, and the American establishment in Greece. He forced through a plan giving the Greek cabinet, rather than the CIA, direct control over the Greek intelligence agency. He called for social reform, for greater independence for Greece under NATO, for a reduction of palace dickerings in military and political affairs. With the help of his American economist friends, he drew up the first comprehensive economic plan for Greece, and pushed a reform program similar to Western European social democratic programs. He played to Greek popular opinion on Cyprus, and with his father rejected the American proposal for a division of the island, a stand for which top State Department officials never forgave them. Suspected as he was by both right and left of actually being an American CIA agent, resented as he was for entering Greek politics at the top after a twenty-year absence, Andreas Papandreou played hard on the nationalistic chords and refused to compromise with the ruling circles. In time, he became the most popular political figure in Greece.

The response of the highly annoyed American Embassy staff was to drop him. On the whole, the staff never established the same diplomatic or social rapport with the Center Union party that it had had with Karamanlis' party. When the coming political crisis developed, only the American chargé d'affaires, Norbert Anshuetz, made it a point to keep in contact with Andreas Papandreou, and that was done on the quiet, in the private homes of Americans living in Athens.

Early in 1965, General George Grivas, the rightwing royalist commander of the Greek Army on Cyprus and rival of Archbishop Makarios, with whom Andreas had allied himself, reported to King Constantine that Andreas, a highly popular figure on Cyprus, had been plotting with some dissident troops there, who had formed a club called *Aspida*, to overthrow the government in a "Nasserite" coup. A few months after the sensational "*Aspida* plot" story broke, George Papandreou became locked in dispute with the King over Papandreou's desire to fire his defense minister, who had been dealing with the King and Grivas against Andreas, and appoint himself to the post. Over that issue, the Papandreou government was ousted in July, 1965. There were serious riots, which proved to some of the American Embassy staff that Andreas was dangerous.

The events of 1965 were the beginning of the end of Greek prallamentary democracy, and led directly to the current situation. In the confrontation between an unpopular royal family and popular political figures, American policy-makers were on the side of the palace.

For the next several months, there was political chaos. The King dared not call elections, for the Papandreou would have won. Anshuetz, now in charge of the embassy in the absence of a U.S. ambassador for several months, informed the King that the United States would not approve a dictatorship, which the King was considering, but that it would go along with moves that were technically constitutional. Whether the King's subsequent moves were or were not constitutional is subject to some debate. He made

several attempts to establish a new government through the more palace-oriented minority of the Center Union party. His tactic was to stall for time, meanwhile working to destroy the Papandreu's popularity. Despite our official neutrality, some of the embassy's staff members helped him. Andreas, they had decided, was inimical to America's interests, and his return to power should be forestalled. If this meant forestalling elections, so be it. They assumed that the Papandreu's following was a passing phenomenon. American Embassy employees and military representatives circulated through Athens denouncing Andreas Papandreu. Americans were in the chambers of parliament urging deputies to cooperate with the King's attempts to form a rump government. Although Andreas Papandreu was not brought to trial for the Aspida plot, their position was that of course they couldn't be sure, but, you know, where there's smoke . . . One former American official who was in Athens at the time argues that we should have been using our extensive influence "to prevent the subversion of constitutional government. . . . We were extremely influential," he says. "But many people in Washington and the embassy and the military didn't like Andreas, and were happy. It wasn't just that we didn't protest; we cheered. We didn't look ahead one inch."

The State Department says that it was surprised by the coup of April 21, 1967, but the only surprise could have been that it was not the coup it was expecting. Elections had finally been scheduled for May, almost two years after the Papandreu were ousted. It was increasingly clear, however, that despite everyone's efforts, the Center Union party, with Andreas Papandreu now at the zenith of his popularity, would win. The United States knew that if that happened, a group of generals, with the cooperation of the King was planning to seize power. The CIA had suggested that in order to forestall the generals' coup, it set to work to win the election for the right, or at least strengthen the right to the point where the Center Union could not win. (The form of CIA interference would be the usual in such circumstances: money for publicity, for buying off election officials, for stuffing ballot boxes, and so on.)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk vetoed the suggestion for three reasons: it would be a messy business; it would place the United States squarely in opposition to a reform movement; and for what is known in government circles as the "Bay of Pigs reason," it was a shaky proposition in which the CIA could not guarantee the outcome. Which reason weighed most heavily in the decision is not clear. And so we waited for the inevitable. The American ambassador, Phillips Talbot, in several conversations with the King indicated that the United States hoped that Greece would not be taken over by a military junta, and that if the King did feel that he must suspend the constitution, he wouldn't do it for very long. We hoped, it was suggested—indirectly, of course, for one must be delicate in talking to a monarch about his plans for a coup—that he would be just as constitutional about it as he could. But, as one official in Washington puts it, "We were ready for the generals."

Exactly why the colonels stole the coup from the generals is not known. It may be that they feared that the King, who after all had been contemplating his coup for some time, was temporizing once again. It may be that they knew the Americans felt about the Papandreu, and believed that since the United States was at least implicitly concurring in the King's coup, it would not object to this change of personnel. It may have come from their own frustrations within the ranks, for these were "country boys" from the lower middle class who were never going to rise to the military top. Colonel Papadopoulos, the leader of the coup, at one point the contact man between the CIA and Greek intelligence, had a con-

troversial reputation as a fanatic Communist-hunter. Their reasons may simply have been what they said they were: their desires to "purify" Greece politically and morally and to save it from Communism. It is their literal carrying out of this program which has given the junta its comic-opera overtones: the banishment of beards and mini-skirts, the forbidding of the playing of music of suspected Communists. And also its ominous ones: the widespread arrests, continuing on a smaller scale today, the apparent resort to torture, the prohibition of gatherings of more than five persons, and so on.

In any event, on April 21, a triumvirate of relatively low ranking officers—Colonel Papadopoulos, Brigadier Patakos, and Colonel Makarezos—took from the drawer the "Prometheus Plan," a NATO contingency plan for a military coup in the event of a Communist take-over, rolled out the NATO tanks, and seized Greece.

As it happened, they didn't have very much of it at first. The Navy, the Air Force, and the Army in the north, which outnumbered the southern army ten to one, were not with them. Therefore, what happened in the early hours of the coup made the difference. Since the colonels acted in the King's name, there was some confusion in Athens and in Washington at first as to just whose coup this was. Then, when Talbot made his way to the palace, he found that King Constantine was quite beside himself. Condemning the "incredibly stupid, ultra-right-wing bastards" who had stolen his coup, he asked if the United States might send marines to help him and the generals regain control, and requested that we try to convince the junta to take his orders, and that we land Sixth Fleet helicopters to evacuate his family if necessary. Talbot, by this time identifying our fortunes with those of the King, was deeply upset and sent his cable decrying "the rape of Greek democracy."

Sending the marines was never seriously considered. The Sixth Fleet cruised closer to the Greek shore, in case evacuation of Americans and the royal family became necessary, as it did not. The real issues in Washington in the immediate aftermath of the coup were the usual ones in such a situation—that is, a coup from the right, not the left: how soon and how strongly does the United States react, in terms of denouncing the action, suspending diplomatic contacts, and terminating economic and military assistance? A quick, strong, negative reaction on the part of the United States might have various levels of effects: at most, it might unhorse a new, if shaky, junta; in between it can give us a strong bargaining position with a new government; at the least, it keeps the United States from being identified from the outset with a new regime of doubtful capacities and intentions.

Thus, when there was a military coup in Peru in 1962, the United States denounced it and removed the ambassador and suspended the aid programs until the junta set a date for elections and guaranteed a return to civil government; in 1964, there was a free election. Our language can be quite strong. In 1963, Secretary Rusk responded to right-wing coups in the Dominican Republic and Honduras: "The United States views the situation 'with utmost gravity. . . . Under existing conditions . . . there is no opportunity for effective collaboration . . . or for normalization of diplomatic relations. We have stopped all economic and military aid to these countries.'"

Ambassador Talbot pleaded with Washington for an early, very strong statement denouncing the Greek coup. His request was not granted. The explanation of this and everything that has followed lies essentially in who were the policy-makers in Washington, and how they were doing it.

Lucius D. Battle, the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, an able diplomat who had served in various State Department posts during three

Administrations, most recently as Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, had been installed in his new job for only six days when the colonels struck. He was essentially unfamiliar with the Greek situation, and he was and has remained deeply absorbed in other problems in the vast region of his responsibility. In his first days in office, a crisis in Yemen was budding, and the events which led to the June war in the Middle East were in train.

Battle, therefore, had to rely on his assistants: Stuart Rockwell, his deputy, and Daniel Brewster, director of Greek affairs, both career Foreign Service Officers. Rockwell's predilection throughout has been for an accommodation with the colonels. Brewster came at the problem with decided views of his own. He is the Greek hand at the State Department, not simply because of his formal position but also because he was born and educated in Greece, and served in Greece from 1947 through 1952, when the United States was establishing its ties there, and again from 1961 through most of 1965 when the embassy staff was deciding that the Papandreu, particularly Andreas, would not do. As the Greek policy went up the line: Rockwell was inclined to agree; Battle was inclined to defer; and when the policy questions went from the sixth floor of State to the seventh, Secretary Rusk and Undersecretary Nicholas Katzenbach were preoccupied with other matters.

At the White House, in the National Security Council staff, Walt Rostow was as buried in Vietnam and other major crises as were the Secretary and Undersecretary. His staff was said to have had some reservations about Greek policy, but if so, they did not put up much fight. The only White House voice some State Department men recall hearing with any clarity was that of Mike Manatos, a presidential aide for congressional relations who was relaying the concern of the liberal elements of the essentially conservative Greek-American community. Recently, however, some Greek-American businessmen complained to the State Department about the junta's treatment of business in Greece, and their complaints made an impression.

The Pentagon's overriding concern was that nothing disrupt the military preparedness of Greece under NATO, or the ongoing operations of the military assistance program. The decisive group was the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose traditional position has been that Greece is the "southern flank" of NATO, and it must be prepared at all times for an attack from Bulgaria. The Pentagon should not question the likelihood of an attack by the Bulgars, argue the Chiefs; it should be prepared for all eventualities; besides, who can read the mind of the Communist enemy? To the extent that Greece is not prepared, the argument goes, if the Bulgars do attack, the United States will have to make up the difference, so the more Greece is armed, the less likely it is that the United States would have to fight there. If, as the Greek junta did, a government dismisses 500 of the NATO-trained officers and purges many of the troops, that is unfortunate, and we shall just have to start from there.

There are some civilians in the Pentagon who question that Greece is a "flank" in classic military terms, and doubt Greece's strategic importance to NATO. But, says one of the doubters, "That concept was here when we got here, and it will be here when we leave." There is also some ambiguity as to whether the substantial Greek troops and weapons positioned in the Thracian plains in the north are poised against Bulgaria or against Turkey. The way in which the concept of Greece's military importance to NATO has reinforced the junta has been deplored by, among others, such a conservative as Mrs. Helen Vlachos, publisher of Greek newspapers and now in exile in London: "NATO is something we put our signature on when we were free and which was to keep us free."

At this moment NATO is protecting the junta." The junta survives "entirely because of NATO power—NATO money, NATO weaponry, NATO jam in the morning, NATO suits, NATO everything you see."

And while the United States focuses on the "Southern flank," other parts of NATO have fallen out with our Greek policy. Norway and Denmark have suspended diplomatic relations with Greece; the German government has suspended military assistance; and the American policy is highly unpopular with the European social democratic parties, and with the prestigious Council of Europe. Some high-level civilians in the Pentagon have had some concern about the policy decisions regarding Greece. But these have tended to be the same men who were offering strong objections within the government to the escalation of the Vietnam War; with no prodding from the State Department to counter the military impetus of Greek policy, they fought other battles.

The Defense Department's consequent emphasis on the primacy of NATO strategy in policy-making on Greece happened to suit the prevailing mood at State. For some time the central tension in our European policy, which does receive ongoing attention on the seventh floor, has been over whether NATO is outmoded, a bar to détente with Eastern Europe, and should slowly be dismantled, or whether NATO still represents a farsighted policy and our best hope for promoting European unity and therefore must be maintained. At this point in time, with General de Gaulle shaking the NATO foundations, the latter viewpoint prevailed.

Thus there were not great policy debates about Greece. The policy tended just to happen, on an *ad hoc* basis, according to routine bureaucratic procedure. From time to time, there came from outside the normal chain of command strong suggestions that the United States take a firmer line against the junta, but only rarely did these suggestions permeate the structure. Occasionally, an issue even came to the President's desk. When such issues concern countries not normally subject to presidential or seventh-floor attention, they tend to get settled, rather quickly, by a presumption in favor of the position of the Secretary of State.

Responding to Talbot's request for a strong denunciation of the coup, on April 23 Brewster and Battle had drafted at least a mild one regretting the action—"The U.S. by tradition is opposed to the change of democratic government by force"—but Rusk ruled against its issuance. His arguments were that this might impair future relations the United States might wish to have with the new regime, and there were political prisoners whose safety was of some concern to us. If the United States tried to unseat the junta, went the prevailing thought in Washington, the result might be fighting in the streets between royalist and rebellious armed forces; moreover, the junta might be secure enough to prevail, and then where would the United States be? Instead, Washington would work with the junta, trying to influence it to work with the King, to take steps to return to constitutional government, and to free the political prisoners. Therefore it would not be useful to suspend diplomatic relations.

As for arms (substantial economic assistance to Greece had ended in 1962), a major consideration of the moment was that Congress was upset already over the extent and use—as in the Indo-Pakistani and Arab-Israeli fighting—of U.S. military assistance. There was some concern, on the other hand, that if military aid to Greece were stopped, it might be difficult to get it resumed. In a split decision, shipments of tanks and jets were stopped, but light arms, including rifles and bullets, jeeps and trucks, and spare parts—what is known in policy circles as "the rinky-dink stuff"—continued to flow. The issue of the small arms was argued; the argument that cutting them off would be more difficult than it was worth prevailed.

"You end up dealing with what is in front of you," said one of the policy-makers of the first week after the coup.

So for seven days the United States kept its silence, and on April 28, Secretary Rusk issued a statement weaker still than the one Brewster and Battle had drafted. It did not deplore the coup, and it made no mention of military aid, not even that some of it was being suspended, because, explains one official, "It would have been interpreted as an anti-coup move." "We have followed closely the situation in Greece since the military take-over there last Friday," said Rusk's statement. "I am encouraged to see King Constantine . . . has called for an early return to parliamentary government. We are now awaiting concrete evidence that the new Greek government will make every effort to re-establish democratic institutions. . . . I am gratified that Greece will continue its strong support of NATO." The colonels had wasted no time in pledging that. They showed less dispatch about satisfying the other wishes.

The Secretary's statement also noted that Colonel Papadopoulos had said that the political prisoners rounded up during the coup would be set free "in a few days," and that he trusted "this step will indeed be taken." Andreas Papandreu was in prison. The pressure mounted quickly by his American friends, men with access to the highest levels of government, to prevent his assassination and secure his release probably has no recent equal. John Kenneth Galbraith from Harvard, Carl Kayser from Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies, Walter Heller from the University of Minnesota, and others were calling the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary and Undersecretary of State. President Johnson commented that this was the one issue economists were agreed upon. In his White House redoubt, Walt Rostow received more than 200 letters from professors. This pressure was responsible in some degree for what restraint Washington displayed to the junta during the first days—the memoranda that went back and forth referred repeatedly to the fact that the academic community was upset—and also for our more-than-usual concern for political prisoners. But, in the case of the prisoners, there was also the fact that the junta had rounded up and imprisoned several of the State Department officials' old friends from the right.

Perhaps it was his distaste for Andreas Papandreu, perhaps a weary reaction to the pressure from the academics, so many of them his tormentors on Vietnam, that led Dean Rusk to respond in effect to one domestic pleader for Papandreu that Andreas is no longer a professor of economics. He is now a politician, and it appears that he may have "a good deal to answer for."

Eight months after the coup, about one half of the some 6000 prisoners whom the junta had rounded up were released. Andreas Papandreu, who had been kept in solitary confinement all that time, was among them. Both the United States and the junta were interested in removing him from the Greek scene, and so he was released and allowed to leave the country.

Since the coup, the policy questions have arisen in terms of more cooperation with the junta. The policy-makers don't put it that way, of course. They point to Washington's "cool and correct" relations with the colonels, and our use of "carrots and sticks." They also point out how cooperative the junta has been in serving our global needs.

Two months after the coup, the June war broke out in the Middle East. The Greek government permitted the United States overflights, base rights, and blanket, rather than ship-by-ship, use of Crete's landing facilities for the Sixth Fleet. Thousands of American evacuees were landed in Athens, a fact which every Foreign Service Officer whose family has been abroad in a crisis appreciates. (Just why they had to be taken

to Athens, as opposed to Rome or elsewhere, is not clear.)

Moreover, during the Middle East crisis, for the first time a Soviet fleet appeared in the Eastern Mediterranean. To the Navy, this made our entrée to Greek ports all the more essential, so that our sailors could have their "R and R" (rest and rehabilitation). Places of respite were diminishing: Arab ports were out. Spain does not like us to land at Gibraltar, Italy limits our landing rights, and Turkish ports do not suffice. Early this year, the Navy pressed for a port call at Athens by the U.S.S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* to re-establish the fact that we considered Greece a port of call. The visit turned into a friendly shipboard gathering which included the Greek defense minister, Ambassador Talbot, and Colonel Papadopoulos. Cameramen recorded the event, and the story was widely printed in Greek newspapers (under such headlines as "Warm Handshake in Front of Franklin Roosevelt," and "Greece Believes in NATO"). The State Department says that it was all a matter of mixed signals somewhere along the way.

In November, the junta again earned the State Department's gratitude. Turkey was about to invade Cyprus. The United States sent a special negotiator, Cyrus Vance, to cool the crisis and persuade both the Greeks and the Turks to withdraw some troops from the island (in the process, cementing the fact that the United States was dealing government-to-government with the junta. Both sides agreed. The State Department likes to point to this act of statesmanship by the junta, and compare it to the "irresponsibility" of the Papandreus. Aside from the fact that one operated under martial law and the other under an open parliamentary system, it is also possible that the junta was motivated by the fact that if the Turks had invaded, the Greeks would have been overwhelmed.

One of the grounds on which the United States explained its continuing relationship with the junta was the technical one that our diplomatic accreditation was to the King, and since the King dealt with the junta, so did we. Moreover, we were doing what we could to work things out between the two. Therefore, there was a problem when, on December 13, the King decided to overthrow the junta. The United States knew that he had been mulling the action for some time, but officials say that the King did not inform Talbot of his decision to move until that very day. At that point he asked for our help. Talbot relayed the request and indicated that he was giving some thought to going north with the King, our last hope for Greece.

Within the U.S. government, the hope was that the King would succeed, and the betting was that he would—most of the troops were in the north and had not been with the junta. The United States did not, however, want to be caught on the wrong side in case he failed. Help was refused, and Talbot stayed in Athens. As it turned out, Contantine's coup may set some sort of record for incompetence, and within twenty-four hours he and his family were on their way to safety in Rome. ("I find it insulting," one State Department official complained, "that the United States is accused of being associated with such a disorganized coup.") When the King left the country, our basis for dealing with the regime had disappeared, and for a few weeks Washington suspended normal diplomatic contacts. But later, because, it is said, the junta and the King were negotiating for the King's return to Greece, we resumed our dealings—albeit "cool and correct"—with the colonels.

"The purpose of our policy," said one high State Department official, "has been to influence these people to move in the direction of constitutional government, and it has had that effect." Thus the policy-makers are quite pleased to point out that in March the junta issued a draft constitution. The officials must have been counting on nobody's reading it,

however ("the lawyers are studying it," was the reply of one whom I asked about it), for the draft constitution was a document straight out of *Catch-22*. "The press is free and exercises a social mission, that entails obligations . . . Confiscation is permitted . . . when it insults the Christian religion, insults the person of the King, the King's parents, the Queen, the crown prince, their children and wives, insults the honor and reputation of individuals holding public office or having held public office. . . ." And so on. The constitution was to be freely discussed ("the people are writing the articles of the constitution"), under martial law. The expectation was that a revised version would be issued—there was no way for it to go but up—showing the regime's receptivity to public opinion. A referendum on the constitution has been set for early September, but Colonel Papadopoulos has declined to set dates for the formation of political parties or for parliamentary elections. On the anniversary of the coup, one of the newspapers closest to the regime wrote that "the fingers of one hand are not enough to count the number of years it needs to accomplish its aims."

The method by which the United States achieved this policy success is one that State Department policy-makers talk about quite a bit: the use of carrots and sticks." The fact is, however, that diplomats usually prefer offering carrots to wielding sticks. And so by July, 1967, the embassy, having adjusted, as embassies do, to the new circumstances, suggested a gradual resumption of the remaining military aid. Having continued diplomatic contacts, having continued to ship small arms, having done nothing to discourage private investment, the United States had made the remaining weapons—minesweepers, tanks, jets—the last symbol of our attitude of reserve toward the junta. Nevertheless, the question did not cause much debate within the government. The embassy suggestion was approved by the State Department in July and forwarded to the White House. President Johnson concurred, provided that private soundings indicated that Congress would not object.

The soundings were not taken, however, as other planned soundings over the following year on resuming the aid were not, because each time they were about to take place, the junta made some particularly embarrassing move. For the anniversary of the coup, for instance, they put aged George Papandreu and Panayotis Kanelopoulos, the rightist prime minister at the time of the coup, under house arrest. (Around the State Department, this is seen as evidence of the colonels' "poor sense of public relations," as was the fact that only half of the political prisoners were released after eight months.) It was a bit awkward to push for increased arms aid under such circumstances, and it was important not to endanger further the entire controversial arms program by arousing Congress over Greece.

Arms aid to the junta would be increased, however, as soon as the congressional thicket could be negotiated. One State Department official explained (in the same interview) that this should be done because (a) this would be the way to nudge the junta toward a constitutional government and (b) the junta had no intention of stepping aside for some five years and we had better get along with them as best we could. The colonels have also passed along the word, persuasive to some of the policy-makers, that we had best help them further in order to offset the neutralist—the words "Nasserite" and "Gaulist" are used—inclinations of some of the younger officers associated with them.

The major reason for the planned resumption of arms aid, however, lay in the comparative strengths of the pressures brought to bear in Washington. The men who run the military assistance program were anx-

ious to commit the remaining weapons for Greece which had been programmed for the past fiscal year, so that they could justify to Congress their request for still more weapons for Greece—close to \$70 million worth of them—over the next fiscal year. The arms resumption was also vigorously championed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the CIA, anxious to retain its base in Greece. Battle was said to have developed some doubts, but when State is only doubtful and the Pentagon and the CIA are enthusiastic, State loses, unless someone decides to take the fight to the White House.

The general view of those responsible for our Greek policy is that it has all worked out for the best. "They [the colonels] haven't done too badly," said one. "They've made some improvements on the Greek scene. They have brought into the government a sense of austerity and welcome probity, I would say. Although they are inept economically, they haven't brought about disaster. They do lack important things, obviously. They lack constitutionality, legality, experience, and a sense of public relations. But from their point of view, why should they step down?" Another suggested that the way to look at the situation was that order had been restored, Andreas Papandreu and the King, the two most exacerbating factors in Greek politics, were out of the country, and a constitution was on the way.

Despite these ideal circumstances, Washington has not run out of ideas about how to help Greece. The current thinking is that the thing to do is to nudge the colonels into inviting Karamanlis to return from Paris to head the government. Andreas Papandreu and others have suggested a coalition of center and right, and perhaps the United States would accept this, but it is assumed that the right is still the best hope for order in Greece. The embassy has reported, anyway, and it is the accepted wisdom among the policy-makers—despite evidence that the Americans in Greece have chronically and wishfully underrated the Papandreu's popularity—that Andreas Papandreu's popularity in Greece has plummeted to zero, and that his father's is down to 10 or 20 percent. It is also argued that the Greek people are "apathetic," even relieved to have been saved from the politicians, and, lo, the threat of leftist violence, which we and the right have been fearing and guarding against these many years, has seemingly disappeared.

Others do not think it has, and argue that the longer the colonels stay in power, the more likely it is to grow. It does not strain the imagination to consider, if there were Communist insurgency against a military government we have been arming, which side the United States might be on. The policy-makers assume that the Greeks have had their fill of civil war, but the lesson others draw from the 1930s and 1940s is that Greece has a history of violence in the face of repressive regimes. Yet even if the worst—"another Vietnam," for example—does not come to pass, there are other grounds for being disturbed about our Greek policy.

Much of foreign policy, one official says soothingly, is simply "buying time." In the Greek case, another way of putting that might be "mortgaging the future."

lined the importance of restoring and maintaining law and order throughout our Nation. Mr. Lawrence deplors the violence and lawlessness which he describes as incredible and intolerable. Because of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation in this important matter of law and order, I herewith place this article in the RECORD:

IT'S TIME FOR LAWLESSNESS TO END

(By David Lawrence)

This is a strange era. Large numbers of the American people not only are being taught to misbehave but are being permitted to get away with it. Riots, looting, arson, vandalism and disturbances, which are normally punishable by law but which have been glossed over as permissible under the right of "free speech," have aroused throughout America a demand for an end to disorder and lawlessness.

Never has such timidity been shown by the national government as in the last several months. It's the same old story—it takes a crisis to get reform. Congress finally has enacted an anti-crime bill, including provisions for limited gun control, but it still is reluctant to pass stronger legislation that might keep guns out of the hands of madmen.

At last, however, the tide is turning. The courts are growing a little more sensible and are brushing aside some of the technicalities which have served to protect criminals and to hamper police in their efforts to enforce the law.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in a decision on June 10, affirmed the right of a police officer to "stop and frisk" individuals whose "unusual conduct" could reasonably lead him to believe that "his own life and that of others might be in danger."

In the federal district court in Boston, four prominent individuals who have been active in "peace demonstrations" have just been found guilty of conspiring to counsel young men to evade the draft. The jury brushed aside the argument that such activities were merely an exercise of the right of "free speech" and were "justified" because of the defendants' "moral concern" over the Vietnam war.

In the courts of the District of Columbia, some stern sentences have been given to persons arrested during the riots in the nation's capital in April. One judge took the occasion to criticize city officials sharply for their failure to order police to arrest looters and arsonists and for not publicizing beforehand that such persons would be prosecuted.

Despite these hopeful signs, the violence and lawlessness still are incredible. Candidates for the presidency cannot make public appearances without risking their lives and those of their families who may accompany them. Issues of importance have been lost sight of as the safety of persons seeking the presidential nomination has become the biggest concern of the campaign.

The assassination of Robert Kennedy was a most tragic episode in American political history. It will have a lasting effect on the American people, who are waking up to the fact that political campaigns are becoming an instrument of mobocracy instead of democracy. It matters little whether an assassination is motivated by a specific political issue or is merely incidentally identified with some of the questions involved in a campaign. The fact remains that not only the candidates but the people are not safe when they attend a mass meeting to discuss in democratic fashion the issues of the day.

Time was when the big fear was that a president of the United States might be assassinated. Now the anxiety has spread to the men who have offered themselves as candidates for the highest office in the land.

LAWLESSNESS MUST END

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Columnist David Lawrence in a recent article in the Washington Star under-

Only five months remain of the 1968 presidential and congressional campaigns. There are lot of important questions before the country—Vietnam, crime, education, inflation, food for the poor and sociological reforms. But all these become secondary if, in a country which boasts of the right of free people to govern themselves, it is dangerous for a campaign to be made by an individual who seeks to serve his country in the presidency.

Too many persons have been taught to believe that "civil rights" means the right to do as one pleases—to engage in "civil disobedience," to "demonstrate" in the streets, and to demand from the government whatever they feel is their due, irrespective of law.

The time has come to teach these people that they cannot expect to coerce the government to do their bidding by means of force or threats of force. They must recognize that this is still a democracy in which people believe that there must be debate on the current issues and that the majority decides what is best for the nation.

HON. DAVID M. MCCONNELL

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced the appointment of the Honorable David M. McConnell of Charlotte, N.C., as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 45th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Geneva, Switzerland, convening in July and August 1968.

Mr. McConnell will also be appointed as a special advisor to the Council, with the rank and appointment of Ambassador of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Mr. McConnell's many friends on Capitol Hill in congratulating him on this important assignment. Mr. McConnell is a member of the board of trustees of Erskine College in Due West, S.C., in my congressional district, and I would like to extend congratulations and best wishes to him from his many friends in this part of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following biographical sketch of this dedicated American to the attention of my colleagues and the people of the United States:

David Moffatt McConnell, an Attorney-at-Law of Charlotte, North Carolina, has served the past two years as a member of the North Carolina Tax Study Commission. He was formerly Special Counsel to the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and was Counsel to the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Reorganization, and an Administrative Assistant to U.S. Senator James F. Byrnes of South Carolina, who was later Secretary of State.

He has a broad background in International affairs. He served as Provost Marshal and Protocol Officer with the Nationalist Chinese Army under General Joseph W. Stilwell in China, Burma, and India. He was Chairman of the International Conference at Ramgarh, Bihar Province, India, in 1942, which Conference prepared Treaties of Military Command and Criminal Jurisdiction of Forces for China, Burma and India, for which he was awarded the U.S. Legion of Merit and

awarded Order of Cloud and Banner by Chiang-Kai-Shek.

Served as Chief, Legislative Branch, War Department General Staff G-1, as a Colonel, General Staff Corps. He was a co-draftsman of the Declaration of Nuremberg and the Post-War Treaty with the Republic of the Philippines.

Assisted in the drafting of Tax Conventions with the Kingdom of Denmark and the Republic of Colombia.

Active in Civic and Political Affairs, served as Chairman of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; served as a Delegate to many Democratic National Conventions and was a Member of the Nine-Man Executive Committee which formulated the Democratic Platform of 1964. He personally drafted the Civil Rights Plank in this Platform.

Members of State Department Mission to West Germany to celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the Marshall Plan and the Declaration of Nuremberg, 1964.

Liaison Official for War Department General Staff with U.N.R.R.A. and U.N.I.C.E.F., 1944-1946.

Awarded Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster for services on the General Staff.

Member of the Bar of North Carolina, South Carolina, District of Columbia and the U.S. Supreme Court, and Tax Section, American Bar Association. Active in corporate affairs as General Counsel, Belk Stores.

B. S. Summa Cum Laude, Davidson College, North Carolina—Phi Beta Kappa and Kappa Alpha Order; Rumrill Award Scholar, Harvard Graduate Business School; LL.B., LL.M. in Federal Taxation, Georgetown University; Juris Doctor, Federal Taxation, Georgetown University.

STRICT LAW ENFORCEMENT IS THE SENSIBLE APPROACH TO REDUCING THE ILLEGAL USE OF GUNS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Louis P. Cashman, Jr., editor of the Pulitzer Prize-winning Vicksburg, Miss., Evening Post, recently published two extremely timely and thought-provoking editorials on proposed gun control legislation. I commend the editorials to my colleagues inasmuch as they constitute a most sensible and valid approach to this highly important subject:

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Evening Post]

THE PROPOSED GUN LAW

Acting under the hysteria created after the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, the drive is on for a strict gun law, in which every gun, of every description would have to be registered and it is proposed that on registration a photograph of the owner and his fingerprints be made a part of the registration. We do not believe this will check the criminal who is intent upon murder with a gun. Rather it would be only effective in putting another regulation on the honest and law-abiding citizen. The criminal will get his gun, even change the serial number if necessary and possible, and the net result will not improve matters.

So many laws have been passed under the pressure of emotion or passion, and this is another one. But we have contended that the very best way to meet the wave of violence in our country is through enforcement of the laws we have on our books, and through the full support of all our officials. When a criminal knows he will have to pay

the full penalty for his murderous action, he will not be as quick to pull the trigger. But as matters now stand, he knows he has an excellent chance to get by with any action, as he has been so protected in his "constitutional rights," he doesn't worry too much. The nation is filled with criminals who have been made to pay the penalty for their misdeeds, and their crimes have mounted. In addition, because of their protection, many others who might have thought twice before indulging in a life of crime, now feel they, too, can get away with it.

The mere fact of a law requiring registration of guns will not get at the root of our problem. The one solution which will deter crime and criminals is strengthening the hand of our law enforcement officers and making it crystal clear to the criminal that he will pay for his crimes. Without this, registration of guns will affect the citizen who has no inclination to crime, but it will not make much impact upon the criminal. Only by tough enforcement of the laws we now have followed by conviction and penalty commensurate with the crime will we begin to see the ebb in the wave of violence.

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Evening Post]

GUN REGISTRATION AND LICENSING

The push is on by the Administration to add strict registration and licensing to any gun control law which might be passed. Every gun would have to be registered—every owner would have to be licensed. That means all guns—all owners—at least all law-abiding citizens. Under the proposal anyone wishing to purchase a shotgun for hunting, or a rifle for the same purpose, would have to apply for a license—a federal license—and register his gun, stating for what purpose he would use it. In short, complete and unadulterated federal control under which the average citizens would come.

But what of the criminal? What gangster, or criminal, or ex-con turned out on society by some of the famous judicial decisions, will register his gun, or apply for a license?

We believe there are two sides to a law so all-embracing as that which is being proposed. We believe that it is quite proper to have registration of pistols, and many states have such laws, but extending such stringent regulations as are proposed to sporting firearms is just another step towards the never-ending drive for complete and absolute federal domination in all phases of our lives.

Much has been said and written about the activities of the National Rifle Association, which vigorously opposes this type of federal control. Characteristically, the NRA is pictured as an enemy of law and order and as abetting crime. The NRA, in our opinion, is voicing the sentiments of the hundreds of thousands of sportsmen, and they are waging a valid and logical fight against extreme controls. Members of Congress are hearing from the folks back home, in a deluge of letters and telegrams opposing the measure.

The very best gun control we can accomplish is to give to the nation full law enforcement, unimpeded by decisions and directives which reduce the effectiveness of our law enforcement officers. Hardened criminals, with long and vicious records, have been turned loose and it is not unusual for some of them to have several murders on their record. But their "constitutional rights," effected through the invocation of technicalities and other loopholes, have been protected to the detriment of society in general.

Strict law enforcement, is the real answer. The law-abiding citizen should not be subjected to licensing, questioning and registration of his gun because of the inadequacy of law enforcement resulting from questionable decisions and the reluctance of politically-motivated officials to demand, and get, respect for law.

In Hitler's Germany, citizens were forced to register all guns and they were confiscated.

Why is it necessary for such extreme measures in the United States? Or is it part of the plan to create a situation which would follow the Hitler plan?

COLLAPSE OF THE WILL TO GOVERN

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, American Security Council Editors Frank Johnson and Anthony Harrigan pose the questions "Where is the storm of indignation? Where is the outrage?" at the burning of our cities, the takeover of our universities, and the lawlessness in our streets?

They state, and it appears to be true, that the majority of Americans, and citizens of other nations under attack, are "outraged." But they are the followers of leaders who "have neither the ideological conviction nor the moral fortitude to fight back."

"They suffer the law to be broken in the name of 'freedom' and mobs to rampage unchallenged in the name of the sanctity of human life."

And they fail to understand that they are condoning the "spirit and doctrine of nihilism."

The examples and arguments of these two editors are much too real to be passed off lightly and I submit "Collapse of the Will To Govern: The Impact of the Nihilist Revolution," at this point in the RECORD:

[From Washington Report, June 24, 1968]
COLLAPSE OF THE WILL TO GOVERN: THE IMPACT OF THE NIHILIST REVOLUTION

Nineteen sixty-eight is the year that the consequences of permissiveness in American education and public policy are illustrated by widening chaos at home and increasing weakness abroad. It also is the year in which an American President, bowing to noisy critics representing only a small minority of Americans, announced that he would not seek re-election because his policy of limited war in Vietnam had "divided" the American people. The exponents of withdrawal and appeasement rejoiced at their success. In this same year, many of America's great cities have been set afire and public streets have turned into battlegrounds. Meanwhile, in the universities there has been left-wing lawlessness similar to the book-burning on German campuses in the Nazi era.

Where is the storm of indignation? Where is the outrage? What is it that ails us? Why cannot the majority of our people make their feelings felt?

In the United States, France, Germany, Italy—in all the pillars of Western civilization—there is a spirit of revolution in the land. But this is no healthy rising of liberty against tyranny. Its aim is to overthrow law and authority and to substitute anarchy. Its methods, whether in the universities or the streets, require denial of the will of the majority and its replacement by a dictatorship of the militant few. The majority of law-abiding citizens is to be swept aside because it is no longer "with" history.

The great majority of Americans is indeed outraged by the arrogant posturing and ever-escalating, obviously insatiable demands of the revolutionaries. But this majority is largely silent. It does not fight back.

The reason is to be found in the leaders of the Establishment. They have neither the ideological conviction nor the moral fortitude to fight back. They offer platitudes and appeals instead of leadership and action. They suffer the law to be broken in the name of "freedom" and mobs to rampage unchallenged in the name of the sanctity of human life. They have lost, in short, the most essential quality of government—the will to govern. They don't understand what is at the root of anarchy—the spirit and doctrine of nihilism. This is the concept that all traditional beliefs and values are unfounded and must be destroyed. America must understand and counter-attack nihilism if it is to survive.

The term nihilism first became widely known in 1860 when the Russian novelist Ivan Tugeniev applied it to the concepts of the Hegelian Slavophiles whom he accused of a desire to destroy everything. The declared nihilist purpose was stated by Mikhail Bakunin in the 1868 manifesto of the International Democratic Socialist Alliance: "Brethren, I come to announce unto you a new gospel, which must penetrate to the very ends of the world. The old world must be destroyed and replaced by a new one . . . Our first work must be destruction and annihilation of everything as it now exists.

Exactly a century later, the zealous inheritors of Bakunin's nihilist vision are at work in the United States, France, West Germany and other free societies of the western world.

The extent to which nihilistic ideas and impulses have captured the minds and imagination of radical youth is revealed in the wave of riots and campus disturbances on both sides of the Atlantic. Like the Russian nihilists of the 1860's, the nihilists of today—the occupiers of Columbia University and the Sorbonne—profess to stand for honesty, justice and equality. But in all their operations they force their will upon others. When they raise the black flag of anarchy, close down universities and raise barricades in the streets, they deny to others exercise of free choice.

In examining the nihilist upheaval in our times, it is well to begin with the professed goals and objectives of the radicalized youth. They say that they desire to create a new state in which human relations are advanced in every sphere of state activity. They urge the break-up of monolithic state power. They demand that the gap be closed between the people and authority. They insist that they are in revolt against a consumer-oriented society that allegedly mutes the true interests of human beings. These ideas and demands are couched in the language of contemporary nihilism, the "newspeak," with its heavy use of such words as "involved," "engaged" and "committed."

How seriously can law and order-oriented Americans regard these and other demands for "direct democracy" or for "participatory politics," as the protesters sometimes say?

Certainly, a good measure of direct democracy is desirable. But the campus nihilists have no monopoly on faith in such procedures. The New England Town Meeting is an ancient, worthy institution. This does not mean, however, that the entire United States of America can be operated on the basis of a continuous town meeting.

"Participatory politics" is another concept to which the nihilists can't claim a patent. For decades, responsible community and national leaders have urged greater public participation in political affairs, including registration and voting. One reason America's political stability has suffered in recent years is that many responsible voters have stayed at home on election day and allowed the herded blocks of voters to be dispatched to the polls like sheep.

The new nihilists speak of the rigidity of conventional structures in the United States. Actually, the United States has a highly flex-

ible, multi-layered political structure. Unlike France, which is tightly centralized, the United States is a union of fifty states, each with its own administrative structure. The American states constitute fifty laboratories in government. Thus, on examination, the nihilist complaints against the American "Power Structure" are invalid.

The maze of committees and collectives that thrive on campuses and in slum areas of big cities, both in the United States and Western Europe, mask their real objectives and intentions in their criticism of existing free societies. The West German nihilists, such as those who rioted after the shooting of "Red" Rudi Dutschke this spring, come close to revealing their goals when they refer to themselves as an "extra-parliamentary opposition." Obviously, the protest elements believe that parliaments and congresses are moribund and seek their destruction. Thus the real objective of the nihilists in the United States, for example, is not the control of a few campuses or any radical "restructuring" of university life but the end of representative government.

Direct sharing of decision making has a superficial appeal to some people who haven't considered the nature of the state or the history of self-government. Indeed this is a classic socialist goal—the establishment of myriad "soviets" or workers and student councils. The nihilists of today simply add to this old conception the new idea of utilizing computers to register the current will of the people on every piece of legislation and every policy, thereby eliminating the institutions of representative government.

The ancients, in their wisdom, rejected this type of direct democracy, not because of inadequate communications in classical times but because it would have turned government into an expression of transitory emotion. Yet this is what the New Left really wants in the United States and Europe: government by plebiscite, or plebiscitary democracy. If such a system were adopted in any free country, it would be the end of liberty under law.

Bertrand de Jouvenel, the French writer on government, has warned that such a system of extreme participatory politics would "become the expression of the passions of the moment." It is timely to bear in mind that one of the chief advocates of government by plebiscite in the 20th century was Adolf Hitler. Had the Weimar Republic possessed a "power structure" more solidly based in the rule of law, Hitler would not have been able to translate a state of unrest and a mood of rebellion into a regime of colossal tyranny.

In reading the comments made by leaders of the Students for Democratic Society and other nihilistic groups, it is not hard to understand that the demands for "participatory politics" are but a euphemism for minority dictatorship.

The demonstrators at Columbia University, for example, didn't seek to discover and implement the will of the entire student body. The majority of students wanted to continue their classwork. What happened at Columbia was that a small minority of militants, claiming to be the authentic voice of student power, declared war on the established order and seized positions of power. This is the classic pattern of all revolutions—control and domination by a ruthless minority in the name of the majority.

The behavior of the new nihilists exposes the emptiness of their professed idealism. A true idealist concerned with human relations does not throw stones at policemen or burn other people's automobiles to form a flaming barrier. One who is interested in liberating constructive energies does not use the office of a university president as a latrine. Those who are sincere in their complaints about "police brutality" do not engage in "student brutality" towards police. Those who say that

they want an unexploited, creative society do not make heroes of Mao Tse-tung, "Che" Guevara and Ho Chi Minh—symbols of repressive regimes. And those who are honest when they urge tolerance of dissent are not likely to show complete intolerance for those who assent to the values of a free society.

In the disorders of our era are several elements. There is a form of revolutionary romanticism, a playing with extremism. These innocents surely will discover, as history shows, that revolution eats its children. There is intellectual deterioration, which shows up in the reliance on buttons, posters and slogans and in the cult of secondary personalities such as "Red" Danny Cohn-Bendit in France and Mark Rudd in the United States. But there also is a neurotic, poisoned atmosphere in the nihilist movement and organizations—a true darkness of the spirit such as characterized the Nazi movement. In the writings and speeches of the more extreme demonstrators, both on campus and in the streets, is the threat to lynch civilization. The campuses disturbances are only one component in the situation. Equally alarming are such situations as the recent one in which a rabble of shouting protesters from the camp-in at Washington abused and threatened the Attorney General of the United States.

The communists are not the originators of the nihilist revolution. They do, in most cases, control it. Moreover, the nihilists employ the communist vocabulary and tactics. And the communists are the ones who ultimately profit from the work of the nihilists.

The nihilist movement offers a dead end to America's free society. It asks for toleration so that it can engage in the wrecking of the country. Already excessive toleration has resulted in the burning of cities, the paralysis of universities and the necessary emplacement of machine guns on Capitol Hill. Tolerance is not the only desirable public virtue. Prudence also is a requisite of a civilized state. No matter what the cause or what the rationale offered for disorder, lawlessness cannot be permitted or condoned. The extremist behavior of demonstrators already has created an intolerable atmosphere in the United States. The American Republic is in process of demolition from within at the hands of small cadres of militant wreckers. If mobocracy is not to become the American form of government, a stop must be put to the work of the nihilists. And the United States must find a new leadership that is not afraid to exercise responsibility.

ANTHONY HARRIGAN,
Managing Editor.
FRANK J. JOHNSON,
Foreign Editor.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SEEKS WORLD PEACE

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, of all the multifaceted activities and responsibilities of the American Presidency, perhaps the most important in recent years has been the search for world peace. It is clear from the words of former President Eisenhower and the late President Kennedy that world peace preoccupied their thinking and their energies. This condition also holds true for President Johnson.

Monday, then, must have been a day of real satisfaction for the President. He signed, on behalf of the American Gov-

ernment, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and announced that the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to hold talks aimed at reducing the spiraling levels of strategic weapons systems. Incidentally, the President first proposed such talks to the Soviet Union more than 4 years ago.

The hopeful news out of Washington, however, is not just a personal triumph for President Johnson. It is a day of hope for the entire world.

Instant peace is not likely to break out tomorrow morning all over the world. However, the groundwork laid Monday holds the solid promise of peace in the not-too-distant future for all the generations who will come after us.

RESOLUTION OF THE COEUR D'ALENE INDIAN TRIBE OF IDAHO

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, seemingly few members of our minority groups today are petitioning the courts and Congress with their grievances through legitimate channels. Instead, we find pickets before the White House; poor people camped in our national parks; riots in our cities; and citizens desecrating the symbols of our freedom. Through civil disobedience they demand more food, better living conditions, and spontaneous brotherhood from their fellow Americans. In terms of destruction and law enforcement, the price we will pay for these improved conditions will indeed be high. More important, our Nation's moral fiber is quickly disintegrating in face of such irresponsible action.

It was with pride, therefore, that I recently received a resolution from the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe of northern Idaho, in which they outlined a responsible and direct approach to gaining the cooperation of the Federal Government in solving their problems. I have already had an opportunity to congratulate the leaders of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, and I shall, at this time, bring their ideas to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe does not agree in principal with responsible tribal bodies participating in mass demonstrations such as the Poor People's March to Washington, and

Whereas, events during the march have in the opinion of the Coeur d'Alene Tribal Council substantiated the prudence of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe's point of view, now, therefore,

Be it resolved:

That the Coeur d'Alene Tribe adopts the following statement regarding the Poor People's March to Washington.

The Coeur d'Alene Tribal Council recognizes the right and, in some cases, the effectiveness of mass demonstrations in behalf of the poor and underprivileged of our nation. It is sympathetic to the black people, the Mexican Americans and all the other racial and economic minorities. It realizes that our nation still has much to achieve in

the fields of social and economic justice. It also has much to achieve in the fields of law and order.

Despite our sympathy for these underprivileged groups and our support of them, we do not feel that that is the expedient and effective method for the Indian groups to follow. It is true that some of our Indian people are among the most poor, that some of our Indian associates have suffered from discrimination, segregation and social and economic deprivation exceeding that of the other poor people of America. We were the dispossessed and the alienated. We need not detail this. It is recognized as a black page in the history of our country.

But our organized tribes have learned to work through the legitimate channels of our courts, our government agencies and our Congress. We have emerged as responsible governmental entities. As such, we find ourselves a part of our nation politic—a part of the process of government. We, therefore, can express our wants and needs better through these proper channels than by "taking to the streets" and the highways.

Another thing—just as we as individuals, as a race and as a social and economic minority may have suffered more than others, our problems have been uniquely Indian. Therefore, our solutions must be uniquely Indian. We can achieve more by our own methods. As a relatively small segment of poor society, our special needs and solutions can be lost in the welter of the disorganized millions of poor people most of whom have little knowledge of our special problems and circumstances. The unrealistic, sometimes grossly inaccurate statements by representatives of the Poor People's March about the "Indian Problem" recently made in Washington, D.C. bear this out. We Indians and our chosen spokesmen can best speak for ourselves.

Let us hope that our Indian people will work as they wish in the activities and demonstrations in behalf of the poor people of our country. But may we and they, in working for our Indian poor, particularly those on our Reservations, avoid the use of public demonstrations and work through our regular governmental channels.

Certification: The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Coeur d'Alene Tribal Council at a meeting held June 3, 1968, at the Plummer Sub-Agency near Plummer, Idaho, with the required quorum present, by a vote of 5 for and 0 against.

OSWALD C. GEORGE,
Vice Chairman.
EVANGELINE ABRAHAM,
Secretary.

MAYOR ASKS THAT BELLS RING ON JULY 4

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in the *Benld, Ill., Enterprise* whereby Mayor Tileo Tiletagnolli, Benld, Ill., declared a citywide observance, "Bells on Independence Day" be designated for July 4, 1968. The ringing of bells on July 4 in observance of the birth of the United States is a very sound idea and I feel merits mention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under unanimous consent, the article follows:

MAYOR ASKS THAT BELLS RING JULY 4

Whereas, Religious, civic and patriotic organizations will once again join in the annual July 4th celebration, "Bells On Independence Day," and

Whereas, the ringing of bells in schools, churches, village halls, carillons and other public places will be at 1 o'clock p.m. Thursday, July 4, 1968, and one full minute of bell ringing will be staged nationwide in observance of the birth of these United States, and

Whereas, the ringing of bells is to commemorate symbolically the ringing of the Liberty Bell in 1776 that proclaimed the signing of our Declaration of Independence, that historic document that marked the birth of our country as a free and independent nation, and

Whereas, it is altogether fitting and proper for us to encourage all our citizens to take part in at all possible in this national, patriotic event,

Now, therefore, I, Tileo Bertagnolli, mayor of the City of Bend, Illinois, do hereby declare the citywide observance, "Bells On Independence Day," be designated for July 4, 1968, ceremonies. I further call upon our citizens to take note of this observance by the planning of special programs that will consist of bell ringing ceremonies to remind us of our freedom and the high cost of that freedom.

TILEO BERTAGNOLLI,
Mayor.

HON. CHARLES SILVER DELIVERS
MEMORIAL TO SENATOR ROBERT
F. KENNEDY

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1968, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, consultant to the mayor of the city of New York and president of Beth Israel Medical Center delivered a memorial tribute to the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

This eloquent tribute from a distinguished resident of the city of New York is particularly appropriate at this time because Mr. Silver discusses patriotism, freedom and the price which Senator Kennedy paid for these cherished principles.

I am placing the full text of Mr. Silver's remarks in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues in the House:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BETH ISRAEL MEDICAL CENTER, AT MEMORIAL TRIBUTE FOR SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY—JUNE 7, 1968

There is a scar in the heart of our people that has widened again like a wound reopened.

Its pain cannot be healed by any remedy but time—perhaps not even by time. Nor will it be eased except, perhaps, by a profound inventory of the demented forces that produce the unimaginable violence, chaos and tragedy that stalk our land.

Dark, indeed, is the glass through which we look back on the events of the past few days.

Senator Kennedy is dead. Even as we mourn the loss of this fine, young leader, we lament, as well, the loss of a very substantial part of our national self-respect.

All we have left are the bitter dregs of bereavement . . . a chance to examine the mistakes of yesterday . . . the sorrow of today . . . and out of these, we may somehow find the strength to build a brighter tomorrow.

But we must not forget. The nightmares—

of President John Kennedy's death—of Dr. Martin Luther King's death—of Senator Robert Kennedy's death—are an anguished warning, thrice repeated, and a national shame, thrice endured.

We must remember . . . and resolve . . . to make amends, to seek the truth . . . and, with sanity, justice and mercy, to determine that no such further disgrace will blight the pages of our history.

It must seem that some of our two hundred million people have lost their minds. It may help us to keep our own if we remember that in a commonwealth of so many millions there may be some who do not belong here and do not deserve to stay.

It is not easy to single them out. It is no simple matter to spot the threat of danger beforehand—and there is always the risk of trapping the innocent, in the net of suspicion, along with the guilty.

Yet, are we not reaping the repulsive harvest of our own apathy? Are we not cultivating crime, encouraging social degenerates and enemies of decency and democracy? We are eliminating the death penalty, coddling criminals and freely putting guns into the hands of lunatics and idiots.

Why have we had 5600 deaths by violence in the United States in the last year while Great Britain, for example, had less than 30, France less than 20?

When are we going to learn? When will we come to care? When will we return to the legacy of our faith and the Law of God?

The first news came like a bolt from the sky. This, it truly was . . . shocking and numbing in its impact.

With moist eyes, unable to move from our television sets, we watched . . . stunned and confounded by a series of unbelievable scenes . . . consumed by a sense of horror and disbelief.

As the original fact of the cowardly attack struck home—and then struck again with the dreadful tidings of Senator Kennedy's death—our whole world came to a sudden, shuddering halt. The crowded streets froze into screaming silence.

Humanity held its breath. In every fearful heart there came a piercing grief, a pang of sorrow for Mrs. Kennedy and the children. From every far-flung land, even from behind the Iron Curtain, where compassion seemed to have fled, there came a sound of sobbing.

The bleeding flesh of our heroic dead became a symbol of mankind's shame that our enlightened civilization could breed the evil hand and eye that aimed those fatal shots.

Is this the terrible price of too much freedom?

Are the borders of constitutional protection too broad for those who despise our laws and desecrate our liberty?

Has our own lazy loyalty and indifferent Americanism played a part in this incredible pattern of events?

It is not easy to answer.

Our hearts are too heavy with the knowledge that a noble young warrior has been cut down in the prime of his days, in the very moment of his triumph, at the very beginning of his most notable achievements.

His was a bold, uncompromising call to truth . . . a call to arms against injustice and oppression and poverty that keeps ringing in our aching hearts.

We hear him yet. We see him as he stood before us . . . smiling . . . self-assured . . . and, oh, so tragically young. He is there . . . head high . . . waving to cheering crowds . . . rushing forward to shake a friendly hand.

Such a man cannot be eliminated by a maniac with a gun . . . no . . . nor by the madness that walks abroad in the world.

Such a man lives as long as men dream of freedom. His influence grows with the growth of the great country he served . . . alive and indestructible in our memories. Time erects his monument, and history will build it high.

We weep at the loss of a cherished friend.

We are outraged at the disgrace that again and again has befallen our land.

Robert F. Kennedy paid a high price for his patriotism . . . but he *was* a patriot. Most of us don't even know the meaning of the word.

Perhaps we will think differently now.

Perhaps we will act differently.

On this day of mourning and remembrance, we honor the memory of his wisdom, wit and eloquence. Our spirit is warmed again by the fire that lighted his love of America. Our hope for democracy lives on—and, while it lives, those who love liberty cannot truly die. In his name, let us resolve to strengthen our national integrity, to protect the principles of justice and equality for which he gave his life.

That is the greatest tribute we can pay in eternal gratitude for his ultimate sacrifice.

While our hearts grieve, let us beseech eternal peace and the blessing of Almighty God, as we intone the ancient supplication of the Kaddish for the immortal soul of Senator Robert Francis Kennedy, friend of mankind.

"TOPICAL COMMENT: KENNEDY IN AFRICA—ONE MAN'S FAITH IN A CONTINENT," AN ARTICLE BY WAYNE FREDERICKS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a most thoughtful article concerning the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy and Africa.

The article was written by a friend of the Senator's, Wayne Fredericks, who served with very great distinction from 1961 until 1967 as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

Mr. Fredericks, who holds the State Department's Superior Honor Award, is now with the Ford Foundation, working in the area of international programs.

The article, which appeared in the June 20, 1968, issue of the Los Angeles Times, follows:

TOPICAL COMMENT: KENNEDY IN AFRICA—ONE MAN'S FAITH IN A CONTINENT

(By Wayne Fredericks)

On June 6 two years ago, Sen. Robert Kennedy said to the students of the University of Cape Town in South Africa: "At the heart of Western freedom and democracy is the belief that the individual man, the child of God, is the touchstone of value—and all society, groups, the state, exist for his benefit. Therefore, the enlargement of liberty for individual human beings must be the supreme goal and the abiding practice of Western society." His speech was made in the course of a journey which took him and Mrs. Kennedy to the Republic of South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania, and Ethiopia.

Robert Kennedy's interest in Africa goes back at least as far as the "Kennedy airlift" of 1960, when the Kennedy Foundation provided charter flights for a number of students from East Africa who had scholarships at various American colleges but did not have funds to get to this country from Africa.

Robert Kennedy remained especially interested in the role of youth and students throughout the world, including Africa, and was conscious of the great impact which would be made in Africa as more and more young and increasingly better educated Africans assumed positions of responsibility.

When he reached Ethiopia on his 1966 African trip, he spoke to several thousand students in a hall normally holding one-third that number, and referred to youth and students as the elite of their country and told them it was their responsibility to strive for the betterment of their own people and "to promote a dialogue between young people of all nations."

His interest in Africa grew during his years as attorney general and as senator. He asked for and received regular briefings on African developments from State Department officials and others.

He had often expressed to me a desire to visit Africa and was pleased when he received an invitation in the autumn of 1965 from the president of the National Union of South African Students to speak to a student audience in Cape Town. Delays in obtaining visas and in finding a mutually acceptable time caused the trip to be postponed until June 1966, a time which was not convenient to Sen. Kennedy because of the political campaign of 1966. Nevertheless he proceeded.

An impressive amount of time and energy went into the preparation of the trip. Information was requested, not only from official sources, but from universities and a wide variety of private sources of knowledge on southern and eastern Africa. The senator held discussions with scholars, officials, businessmen, churchmen, journalists, authors, Africans, South Africans, representing a wide range of views on developments in Africa and on race relations.

Particularly useful were a series of Saturday morning discussions beginning with breakfast at the senator's home at Hickory Hill. During these and other discussions, Sen. Kennedy formulated and refined the principal themes of his speeches in the four countries he was to visit.

In the case of South Africa, whose policy of apartheid was repugnant to most of the world community and whose racial problems were very difficult, he was anxious to set forth for all South Africans, regardless of race, his own views of the basic values of Western democracy. (It was from a speech in South Africa that Sen. Edward Kennedy quoted in his eulogy to his brother in St. Patrick's Cathedral on June 8.)

Although he was ignored by South African officials his speeches, his visits to universities, to African townships, to the late Chief Albert Luthuli, and to industrial leaders were widely reported. And Kennedy, too, was impressed not only by modern technological achievements—but by Chief Luthuli, a modest African Nobel Peace Prize winner under restriction on his farm and of whom Sen. Kennedy said, "He is one of the most impressive men I have ever met. His compassion, understanding, and tolerance were most impressive."

As Kennedy departed, the Rand Daily Mail an English language Johannesburg paper, said "Sen. Robert Kennedy's visit is the best thing that has happened to South Africa for years. It is as if a window has been flung open and gust of fresh air has swept into a room."

Although the South African portion of the journey was controversial both inside and outside South Africa, the visits to Kenya, Tanzania, and Ethiopia took the form of a homecoming. President Kenyatta, President Nyerere, and His Majesty Haile Selassie and their people accorded him a reception usually reserved for a visiting chief of state. Both President Nyerere and the Emperor had met Robert Kennedy during their state visits to this country in 1963 when he was attorney general.

Robert Kennedy was one of those few American in high places who early felt the growing importance of Africa and who saw the importance of the issue of race and color for Africa, for the United States, and for the world. He saw danger in the minority regimes throughout Southern Africa based solely on race and in the potential opportuni-

ty they afforded communism. "The denial of freedom," he said in Africa, "in whatever name, only strengthens the very communism it claims to oppose."

He was concerned at the low level of U.S. economic assistance to Africa and called for an increased flow of economic aid and private investment from the richer to the poorer nations.

He had the ability to communicate with Africans—both about their problems and ours—and was always ready to receive African visitors when they came to Washington or New York on official or private visits. One African leader's comment to me was typical, "Sen. Kennedy certainly has an understanding of the problems of Africa."

I was in Kenya when the shattering news of the shooting and then the death of Sen. Robert Kennedy came. President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, who has led his people through periods of stress and difficulty to racial accommodation and tolerance summed it up for himself and for Africa when he said on June 6, 1968, "America and indeed the world has lost a courageous, liberal, and far-sighted personality. The ideals for which he strived will live on and inspire people the world over to live in understanding, respect, and love."

ENVOY OF FREEDOM

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to meet a most distinguished and unselfish American who has, through his own uncompensated efforts, done more for America and several individual Americans, than the entire U.S. Government was able to accomplish.

I am referring to Mr. Maxwell Rabb, of New York City, who recently was successful in bringing his seventh detained American out of East German jails, purely through his personal efforts.

Although Mr. Rabb is presently an attorney, he has served in critical capacities for the Government almost continually since he graduated from Harvard Law School. His service to the Nation began when he was administrative assistant to my close friend, and a truly distinguished American, Henry Cabot Lodge, during his senatorial service. In World War II he served as a Navy lieutenant in the amphibious service, returning to civilian life to become legal and legislative consultant to Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal. During the Eisenhower administration, Maxwell Rabb served as Presidential assistant, and secretary to the Cabinet. In 1958 and 1959 he was chairman of the American delegation to UNESCO in Paris. Only recently he has been appointed by President Johnson to the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, studying aspects of welfare programs in the United States.

I point all this out, because Mr. Rabb's history of service to his country, crowned with his latest activities on behalf of individual Americans imprisoned in East Germany, seems to prove a point. There is a certain type of individual whom this Nation produces, who will continually and unselfishly utilize his natural talents for the greater good of the American

people, without compensation, without hope of personal gain, or of individual recognition. Today, at least, I can help balance the books by attempting to provide some small recognition of what Maxwell Rabb has done for us; for I believe that he is such a man as I have mentioned. Accordingly, I would like the following newspaper item from the New York Daily News to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

ENVOY OF FREEDOM

(By Sidney Fields)

It was all done so quietly no one knew that Maxwell Rabb got seven Americans out of East German jails until they were freed.

Six were tried and received sentences from 27 months to 15 years. The seventh, Ronald Wiedenhoef served nine months, but was freed last June 3, without a trial, a triumph for Rabb. Wiedenhoef, 31, with two small children, and an instructor of art history at Columbia, was arrested and charged with espionage while taking photos of East Berlin buildings for a Ph. D. thesis on German architecture.

When Rabb first met him and told him he was free, Wiedenhoef stood there with a bewildered, unbelieving look.

"They all reacted that way," said Rabb recently in his office here. "Prisoners are never told anything."

Wiedenhoef decided to remain in Germany and finish his thesis.

Last May Rabb negotiated the release of Peter Feinauer, 27, of Providence, R.I., a student. The Communists said he was in East Berlin photographing military maneuvers and sentenced him to 15 years. He spent a year in jail before his trial and nine months after it.

"He's still in Germany with his mother," Rabb said. "After 21 months in jail he needs some fattening up. He's ill."

Rabb receives no compensation for these efforts; he pays all his own expenses.

WAS CABINET SECRETARY

He seems the most unlikely person to negotiate with Communists. A proper Bostonian from Harvard and the Harvard Law School, who served in the World War II Navy, Rabb has three daughters and a son who practice with him in the big Wall Street firm. President Johnson named him American conciliator on the Board of International Investment Disputes of the World Bank and last June 1 appointed him to the commission to study all aspects of welfare in America.

Earlier, when Henry Cabot Lodge was in the Senate, Rabb was his administrative assistant. He was secretary to President Eisenhower's cabinet, chairman of the American delegation to UNESCO and since 1960 president of the U.S. Refugee Committee. He speaks no German.

"That helped," said Rabb. "The East Germans thought I was less likely to pry or anticipate everything they thought or spoke."

On his very first trip he was startled to learn that they knew everything about him. But he never made any secret of his feelings for their ways and views or his own feelings about America's ways and views.

"They're suspicious and hostile because they're the seventh largest industrial nation and still unrecognized by the West," said Rabb. "You feel that East Germany is still the land of the spy who came in from the cold."

His mission began in 1965 when he went to the Leipzig Fair for a client who wanted to know if his European competitors were doing business with Iron Curtain countries. Allied firms were among the top exhibitors at the fair. West Germany was the second largest; the British, fourth; and the French, fifth. It was Lenin, who, observing capitalist cut-throat rivalry, remarked with savage sarcasm that when the Communists would be ready

to hang them all they'd be bidding against each other over who'd sell the rope to the Reds.

Anyway, Rabb told the East Germans he met that he'd tell our State Department about Allied participation in the fair. He did. Four months later State asked him to go over and help John Van Altena Jr., of Milton Junction, Wis., a student in West Germany before he got an eight year sentence for helping East Germans escape.

"They didn't think I'd succeed, but wanted to try everything," Rabb said. "They also told me they couldn't pay me and had nothing to give the East Germans."

It took Rabb four trips to free Van Altena. He served 18 months, 11 of them in solitary. When he returned here to school he wrote a scathing book about East Germany called, "A Guest of the State." He's 23 now.

"He admitted to me that he did have a gun when caught," Rabb said, "and that he'd do it all over again."

SON TRIES TO EXPLAIN

Last year he was called on again and made four trips for four other Americans: Moses Herrin, 25, of Akron, Ohio; Frederick Matthews, 24, Elwood City, Pa., both restaurant workers; and Mary Ellen Battle, 26, an ex-Miss Tennessee, a student and now in Union Theological Seminary. The three were charged with helping East Germans escape. The fourth, William Lovette, 26, of San Francisco, was arrested for reckless driving after plowing into a group of people and injuring ten. He served 18 months; Matthews and Herrin, 30; and Miss Battle, 19, before Rabb freed them.

One by-product of his work: East Germany is now buying American oranges, textile machinery and West Virginia coal.

How did he do all this? Maybe because he denies the classic definition of the diplomat as "a man sent abroad to lie for his country." His son Bruce, who went along to see Wiedenhoeft released, tried to explain it:

"They were overwhelmed that an American could be human and speak to them directly, informally and with complete honesty about them and about us."

And Rabb added, "I hope it's all over. There are no more Americans in East German jails—as of now."

ESTABLISH DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to establish daylight saving time on a year long basis which was adopted on June 20, 1968, by the Massachusetts House of Representatives. The text is as follows:

Whereas, The question of establishing Daylight Saving Time on a uniform basis for twelve months of the year has long been the subject of debate; and

Whereas, Investigation and study of this question has resulted in a finding that some of the benefits to be derived from such system are: workers and many school children would arrive home in Daylight between 51 and 85 more days than they do under the present system; a savings in fuel and electric bills; a reduction in motor vehicle accidents; more Daylight hours for leisure sports and recreational activities and greater personal

safety for adults and children from criminal attack; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectively urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing Daylight Saving Time on a year long basis; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

CAMPAIGN AGAINST CRIME

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the upsurge of crime and violence in the cities of America is a startling commentary on the temper of the times. There are deep-seated causes to this violence which must be eliminated, but which will take years to accomplish. In the meantime, the cities are faced with a war against a dangerously rising crime rate.

In February of this year, I brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the campaign against crime initiated by Police Chief Walter Headley of Miami, Fla. Over the 1967 Christmas weekend, a severe wave of crimes prompted Chief Headley to react strongly against the thugs and criminals who threatened the safety of the streets of Miami. The effectiveness of Chief Headley's "get tough" campaign is now well known.

Recently, the National Observer reported on the progress of Walter Headley's program against crime. I think that other American cities could learn much from the policy and procedures of Chief Headley in their own fight against crime:

A TOUGH COP CUTS CRIME IN MIAMI CRUSADE—PATROL DOGS ENRAGE SOME NEGROES, OTHERS CHEER—"LIONS WOULD BE OKAY"

MIAMI.—Walter Headley, a tough cop, set out to start "an epidemic of law and order" in the sweltering and violent Negro neighborhoods of Miami. He armed patrolmen with shotguns and dogs, told them to use the city's new "stop and frisk" law lavishly, and warned hoodlums to beware.

"When the looting starts," the chief of Miami police said, "the shooting starts."

That was six months ago. Most of the results so far were easily predicted. Violent crimes in the three large Negro neighborhoods have dropped sharply. In the first month, strong-arm robberies diminished by 62 per cent in the Negro neighborhoods, 45 per cent Miami-wide. So far this year, not one merchant has been killed in a robbery attempt.

AN OBJECT OF ATTENTION

Miami's crackdown is, in a way, an experiment with hard-nosed law enforcement in a day when hard-nosed law enforcement is out of style if not beyond the letter of the law. The chief himself has become the object of attention, if not always adulation, of police chiefs, civil-rights groups, and citizen law-enforcement groups across the nation.

He has received more than 12,000 letters since his campaign began last Christmas Eve. In the first few days, in fact, he received, in addition to the sacks of mail and bundles of telegrams, a dozen roses, a potted poinsettia, and a dollar from a man in Ohio

with instructions "to buy some slugs with this."

This reflects a growing national concern that at times and in certain places approaches fear if not panic. Nearly everyone agrees that "crime in the streets" will become a pivotal issue of the 1968 Presidential campaign; polls show most Americans worry more about crime than any other single problem.

Nowhere is this concern and fear more pervasive than in the cities. The Federal Bureau of Investigation last week reported that "serious crime" in the cities rose 17 per cent in the first three months of this year over last. Crimes of violence—murder, rape, and robbery—increased even more markedly.

Miami's Chief Headley is an old-time cop who thinks tough enforcement is the only way to fight crime. "There has been a policy of appeasement all over the country," he says, "and it isn't going to accomplish anything. The job of the police is to protect life and property, preserve the peace and enforce the law." He likes harsh solutions for harsh problems. Says he: "You can't bond a felon of the morgue."

Civil-rights groups were, predictably aghast at the chief's language, if not his intentions: some civil libertarians accused Mr. Headley of racist demagoguery. One NAACP official said the 62-year-old chief was simply asking for trouble.

NEGRO REACTION

What was not so easily predicted was the reaction of many Negroes in the three high-crime-rate neighborhoods. Many of them, either victims of hoodlums or neighbors of those who have suffered from the violence of black criminals, have urged Chief Headley to keep the pressure on.

"Some people criticize Headley for using shotguns and dogs," say one Negro minister, "but with a lot of my people it would be okay to use tanks and lions."

Another Negro man, the owner of a small appliance shop in the Liberty City area of northwest Miami, agrees. "What a lot of people don't realize is that black people are the biggest law-and-order fans in town. When there is no law and order, it is black people who suffer the most."

Even Chief Headley's critics usually temper their criticism with faint praise. When the Miami Times, a weekly aimed at Dade County's 170,000 Negroes, demanded that he resign, it carefully commended Mr. Headley's goal of cutting the crime rate in Miami's neighborhoods.

Fan and critic alike agree that there was, in fact, a frightening surge in violent crimes last year and that Chief Headley's tactic of putting patrolmen into the "hot" neighborhoods has, in fact, cut out a lot of the trouble.

In the week end that snapped the city's patience, 58 stores were hit by robbers; three merchants were killed. One was Chinese, the others were white. One merchant, who was not physically hurt, was robbed for the 25th time.

"Some of them said I wouldn't have done anything if the merchants who were killed had been Negroes," Chief Headley recalled last week. "Well, how do they know I wouldn't have done anything?"

Chief Headley confesses he doesn't know why all this violence arrived with Christmas. "We noticed that the really bad crimes, the crimes against the person, started escalating last July. I can't explain it, unless it had something to do with all the riots."

The chief sprinkles his conversation with military terms, discussing the "escalation" of crime and how he "deploys" his "troops" against the "enemy." He scorns such things as civilian review boards and community-police relation boards as "fraternizing with the enemy." He plainly has no use for subtle, indirect, "criminal-coddling" crime-fighting.

THE POTENTIAL WAS THERE

"We had been averaging picking up 125 guns a week with our stop-and-frisk law. That's why I am so happy about the Supreme Court ruling upholding our law. We weren't surprised when the crime wave started. We knew the potential was there."

Miami has become a large city, with a population of almost 400,000. It has spread across the swampy lowlands, instead of growing vertically as many older cities did, and this often gives even the slums a sunny character.

Negroes live in three principal neighborhoods: the Central City, though this has been almost altogether taken over by Cuban refugees, and in two outlying communities called Liberty City and Coconut Grove.

The worst-looking is Central City, a rundown collection of dilapidated stucco buildings left over from the land-boom days of the 1920s. Whites began giving up these neighborhoods during World War II, and this is the area where assault, robbery, mugging, and rape are most common.

Liberty City is in the northwest part of town, beyond the airport, and included in Liberty City are streets with the neat pink or white concrete-block houses that most of Miami lives in. Some of the Negro homes in Coconut Grove, near Coral Gables, are quite plush.

In these three areas live the Negroes who make up 15 per cent of Miami's population, and who commit 85 per cent of the crime. "If they commit 85 per cent of the crime," says Chief Headley with a matter-of-fact simplicity that infuriates many Negroes, "that is their fault and not mine. But since that is where the crime is, that is where the enforcement has to be."

He set up a special division, which was inevitably called a task force, and armed them with shotguns and assigned Miami's 20 police dogs to this special shift. Three of the 20 dog handlers are Negroes.

"We put the dogs on leashes," the chief says, "because that is the way they are most effective." To set up this shift, he raided other departments. Several officers were taken off the vice squad—not, the chief explained, because he thinks prostitution is unimportant, "but crimes against people are the most important and after all, it takes two to tango."

Word got out quickly. "For two or three days," says the manager of a dimly lighted pool hall on Northwest 65th Street, "you couldn't even find anybody to shoot a game with. Some of them I never have seen again."

Garth Reeves, editor of the Miami Times, agrees.

"The word got around, and the hoodlums got out of town. There is a general feeling of relief in the Negro community about this. But where the danger lies is that some of the militants who are looking for a little action will read these tough things Headley is saying and decide to come in here and see for themselves how tough he really is."

WE ALL MAKE MISTAKES

Critics of the crackdown (and not all critics are black) charge that Chief Headley's men often take the order to stop and frisk with too much enthusiasm. In the early days of the campaign, several officers went into a Negro-owned bar and frisked every customer in the house. When this provoked a loud outcry among Negroes, the chief apologized, more or less. "We all make mistakes," he said.

A few weeks later, uneasiness quickly turned to rage when a 17-year-old Negro boy accused two white patrolmen of stripping him to his undershorts and dangling him, held only by his heels, from an expressway overpass.

The two officers said the boy abused them with sarcasm when they found a knife concealed in his shirt in a routine "shakedown" of suspects in a pool hall, but the chief fired them when they couldn't explain why they dangled the youth from the overpass.

Many Negroes criticized Mr. Headley for firing them rather than placing charges against them. By a bureaucratic irony, the officers were charged only with placing the boy under arrest without reason and, further provoking black rage, for "failing to complete the arrest procedure."

"I know there was some criticism," Chief Headley says, "but I turned over all my information to the FBI, and both men have been indicted for violating that suspect's civil rights."

One Negro businessman here insists, in fact, that most of the black resentment of Mr. Headley's crackdown is a misunderstanding of the chief's public statements rather than disapproval of what he is doing. The chief's bark is often worse than the bite of any of his 20 dogs.

Even when he attempts to mollify his critics, the assurance is less than overwhelming. "We haven't fired a shot or made a wrong bite yet," he replies, dismissing complaints that the dogs are meant to terrorize Negro neighborhoods into tranquility.

Mr. Headley is not one of the "new cops." He goes back to the sterner era of law enforcement. He is a policeman to his toes, and when he married (for the third time) a few weeks ago, he selected his bride from his own department. She was a policewoman whom he had courted for 11 years. He fired her and sent her home the day after they were married.

CRIMINALS, PLEASE NOTE

He parts his hair in the middle, wears dark suits decorated only by a Masonic lapel pin, and sits behind a polished mahogany desk decorated with plaques, citations, photographs, and other souvenirs of a long career. A corner of the desk is decorated by a small framed poster, which features a policeman and a smoking revolver with the message. "Notice to Criminals: Your police are armed and dangerous."

He was a U.S. cavalryman at 15, a shrewd and savvy lad who quickly learned to play polo, ingratiating himself with his superiors to win advancement in the ranks. He worked as a riding master on a Bernarr McFadden health spa in New York state before coming to Miami. He joined the police department here in 1937, hired to organize a horse patrol. He was assigned to walking a beat instead.

"He was a new kind of policeman then," an observer of the police of those days recalled not long ago. "He was even the department intellectual, because in those days the police were recruited from the corn fields of south Georgia and north Florida."

Miami was wide open then, a superswinging kind of place that looked on prostitution as a source of tax revenue and tolerated sidewalk bookies and "numbers" agents openly. Miami is quiet, if not altogether dull today, though there are occasional charges that Mr. Headley's department is not 100 per cent pure.

The chief likes to boast that he is a policeman and not a politician, but the survival instincts of a political professional have helped weather several attempts to replace him. He turns criticism aside with a politician's aplomb. When a citizens' committee charged that "numbers" rackets were pulling in \$5,000,000 a year, the chief replied: "Aw, that's fantastic." On another occasion, when a reporter produced a "numbers" ticket he had purchased on the street, the chief whistled and said, "I'm amazed."

He cruises around Miami in either a new Lincoln Continental convertible of his own, or a city-owned, nine-year-old Buick. "The city offered me a new Ford or a Plymouth," he said, "and I told them, 'nothing doing.'" He keeps a listed telephone number and a policeman's whistle by the telephone. Crank callers, and he is bothered by them occasionally, get an eardrum-shattering blast.

Negro leaders here, on the other hand, concede that Mr. Headley has been something of a pioneer in civil rights—he hired Negro po-

liceman as early as 1944, when to do so elsewhere in the South would have been career suicide.

TWO CATEGORIES OF OFFICERS

To get them, he says, Miami watered down an entrance examination for the police academy, a part of the University of Miami, and established two categories of officers: White would be called policemen, Negroes would be patrolmen.

The "patrolmen" were assigned to a special precinct station in the Central City district, and this station was abolished only a few years ago. Five years ago, at the urging of Negroes, the special exam was eliminated and only five Negroes have been recruited since then.

About 50 of the 590-man police department are Negroes, including the three in the dog corps, one lieutenant, four sergeants, two motorcycle patrolmen and 10 plainclothes detectives. "We're 50 men short right now," Chief Headley says, "and I'd like to fill every vacancy with a Negro man if I could find them."

Many of them would probably be assigned to the three Negro neighborhoods. "That," says the chief, "is where the crime is." This would please the Negro community.

"We don't need shotguns and dogs," says one Negro critic of the chief's, and a resident of crime-plagued Liberty City. "We just need more men up here."

WESLEY PRUDEN, JR.

VIETNAM DISTASTEFUL, BUT NECESSARY

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, an impressive Memorial Day ceremony at Kohlerlawn Cemetery in Nampa, Idaho, was highlighted by Tracy Coker's address on Vietnam. Mr. Coker is a teacher at Nampa High School. He is also past commander of the Nampa American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. Because Mr. Coker's statement is the best one I have read recently on the subject of why we fight in Vietnam, I place it at this point in the RECORD, as it was reprinted in the Idaho Free Press and Caldwell News-Tribune:

VIETNAM DISTASTEFUL, BUT NECESSARY: "WE WILL NOT NEGATE THE SACRIFICE OF OUR DEAD"

As we pause in this moment to consider those, living and dead, who have served in the uniformed services, it is fitting that we think about the rightness and morality of their services.

Their cause, in all cases, was and is, essentially, to preserve our Republic and its institutions and processes, which were designed originally, and have since been molded, to achieve by orderly and democratic means justice, liberty, and progress for all. Sometimes service people have been called upon, not only to preserve these values at home, but to fight in foreign lands to protect us from invasion, and to protect and create law and order and freedom for us and for others of many nationalities.

It has been their part, only in the tiniest measure, to determine the issues and the policies, and the dread question of war or peace. Their task has been the simple act of doing their duty in all faith and confidence in the rightness of our causes as determined by our chosen leaders and the majorities that supported them. No service person can, or should, go much further than that.

This brings us to the fundamental question: Are war, force, and violence ever justified?

The question of where and when force should be used is too vast for our allotted speaking time today.

All must agree that war is an evil and carries with it many attendant evils. If it can be justified at all, it must be on the basis of the reasoning of Cicero, the ancient Roman orator, who said 2,000 years ago that war can be justified only to end or prevent worse evils, such as invasion, anarchy, tyranny, subversion, terrorism and slavery. Force and violence can be justified abroad on no other basis. At home it can be justified to protect life and property, law and order, and the freedom, rights, security and dignity of the individual.

Orderly society depends mainly upon sincere and law-abiding majorities, who, as individuals, seldom or never require coercion to make them respect the rights of others. But there are always a few overly-selfish individuals, and even some criminally-minded persons whose violence against society must be overcome with greater force and violence. The same is true on the international scene. That is partly why we have war.

Hence, all who believe in an orderly society, where people can be safe from criminal assault, must give full support to police power and force, democratically controlled by society.

The pacifist takes the view that all war and force is wrong, but he is anxious to enjoy an orderly society. We can respect his right to his view, we can honor his courage if he sticks to his view, we can deeply appreciate his goodness of heart, which, if shared by every human being would destroy war and make forever the use of force unnecessary.

But we can neither respect, or honor, or appreciate his realism or his logic.

Neither the world, nor everyone in our national society has his goodness of heart or purity of intention. While we may hope for that day of human perfection, we dare not sit down to await it.

There is evil and dangerous disorder in the world. These anti-social elements must be contained. When they turn aggressive, they must be fought. To complacently await the day when education and brotherly love shall have changed them, can lead to our non-survival.

Force never has been and perhaps never can be entirely absent from organized society. The only hope of safety, justice, freedom, and progress for all is that predominant force may be always kept in the hands of a just and kindly people.

To do this is not easy. Every good citizen must do his part and oppose with all his being and all his resources every ism, or doctrine, or ideology destructive to these ends. The cost of freedom and justice, and the preservation of our nation is high. It can be counted in the remembered and unremembered sweat and toil, suffering, sacrifice and endurance of millions—and in the graves of over a million Americans who have died for our country.

No matter what modern preachments or theories may be advocated, we will not negate the sacrifice of our dead. Nor will we cease to venerate their just causes. And whatever may be the doctrines or ideologies of others, while tolerating those beliefs in this land where their freedom was bought by the blood of better men, we will not fail to give low marks to those who refuse to assume their share of the burden.

The fact that to commit ourselves to force is so distasteful that we all wish for a better world where it is not necessary, must not deter us from the grim task of doing our duty in the real world.

None can view war with as much horror and loathing as those of us who have seen it close up; but we know that pacifism did

not stop Hitler, nor is it likely to prevent the terrorism and slavery of Communism. While we should contest the spread and continuation of such evils as far as possible by moral persuasion, skilled diplomacy, and the propaganda of truth, we must not deny ourselves the ultimate weapon of power.

If there be talk of building bridges across the chasm that divides the world, let it not be bridges from us to tyrants, but rather bridges built directly to the plain people oppressed by those Red regimes. Let us build bridges of hope to them by standing fast for freedom, until Communism fades away or is destroyed.

It was not the plain people that made the war in Korea, or the one in Vietnam. They did not enslave Russia, or Red China, or Poland, or Czechoslovakia, or so many other peoples. It was the Communist Party. Let us not forget that.

Our fighting men did not make the war in Vietnam, nor did our national leaders. It, like others, is the result of communist drive to world conquest. Let us beware of our so-called leaders who go about the country saying the war can not be won, or that it is unjust, or immoral. Whatever their motives, they are simply undermining morale and helping the enemy. It is not immoral to defend freedom for ourselves or others. There is no battle for right which can not be won.

Let us beware of negotiations with Communists. Let us beware of those who insist on a coalition government in South Vietnam with the Viet Cong in it. Let us remember how we lost mainland China to the Reds by insisting that Mao Tse-tung be in a coalition with Chiang Kai Shek. Think of the dread consequences of that. Can we not remember such an experience and learn something from it?

Loathing war, as all good people must, we are now in a sad dilemma. We are trying to negotiate with a regime that will not even admit that it is in the war in South Vietnam. And the day we make peace with them, we lose the people of Cambodia, Laos, and perhaps those in Vietnam to slavery. Our bombing pause has already aided the enemy and caused more Americans and others to be killed.

Knowing war and hating and fearing it and all the evils that follow in its train, we will never cease to persevere in the effort to curb it and end it in the only feasible way that exists—that is by bringing liberty, justice, and democracy to men everywhere. But until assured of the preservation of these values, we must not, sorrowfully as may be, fail to hold fast to the sword of defense.

Those we honor today have stood in the breach and faced the foes of freedom. From those of us who were their friends or relatives, or their comrades and fought beside them, to all those who today must answer "Absent" to the roll call of life, there goes the pledge that we will stand and fight for the American values which their lives, and deaths, and services have preserved for us. We loved them. We miss them.

Let us all pledge that we shall forever hold in sacred memory both them and the great Republic which they cherished.

WHY OUR WATER SUPPLY IS FAILING

HON. DON. EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a most interesting article from a constituent of mine from Fremont, Calif., Mr. Bill Gianella. This article raises a funda-

mental question of great import for both East and West—"Why Our Water Supply Is Failing," Mr. Gianella looks beyond the drought as a cause to the matters of watersheds and the variety and degree of vegetation surrounding watersheds. He sees far-ranging implications in brush depriving areas of water and destroying forests as the trees struggle for water and ultimately in hindering farming, industry, and urbanization in the region. The idea of using brush control techniques to gain a more usable, plentiful water supply is fascinating and full of potential. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, at this point include Mr. Gianella's article in the RECORD:

WHY OUR WATER SUPPLY IS FAILING

(By Bill Gianella)

For many years our streamflow and our ground-water levels have been getting lower and lower. Most people lay the blame to drought, completely overlooking the fact that for years when the wet part of the climatic cycle returned to follow the dry, our streams and our ground waters have not come back to their former normal levels.

This is not a recent phenomenon; it has been going on for generations; but only since water has become so scarce has the matter received any attention from the people of the lower country and of the cities. Most of these people (even the ones who should know better) will insist that the water levels should return to their former levels when the wet part of the climatic cycle returns. I grant the water levels should do that but for years they have not been doing it. This article is to explain why they do not; and it is to show how we can remedy the situation.

The reason the water levels do not come back to where they should is due to the fact that there has been a change in the kind of vegetation covering the watersheds, since the various Governmental Agencies instituted an attempt to completely keep fire out of the forests. This Fire Exclusion Policy has resulted in grass lands going to brush and in open forests turning into thickets. This change has been from wet-season growing shallow-rooted types of plants to summer-growing deep-rooted types.

An excessive amount of deep-rooted types that dry the soil to a greater depth. This water that has been transpired by the watershed cover must be replaced before any replenishment of the ground-water that feeds the wells, the springs, the lakes, and the streams can take place. So the more water used to maintain watershed cover, the less available for downstream users. The remedy lies in preventing the erosion of the watershed by protecting it with the least-water-demanding cover that will do the job.

On the average, it takes eight hundred to nine hundred pounds of transpired water to produce one pound of vegetal dry matter. So every pound produced sends about one hundred gallons of water into the air. This means that every unnecessary pound produced in the uplands precludes the production of a useful pound in the irrigated valleys below or that it deprives some industry or some city dweller of one hundred gallons of water.

Any thinking person knows that we must protect our watersheds from erosion; and that no water should be made available for folk downstream until that is done. But the forest protection efforts have not been directed towards this mark. They have kept out all fires (even controlled litter-consuming fires) that the forest needs.

In the old days the watershed cover consisted of grass and of scattered trees. The grasses were mostly wet-weather-growing and were shallow-rooted species that went dormant when the dry weather set in so they de-

manded no water in the dry season and at the worst dried only a couple feet deep of the surface soil. Trees and brush being deep-rooted and being summer-growing not only dried the soil deeper but took water at a time the skies were not supplying any.

If trees are not too closely spaced they do well and stay healthy but if crowded they not only so dry the soil that no streamflow can take place but they kill themselves in their struggle for water and leave a mess of forest litter that makes wildfires inevitable with all the attendant ills of erosion, silting up of streams, streams leaving their courses, etc. So we must make up our minds what we want most; deep-rooted stuff in the uplands or dry-weather streamflow. We cannot have a maximum of both. So each watershed should be treated as an individual district and the watershed cover tallored to give the results most beneficial to the people of that watershed. It has not been so looked at in the past; I ask that a start be made while we still have something worth saving.

In the days when the forests were healthy, the trees were scattered; with grasses and other shallow-rooted forage plants between. According to the soil and the climate of the district, the size and spacing of the trees varied but a good oldtime Yellow Pine forest or in a good Sugar Pine forest had trees some two rods apart; something like forty trees to the acre. When fire was excluded, a "population explosion" of young trees took place; where the young came in as close as a yard apart we have some forty-eight hundred to the acre; when they came in at less than a foot apart, we have over forty-three thousand to the acre. When one considers that a hundred trees or so is plenty for an irrigated and cultivated orchard, it is easy to see that the land and water is being asked to support too many forest trees. Many times what either the land or the water available can support. So under this Fire Exclusion Policy not only have the downstream people been deprived of their traditional water supply, but the very Forests the Foresters are supposed to protect are being killed off by the struggle for water and the Forests have been turned into an accumulation of flammable rubbish in which the prevention of Wildfire is impossible.

It is time for people to realize that the accumulation of surplus vegetation on the watersheds of parts of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado and New Mexico can limit the amount of hay or vegetables produced in Southern California and in Arizona; that the accumulation of surplus vegetation anywhere on the Sierras can limit agriculture of the Central Valley and it can limit the growth of practically all the populous districts of California. The same applies on any watershed; surplus vegetation by cutting off the water supply at the headwaters can limit all human endeavor clear to the sea. For example, surplus vegetation in Colorado, and in New Mexico can hamper farming, industry and city development as far away as Brownsville, Texas. Surplus vegetation will do the same to our Gulf Coast and to the Atlantic Seaboard. Of late they have been complaining of Drought but so far as I know no real study has been made to see if they are getting all that can be gotten of the waters that come from the sky. If they are letting brush and other excess vegetation transpire more than is necessary for watershed protection they are not. In this respect the East is now in the same boat as the West but they do not yet realize it. The only difference between East and West is that this brush hazard is slower in manifesting itself in humid districts. But the remedy for water shortage is the same; do not waste any water upstream by transpiration.

In addition to killing the forest and depriving the downstream people of their water supply, this forest policy of letting litter accumulate saddles the country with a still

greater liability. This year after year of letting forest litter accumulate lays the country wide open to sabotage. A smart enemy could for the cost of about three dollars, put out a device in the fall, an incendiary device, that would not fire until the right temperature came in the summer. For the price of less than the price of one bomber, they could deal us a blow that would dwarf Pearl Harbor. The only preventive of such a hazard is to get rid of the forest rubbish by controlled burning.

As I see it the only thing that has saved us so far is that our enemies (like our friends) have Bureaucracies even more unwieldy, and with less vision and that are even less imaginative than ours. I grant this is some accomplishment but so far they have exceeded us in this respect. Nevertheless, we should not trust our National Security solely to the relative unwieldiness of Bureaucracies. Security itself demands that we reduce the fire hazard of forest litter.

PROTECTION FOR U.S. TEXTILE INDUSTRY

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the situation currently confronting America's textile industry is growing urgent. Increasingly, the tariffs which are supposed to protect American textile producers are being neutralized or circumvented by foreign concerns. The American firms are at a comparative disadvantage.

I believe it is essential that we pursue a tariff policy which will give protection to these industries and stimulate trade at the same time. Last week the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on H.R. 11626, a bill which will help protect this vital industry without discouraging trade. I submitted a statement at these hearings, and, under unanimous consent, I include my remarks in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE ON H.R. 11626, "TEXTILE TRADE ACT OF 1968," TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, JUNE 28, 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on H.R. 11626, known as the Textile Trade Act.

For the first time in six years, we have before us proposed legislation for the institution of a comprehensive program of import regulation. Although this nation has been moving toward the goal of free trade—and this trend was certainly obvious in the Kennedy Round negotiations—recent foreign trade practices have placed our textile industry in an untenable situation.

A 3-Year Short Term Agreement, which was concluded during the Kennedy Round talks and which extended the preceding 5-Year Long Term Agreement, provides only a moderate protection for domestic cotton. The areas that are particularly suffering from foreign competition, however, are those which are protected by nothing more than limited tariffs. These include the woolen industry and the man-made fiber and apparel industry.

Until the present, tariffs have been sufficient to shield these industries and to stimulate trade simultaneously. But, through export subsidies, border taxes, cartels in restraint of trade, dumping, import quotas, and a number of administrative procedures de-

signed to thwart imported products, foreign textile producers have taken advantage of our liberal trade barriers. To cite a specific instance, man-made fiber and woolen imports have increased 256 percent in the last six years, and there is no indication that this volume will slacken in the future. Complementing this situation is the fact that textile exports are not increasing.

Two implications of the present balance of trade in the textiles are: (1) that tariffs are no longer operable because means have been found to neutralize or to circumvent them, and (2) that the present trend in textile imports can be identified as being based upon a competitive advantage possessed by foreign industries. The advantage may be considered an unfair one, since it is a result of the substitution of nontariff restrictions for the cuts in tariffs that have been attained in reciprocal trade agreements.

The most equitable solution to the problem would be to provide the basis for an orderly international trade. Legislation should ideally provide protection for the domestic industry, while it should not stifle trade. H.R. 11626 provides a certain flexibility that is directed towards the establishment of these two conditions. It authorizes the President to negotiate "with other governments for the purpose of consummating agreements to provide orderly trade in textile articles into the United States . . . based on the share of the United States consumption of such category supplied by imported textile articles during a representative period of not less than one calendar year prior to the year 1967, as determined by the President."

The President would also have the power to consider other factors that would affect trade, such as historical patterns and the interests of developing countries. Those countries that do not choose to negotiate would have their import trade restricted for any calendar year to the average annual quantity of textile articles which entered this country for consumption during the years 1961-66. Such agreements of a bilateral and a collective nature already exist for cotton and several other textiles.

The danger that faces the textile industry is very real and should not be considered as a hoax which is being used to benefit that industry. Textile imports have increased two and one-half times since 1961. Foreign trade regulations and low-cost production are supporting this trend. It has been estimated that the effect of the imports has been to deprive approximately 200,000 textile workers of employment. Senator Ernest F. Hollings, of South Carolina, has stated that the present handling of the situation will determine whether our textile industries move abroad in the future or remain in the United States. Furthermore, the production of textiles seriously affects areas which have been designated as low-income or poverty-level. In 373 counties in Appalachia, approximately 75 percent of the jobs are affiliated with some segment of the textile industry.

I am sure the Committee will consider what I have said judiciously. Thank you for extending this privilege to me.

OPENING OF LIBERTY PARK

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, residents of Los Angeles will have a very special celebration tomorrow honoring American Independence. Through the efforts of some of our most distinguished Californians, Los Angeles will witness the open-

ing of Liberty Park, a permanent tribute to the freedom we all cherish. Special guest will be Mr. Willard Ridley, executive director of the U.S. Savings Bond Division of the Treasury Department, who will deliver the major July 4 address at the park's unveiling of a full-size replica of the Liberty Bell.

I have had the privilege of serving on the Liberty Park Advisory Council with Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty; Los Angeles Supervisors Ernest Debs and Kenneth Hahn; director of the California Museum of Science and Industry, William J. McCann; California State director of promotion for the Treasury's Savings Bond Division, R. Harry Washburne; John W. Luhring, banker; Capt. Michael Holsinger of the Air Force; Lt. Col. Charles W. Phillips of the Army; Adm. William M. McCloy, Armed Forces chairman of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; Norman Kelly, Los Angeles County director of veterans and military affairs; Ferdinand Mendenhall, board member, California Newspaper Publishers Association; Donald A. Gary, secretary-treasurer of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of America; Congressional Medal of Honor holders John Smith, Raymond Harvey, Louis M. Van Iersel, Thomas A. Pope; Bernard F. Kamins, executive board member, Southern California Industry-Education Council; and Alfred Bloomingdale, creator of a new marketing concept to sell U.S. savings bonds to credit-card holders.

The council and Los Angeles citizens owe special gratitude to Joseph N. Mitchell, president of Beneficial Standard Corp. Mr. Mitchell is devoting a very valuable parcel of land at 3700 Wilshire Boulevard fronting Beneficial Plaza as a permanent display location for patriotically significant artifacts. He and Mrs. Mitchell, with the research aid of British Consul General Andrew Franklin, succeeded in locating the same London foundry which cast the first Liberty Bell in 1751 for Philadelphia. At their own expense, the Mitchells traveled to London and arranged to obtain an exact counterpart of that bell which will be rung tomorrow by his father, Edward D. Mitchell, who first conceived the idea of Liberty Park as a public service.

Tomorrow's celebration will also honor five heroes of Vietnam, each recommended by his own branch of the service. They are: Capt. Michael Livengood of the Army; AT-1 Anthony C. Hanson of the Navy; Gunnery Sgt. Jordan A. Spahn of the Marines; Maj. Glenn P. York of the Air Force; and Lt. George H. Brown III of the Coast Guard. These outstanding young men will receive U.S. savings bonds and letters of appreciation from members of the Los Angeles City Council.

Recognizing the importance of U.S. savings bonds to the freedom of all Americans, the Liberty Park Advisory Council has for nearly 2 years provided speakers and forums on this subject, cooperated in payroll savings business-leader meetings, donated bonds as awards on television programs, assembled and disseminated bonds-promotion letters and established bonds exhibits. Of particular significance has been the contribution of Mr. Alfred Bloomingdale,

chairman of the board of the Diners Club. Utilizing his mass merchandising talents, Mr. Bloomingdale created a program which has helped to sell a large portion of the \$5 billion in bonds sold annually. Sponsoring advertising and order forms, Mr. Bloomingdale has spent more than \$250,000 in postage as a public service.

Mr. Speaker, the favorable reaction to the efforts of these fine Americans is evidenced by a poem inspired by those efforts. "Liberty Bell," by a well-known southern California poetess, Mrs. Rosemary Breckler, will be read tomorrow by one of television's best loved stars, Bea Benaderet of "Petticoat Junction." The poem follows:

LIBERTY BELL

Stand tall and proud
Heart beating with the fervor
Of waves happily crashing on a shore
Pulses throbbing . . . Listen! Listen!
The Bell is pealing, proclaiming
Man shall be free to hold
His destiny in his own hands
Liberty, Liberty for all,
The Bell resounds.

No man too small,
Unless he chooses to hide
In the halls of silence . . .
No man too insignificant
That his plea shall not be heard.
A dream of millenniums
Joyously proclaimed . . .
Guard it well!
This liberty for all.

No shelter is too sound
For the fledgling hope of hopes
No nourishment too rich.
Guard it! *Guard it well!*
Help it grow!
No gold can ever it replace.
Let The Bell peal for endless centuries
Hailing that liberty has succeeded
Flourished in this land!

DR. WALTER BECHER HAILS UNITED STATES ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a heartening letter from Dr. Walter Becher, distinguished member of the German Bundestag, expressing congratulations on our celebration of Independence Day. Dr. Becher's thoughtful letter is a welcome reminder of the confidence the free world has in America's determination to maintain its standard of greatness as a bastion of freedom.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to share Dr. Becher's correspondence with my congressional colleagues:

TRIFTSTR, GERMANY,
June 28, 1968.

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINSHALL: On July 4, the American National Independence Day, I should like to send you my best congratulations. In a time when the world speaks about an American crisis, I should like—out

of my knowledge of your country and people—to express my conviction that America's spirit is unbroken and will lead your country to a new greatness in the future.

America can and will remain the center of freedom—not only for herself, but also for other nations of our world.

I should like to send you my best and most sincere wishes for your country, for your people, for you and for your political work.

With best personal regards,
Yours very sincerely,

DR. WALTER BECHER,
Member of the German Bundestag.

FIREARMS CONTROL

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson directed local postmasters not to deliver firearms unless local law enforcement officers have first been notified.

Of all the hysteria that has followed in the wake of the Kennedy assassination, Mr. Watson's directive must surely rank as the most extreme. It is an insult to the law-abiding sportsmen in this country who evidently will now be accorded all of the indignities of the common criminal.

Where all of this will end, I do not know. Since practically every person living in my State owns firearms, I suppose they will all have to be mugged and fingerprinted.

Mr. Watson piously proclaims his directive to be in the national interest, as if that were his right to determine. There seems to be a question as to whether or not the Congress would agree. This week, the Rules Committee refused to report the President's firearms bill. So what constitutes the national interest on Capitol Hill is not always the same as what it is farther on down Pennsylvania Avenue.

It is a twisted kind of logic that sees more harm in firearms than in Communist propaganda.

It is a twisted kind of logic that inhibits the mailing of guns to sportsmen but ignores the flow of pornography to pervers.

A member of my staff inquired at the Department's legal office as to why the national interest, rather than some statutory authority, is cited as the basis for this directive. The reply was that such an invasion of privacy could only be based on the national interest.

Well, to say the least, this was an invasion of privacy. It is no business of the police or anyone else who is receiving legitimate mail. Mr. Watson's order can only be termed police state tactics of the worst sort.

While the Postmaster General was determining what was in the national interest as far as firearms are concerned, he was doing the same thing with respect to civil rights.

Henceforth, all postmasters in first-class post offices will be designated as deputy equal employment opportunity

officers. They are directed to participate in local programs to eliminate bias from school systems, housing arrangements, and other institutions. The fact that many of these men might be motivated to do so as a matter of personal conscience never occurred to Mr. Watson. Now, they are under strict orders to become involved in the civil rights movement.

The Post Office Department is also hiring 23 contract compliance examiners to make absolutely certain that Government contractors doing business with the Department comply with the President's directive on equal opportunity. And there is to be a \$1.5 million prepromotion supervisory training program attesting to the fact that the Post Office Department is not known for its devotion to economy. Since the training program is announced as part of the equal employment opportunity program, it can only be assumed that it is designed to insure the advancement of those who might not otherwise merit a promotion.

In the matter of gun controls, Watson freely admits that he is trying to facilitate passage of the President's firearms proposal. On equal employment, he has in effect set up a Federal propaganda corps. Perhaps the time has come for the Postmaster General to register as a lobbyist.

Meanwhile, the Department is sending around a recording to radio stations explaining the new postal rates. Listeners in Milford, Mass., will not have the benefit of the dramatic announcement, however, because the local station received theirs in the mail—broken.

All of which leads me to suggest that if Mr. Watson would pursue the responsibilities of his office with the same vigor that he tries to impose firearms curbs and promote the administration's civil rights program, mail service might be vastly improved.

A COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS RESOLUTION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1968, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts adopted a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" as the official hymn of the United States. I would like to call to my colleagues' attention this most fitting eulogy to Senator Robert F. Kennedy:

Whereas, The national life of our great country is weakened by disunity, distrust and assassination of our great leaders; and

Whereas, In recent days when America in paying final tribute to one of its great leaders, Robert F. Kennedy, the singing and playing of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" renewed in all of us a new sense of allegiance to our flag, loyalty to our government and concern for our fellowman; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of

Representatives urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the hymn "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" as our national hymn; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

WATER NEEDS IN THE SNAKE RIVER BASIN

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, last week I attended a meeting of the South Idaho Water Users Association in Burley, Idaho. At that meeting Dr. Robert R. Lee, director of Idaho Water Resource Board made a very fine speech which contained a detailed statement of water needs in the Snake River Basin. Later in the same program, Senator LEN B. JORDAN, one of the foremost authorities on water in the United States, drawing on his long experience which includes service to his State as Governor and service to the United States as a member of the International Joint Commission, underlined in dramatic terms the future critical needs for water in this river basin. Because there has been much talk of the water needs of the Colorado River Basin, and because there has been some poorly advised talk of the Snake River as a source of augmentation for the Colorado River, I commend the reading of both these talks to Members of this House. Only by having full information can we make sound decisions in the future.

The material follows:

WHITHER OUR WATER?

(By Robert R. Lee, Director, Idaho Water Resource Board, before the South Idaho Water Users Association Meeting, Burley, Idaho, June 29, 1968)

INTRODUCTION

We have a marvelous State, the quality of living is unparalleled, Idaho is a State of vast mountain ranges, hidden lakes, clear flowing streams and abundant fish and wildlife. Yet the State is 38th in per capita income. The State's most valuable resource, its youth, is our chief export. There is not enough opportunity to allow them to remain in the State. Our challenge is to provide economic opportunity while maintaining and enhancing the quality of the choice environment which we have. In addition to this challenge, our Snake River water is being attacked from two directions. First, there are projects being proposed on the Middle Snake which could conceivably irrevocably commit water from the Snake River for downstream purposes, and, at the same time, the threat of diversion from the Upper Snake River Basin is now before us.

THE DIVERSION THREAT

The threat of diversion is real. It is not a specter thrown to the people to win votes or to win appropriations. Other speakers will clarify this, I am sure.

The Idaho Water Resource Board was organized three years ago as a response to this threat. The Board was given powers to formulate a State Water Plan and to implement that plan through a program of development. It is fair to ask "What has the

Board done?" "Is the State any better prepared to defend itself?" These are legitimate questions.

What would you do to thwart the effort to divert Idaho's water if you were in charge of the State's water program? I would submit that first of all you would need to recruit capable professionals in a variety of fields to act as the Water Board's experts in hydrology, engineering, economics, land classification, and related subjects. Only in this way could Board members be able to speak out from a solid, factual base. Otherwise, you would have a lot of breast-beating with very little impact. I would suggest that you would wish to embark upon a series of water inventory and needs studies which would identify Idaho's water and related land resources and project needs for various purposes for at least a hundred-year period. The State's ultimate defense against diversion is information derived from these needs studies.

I would suggest further that you would begin to formulate a State Water Plan, using the professional staff but working in cooperation with the local State and Federal agencies. This plan would serve as a framework for the development program.

I would suggest that you would investigate the possibility of the State embarking upon a development program to construct small projects as well as to participate in the construction of large multi-purpose projects. The possibility of tapping revenues from some of the large proposed multi-purpose projects on the Snake and elsewhere would undoubtedly be investigated as a source of funds for a State development program.

In addition, I would suggest that you would be active in maintaining interstate liaison, both through the Western States Water Council and the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission, and to learn views and objectives of the other states and to work to protect Idaho's interests.

And I would suggest that you would take steps to maintain effective liaison with Idaho's Congressional Delegation and various Congressional staffs so that you would be informed on activities at that level and so that information could be contributed with respect to the State's viewpoint and findings relative to the diversion threat.

AN ACTION PROGRAM

All of the citizens of Idaho should know that the Board has taken appropriate steps to create a small but highly professional organization, contract for water inventory and needs studies, initiate a State water planning effort, investigate the possibility of a State development program, provide interstate liaison, and maintain effective Congressional liaison.

A year ago the Board had a staff of four with one professional. By July 1 we will have a staff of twenty with fifteen professionals. This is a capable group, including engineers, hydrologists, planners, soil scientists, an economist, an information officer, and a draftsman.

The staff is engaged in the first phase of our State Water Plan in the Bear River Basin in southeastern Idaho. In fiscal year 1970 the staff will embark upon an Upper Snake River Basin study in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies.

Water needs studies are underway primarily through contract with the University of Idaho and Idaho State University, although the Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and the U.S. Geological Survey are cooperating. These needs studies will identify our needs for all purposes to the year 2070 and should be completed by 1970. We are coordinating these studies with other northwest states and with the Pacific Northwest River Basin Commission so that they will be compatible. Our studies reveal that although there is about five million acre feet per year that

flows past the Wyoming line into Idaho on the south fork of the Snake, nearly all of this is already committed under present-day development. Approximately 1.3 million acre feet per year is all that remains unconsumed at Milner Dam, and this includes a period of approximately 12 years during the Thirties when no flow would pass Milner except for water quality and power rights. The Lower Teton and Ririe dams now underway, plus the proposed Snake Plain Recharge and Lynn Crandall Dam, if feasible would develop all but 387,000 acre feet per year. These projects can only be made feasible by developing the groundwater aquifer to supply water during the dry period.

The water supply situation downstream below Thousand Springs is much better. With Teton, Ririe, and Lynn Crandall sites developed and with 248,000 acre feet of recharge into the Snake Plain Aquifer, there will still be approximately five million acre feet per year runoff at King Hill. At Murphy Gage there would be approximately eight million acre feet, and at Welser approximately 12 million acre feet per year of runoff. On the need side we have preliminary estimates that show that approximately 3½ million acres of land is being irrigated in the Upper Snake River Basin and that there is another 8.5 million acres of potentially irrigable land in the Upper Snake, of which 5.9 million acres is in Idaho. If we consider a minimum estimate of 1½ acre feet per acre consumptive use, the potential demand for water for irrigation in the Upper Snake will exceed the 12 million acre feet available, assuming that it could be made available by complete regulation. Needs estimates for fish and wildlife, recreation, power, and water quality are not yet available. It is, therefore, evident that the Upper Snake River Basin is a water-short area at the present time above Milner Dam and that it will be at some point in the future in southwest Idaho. These are facts that anyone seeking to divert Idaho's water will have to face.

We have been maintaining effective interstate liaison with the Western States Water Council and the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission, primarily through the efforts of Mr. William S. Holden. In addition, Mr. Holden has been the Board's key contact with the Congressional Delegation and Congressional staffs on the diversion question.

The Board has also initiated investigation of a State development program. International Engineering Consultants, Inc. has been employed to perform a preliminary review of existing feasibility studies by Federal agencies and other parties to see if some of them might be financed using State revenue bonds. Their preliminary report is scheduled to be available on July 15, 1968. The Board is convinced that without funding by the State, competition for Federal funds will slow the development of such large projects as the Lynn Crandall Dam and the Southwest Idaho Project and stretch them out for many, many years. We are hopeful that the review by International Engineering will show the use of revenue bonds to be feasible. We have also sent a letter to irrigation districts, canal companies, soil conservation districts, mayors, county commissioners, and other key water officials asking them to send in information on possible small projects that might be funded under a State Small Projects Program, such as that proposed during the last session of the Legislature. Once this information is received, the staff will tabulate it, and the Board, the Governor, and the Legislature will be in a much better position to evaluate whether the State can play a significant role in stimulating small project development.

We have also been involved in Middle Snake discussions relative to development of the HMS site or Apaloosa site in an effort to protect Idaho's interests and obtain a source of revenues for development.

DIVERSION PLANS

During recent months the news media have reported on a number of schemes for diversion of water from areas of so-called "surplus" in the United States and Canada to areas of so-called "shortage." The plans that have so far been proposed that directly affect Idaho are:

1. The Snake-Colorado Project: Samuel Nelson.
2. The Modified Snake-Colorado Project: William Dunn.
3. The Snake River-Green Diversion: John H. Fair.
4. NAWAPA Plan: Parsons Engineering.
5. Western States Water Augmentation Concept: Lewis Smith.

Other plans have been proposed by Roy Tinney and R. W. Beck and Associates which would take water from Central Canada into the Great Plains region of the United States and possibly into the Colorado Drainage. Undoubtedly, many more diversion schemes will be proposed in the future.

The vast, west-wide water diversion plans pose no immediate threat to Idaho because they involve Canada and are so complex. Moreover, both the NAWAPA Plan and the Smith Plan would require the use of the Salmon River for part of the diversion system, thereby destroying the salmon runs and the wild rivers nature of that stream. The conservationist movement alone would likely defeat such proposals. The more immediate threat to Idaho comes from the short-run plans to immediately augment the flow of the Colorado River. The three plans of limited scope affecting Idaho are the Dunn Plan, the Nelson Plan, and the Fair Plan. These will be briefly evaluated; however, it is impossible to give a thorough evaluation of them since the basic estimates and criteria are not available.

1. *Snake River-Colorado River Diversion Plan: Samuel Nelson.* Our staff's evaluation makes clear that the Nelson Plan is grossly inaccurate in terms of costs.

a. There is not a surplus of water in the Snake River near Hagerman as was assumed. The author of the Nelson Plan used estimated average annual flows to support a diversion of 3,450 cfs continuous flow, and this cannot be realized without additional storage, thereby adding additional costs to this scheme.

b. Idaho's ultimate water needs were not given consideration; instead, the plans for Federal development to the year 2000 were used to represent ultimate needs. These estimates disregard state and private activities to develop the water and land of Idaho, and they disregard current rates of development which have exceeded 50,000 acres per year.

c. The millage rate used to determine the value of power in the Columbia system was much lower than the market value. The cost of the Nelson Plan, therefore, would be significantly increased.

d. An evaluation of downstream water rights was overlooked in determining the water supply.

e. The Nelson Plan would definitely injure the State of Idaho by taking water that will be required to meet water requirements in the Upper Snake River Basin.

2. *Snake River-Green River Diversion: John H. Fair.* Like so many of the diversion plans, this is a hastily put together scheme for taking water from the Gros Ventre River of the Snake River Basin in Wyoming to the Green River of the Colorado River Basin. As proposed by Mr. Fair, it would consist of the transmountain diversion of 500,000 acre feet of water per year. The project would consist of a 12'6" diameter concrete-lined circular tunnel 60 miles in length. The tunnel would have a maximum capacity of 1200 cfs of water. A power development of 42,000 kilowatts could be realized at the discharge end of the tunnel on the Green River. The cost of the diversion structure along the tunnel and power plant is estimated to be

\$140,000,000. On the basis of staff analysis of the hydrology of the Gros Ventre River system, we have concluded that the available water supply has been overestimated significantly.

This plan completely ignores the Snake River Compact between Wyoming and Idaho which allocates 96% of the flow of the Snake River to Idaho, and it ignores the fact that the Upper Snake River Basin above Milner Dam is a water-short area even today. Moreover, under the Compact, Wyoming must receive authorization by the State of Idaho before any out-of-basin diversion can take place.

Obviously, the Fair Plan would not only violate a compact but would also seriously injure the economic potential of the State of Idaho.

3. *Modified Snake-Colorado Project: William Dunn.* The Modified Snake-Colorado Project would divert up to 15,000,000 acre feet per year from the Columbia River at the mouth of the Snake River (elevation 340 feet). The water would be conveyed up the natural channel of the Snake River to Brownlee Reservoir (elevation 2,077 feet). It would then be pumped to elevation 5,150 feet and conveyed through a conduit 1,016 miles long that would take the water southerly through eastern Oregon and western Nevada. The water would be released into Lake Mead near Las Vegas after passing through five power plants with a total head of 3,660 feet. The project contemplates branch aqueducts delivering water into Idaho, Oregon, and California and would have a substantial number of reservoirs serving various purposes within the system.

It is estimated that a water demand of 15,000,000 acre feet per year could be developed in 11 western states over a period of 50-60 years. This would indicate the project should be constructed in three stages of five, ten, and fifteen million acre feet per year, respectively, at intervals of fifteen years. It then states that a review of all the uses for which water may be needed in the Pacific Northwest states shows that the project can be operated without adversely affecting any of these purposes. He estimates that the water can be diverted from the Snake and Columbia Rivers with average lifts ranging from 3,170 to 3,700 feet.

He suggests that Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana would benefit from new and supplemental supplies of water made available to various areas in conjunction with project storage units where taken directly from the project aqueduct or its branches. It is proposed that a basin development fund be established to receive money paid as compensation for losses from power revenues. This fund would serve to assist financing of water developments in the Northwestern states. Arizona, Nevada, California, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming would all receive water directly or indirectly from the Modified Snake-Colorado Project. A substantial quantity of water for Mexico would be provided from the project.

The estimated construction cost of the first stage of the main stem of the Modified Snake-Colorado Project is \$3,612,000,000. It is then estimated that it would cost about \$38 per acre foot to deliver 5,000,000 acre feet of water through this first stage of the main stem of the project into the Colorado River. These costs are now outdated and cannot be used for comparative purposes.

Dunn states that Idaho will be the recipient of a new water supply for thousands of acres in the high arid plain areas in the Owyhee River Basin. The supply could be extended easterly to serve other lands which have no other source of water. Idaho could also receive benefits for local projects from the proposed basin development funds. He states that fish and wildlife would not be injured by his plan; however, since he is contemplating pump-back storage from the

mouth of the Snake to Brownlee, it is difficult to see how the problem of interference with the salmon runs could be avoided.

SUMMARY

It is not possible to evaluate in depth any of the plans that have been proposed which might immediately affect the State of Idaho by diversion of Snake River water. These plans are largely paperwork plans and have not been given any great study by their authors. Therefore, it is not appropriate to attempt to compare costs of water from one scheme versus another. The Board has recommended that the appropriate entity for reviewing and evaluating all of these water augmentation plans is the proposed National Water Commission. Only in this way will the full range of alternatives be investigated, thereby giving protection to the states of origin.

The Board's present program of identifying our water needs for all purposes to the year 2070, formulating a State development program, working with other states in the Western States Water Council and the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commissions, and maintaining liaison with our Congressional Delegation appears to be all that we can do given our present resources. The Board will need funds to spark a state development program, funds for project feasibility studies and possibly for a small project fund. The Board will need your support in obtaining this seed money.

The real test of the State's will to protect Idaho's water will come in the next few months as we learn what the costs will be to finance feasibility studies for State development and to fund a Small Projects Development fund.

SPEECH BY LEN B. JORDAN, REPUBLICAN OF IDAHO, BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES CONFERENCE, BURLEY, IDAHO, JUNE 29, 1968

I am pleased to be invited here to talk with you about water. May I commend you for your interest in a subject so vital to our economy. On many occasions I have said that water is an indispensable key to Idaho's future and that Idaho has more thirsty acres to reclaim than our readily available water supplies can satisfy.

The economy of Southern Idaho is closely tied to and dependent on reclamation. Imagine, if you will, a disaster that overnight would reduce all of the buildings in the towns and cities of the Snake River Valley to ashes and rubble. Surely these towns and cities would rise again. But should disaster dry up the waters of the Snake River for all time, then the towns and cities would wither and die.

I think all of us recognize the need for a comprehensive state water plan—one that will inventory our water needs and our water supplies and then set up priorities for bringing the two together. Cognizance must be taken of the many uses for water including domestic, municipal, irrigation, industrial, navigation, fish and wildlife, and recreation. Likewise we must be concerned not only with water use but with quality control of the water we use.

My remarks today will be confined mostly to reclamation, which is by far the greatest consumptive user of water.

So if we are to proceed in an orderly fashion, we should examine first our needs for water and second how do we meet those needs. An economist would call it simply a demand and supply problem. The demand part can be divided into present and future.

From a compilation of records, we know that Idaho presently irrigates about 3,500,000 acres. What our future requirements will be is quite another matter.

Probably the most knowledgeable man with respect to Idaho's water needs is George Crookham, Chairman of the Idaho Water Resources Board. In April of 1967, George Crookham testified before the Senate Interior

Committee on the Wild Rivers bill. He said then and I quote from those hearings (p. 165):

"Senator JORDAN, George, I would ask you, how far are you along with your inventory studies of the reclamation potential in Southern Idaho?"

"Mr. CROOKHAM, Just more or less investigational but we show now some 20 million acres under surveillance, and the first draft, a very rough one indeed, shows 9 million of irrigable lands by known standards.

"Senator JORDAN, For the record, how much is currently irrigated?"

"Mr. CROOKHAM, About 3 million acres.

"Senator JORDAN, And you are talking about an additional potential of how much?"

"Mr. CROOKHAM, From 6 to 9 million acres.

Now the situation is this, Senator: It is much more advisable to irrigate land in proximity to the streams at low lifts than try to transport water 1,500 miles to the south and push it up to an elevation of 6,000 feet. With those kinds of standards as criteria, we could pull quite a bit of the 20,000,000 acres into the total picture, so it depends on what is the economics of food supply that we will face in this third of the century remaining before us.

"Senator JORDAN, I know we have discussed this before, and I think we are agreed that probably in the not too distant future we might be pumping back to the upper reaches of the river, so that we can meet the requirements for a vastly expanded irrigation acreage. I think that is a distinct possibility. Would you agree with me that this is possible?"

"Mr. CROOKHAM, Yes, it is. If you look at the Snake River, we are a deficient stream, quite deficient at Milner Dam, and yet we have a surplus below there, and we have a pump-back situation there that is almost a must.

"Senator JORDAN, If we are to reclaim the land that you have indicated here—from 6 to 15 million acres of additional land—where are we going to get the water for it?"

"Mr. CROOKHAM, There will be an overdraft on the Snake River, as we know it. The next choice, then, the most logical choice, is this Salmon River, available from both ends. The storage of 9 million acre-feet, or nearly 10 million is available from the lower end, and lots of water is available from the upper end. This is Idaho's storm cellar, you might say, for future development."

This gives us a pretty clear picture of our reclamation potential in Idaho.

The next problem is to examine our potential water supplies and their sources.

I am sure that depletion studies for potential reclamation development will show conclusively that the Snake River watershed will not supply enough water to irrigate the presently unwatered but economically feasible lands in the Snake River Basin.

With this fact established, the obvious next step is to first develop all upstream storage in order to better mold the seasonal runoff to irrigation needs and second to look elsewhere for water supplies that can be economically diverted from basin of origin to the Snake River drainage for beneficial use. Priorities should be set up to accomplish these objectives.

Priority number one should be earliest possible completion of the Lower Teton and Ririe projects now under construction. New starts should include Lynn Crandall project and such additional storage at American Falls site as can best compromise the interests in conflict. Construction of the Southwest Idaho project should go forward simultaneously with the development of more storage upstream. For the past decade or more, private capital has been developing in Idaho an average of 50,000 irrigated acres, a year. This program of sound steady growth should continue.

It is highly important to develop the maximum amount of headwater storage. The

cheapest storage available is in the underground lava bed aquifer north of the Snake River. Studies have been made for diverting flood water by canals into this aquifer at several upstream points. These diversions should be a component of the overall resource development package. By providing additional underground supplies for lands north of the Snake River some surface water now used on these lands could be made available to other lands south of the river where the underground water supply is less reliable.

Priority number two should be concerned with the supplementation of Snake River water from other sources.

Before I get into water supplies, I want to speak of the danger of basing our planning on average flows. This can be very deceptive—in fact, reclamation planning based on average flows can be disastrous. Let me illustrate:

The average annual discharge of the Snake River at the Weiser gage is 11,000,000 acre-feet. We know that the 3,500,000 acres presently irrigated in the Snake River Basin will deplete the stream flow by about 7,000,000 acre-feet. By adding the two together we determine that, in an average year the Snake River watershed will yield about 18,000,000 acre-feet.

But how about a critical water year? Any irrigator knows he will go broke in the low water years if his operation is set up for average years.

In 1931, a critical water year, Snake River flows were only about 60% of average. In other words, instead of yielding 18,000,000 acre-feet, Snake River watersheds yielded only 10,800,000 acre-feet. If the land presently irrigated received its full water supply of 7,000,000 acre-feet, it becomes apparent that only 3,800,000 acre-feet would flow past the Weiser gage.

Under the terms of their FPC license, Idaho Power is required to release a minimum flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second which, if maintained, would discharge 3,620,000 acre-feet in a year.

Thus we see the sheer folly and the real danger of using average flows in our calculations. Unless sufficient headwater storage is available upstream to hold over water from the "wet" years for use in the "dry" years, no sound programming is possible unless it is based on critical year flows.

With storage equal to four times its annual runoff, the Colorado River can be molded to a much higher use of its watershed yield. With storage no greater than its annual runoff the Snake River cannot.

Without supplementation from another river basin, I firmly believe that Idaho reclamation is approaching the tolerable safe limits for further development of the fish and wildlife and navigation commitments are met downstream from the Middle Snake dams.

As we search for new sources of supply it is only natural that we turn to the Salmon, the longest river in the United States which is contained wholly within the boundaries of one state. If the thirsty Southwest had this river, they wouldn't sell it for all the gold in Fort Knox. Or perhaps I should say for all the gold that was in Fort Knox a few years ago.

But here we run head on into the dams versus fish controversy. Fortunately this is a decision we don't have to make now. The die may already have been cast. When the ten dams are built that will provide slackwater navigation from the mouth of the Salmon River to the ocean, we may have no more anadromous fish.

Or we may have learned by then to accommodate not only the upstream migrants but the downstream fingerlings over another dam. Under either possibility the air would be cleared for a re-examination of the Nez Perce site on the Snake.

Now before someone starts throwing something, let me repeat Nez Perce is one option we must not foreclose at this time. To say that it is our best option is an understatement.

ment. The truth is Nez Perce is the only project that will enable us to get the best multipurpose usage out of a wholly Idaho river that is entirely within our boundaries. I am not saying we should build it now, or five years from now. But about ten years from now we will have some of the answers about fish passage and about Idaho's reclamation potential. Until then no useful purpose will be served in choosing up sides or pressing for a showdown as to what we do with the Salmon River right now.

If we are to keep our options open on Nez Perce, it becomes quite obvious we cannot go for either Mountain Sheep or Apaloosa. Nez Perce is so far superior in every way that comparisons are striking.

As proposed in H.D. 531, Nez Perce Dam would be located on the Snake River at mile 186.1, 2.5 miles downstream from the mouth of the Salmon River.

The height from low-water to normal pool elevation, 1,510, would be 615 feet and the maximum height from foundation to top of roadway would be over 800 feet. The crest would be 1,410 feet in length.

The average annual runoff is estimated at 21,300,000 acre-feet at Nez Perce Dam site during the period since 1911; the maximum was 31,900,000 acre-feet in water year 1953; and the minimum was 12,500,000 acre-feet in water year 1931.

Nez Perce Reservoir would have a total capacity of 6,600,000 acre-feet, of which 3,650,000 acre-feet would be usable for flood control, power generation, and downstream regulation during low-water periods. The reservoir pool would extend up the Snake River 64 miles and up the Salmon River 63 miles.

Total annual power benefits associated with the project are estimated at \$39,342,000 of which \$33,217,000 would be for at-site power capability and \$6,125,000 would be for incremental firm energy developed at downstream plants.

Benefits for flood control, navigation, and recreation would be substantial. Economically the Nez Perce project is undoubtedly the most attractive development in the Middle Snake River Basin.

Nez Perce Dam would not interfere with the thrilling boat trips on the renowned "River of No Return."

The power potential of this project is tremendous, especially if used for peaking with China Gardens Dam below for re-regulating purposes. But I am more interested in reclamation than power because kilowatts can be derived from many sources but the one element absolutely essential to make the desert bloom is water.

In 1955 the Corps of Engineers made a review of their review report on the Middle Snake River. I agree with the premise of the Corps as expressed in several places in the report that the anadromous fish runs are of sufficient importance to cause the postponement of construction of projects that would be seriously detrimental to them.

However, it may very well be that decisions that have already been made to build ten dams below the mouth of the Salmon River have already made the migration of anadromous fish impossible. I hope this is not true, but we have no firm evidence to prove otherwise—all we can do is wait and see and hope for the best.

On the contrary, studies which have been carried out at Bonneville Dam indicate that mortality occurs to downstream migrant fingerlings at that structure.

Studies of the Oregon Fish Commission have indicated a delay of adult salmon of 2½ days to 3 days at Bonneville Dam in the fall of the year, while apparently the most critical period occurs in the spring months. The cumulative effect of such a delay at a series of dams might very well prevent successful spawning. A delay of twelve days in

the early part of the season and considerably less in the latter part on the Fraser River at Hells Gate was demonstrated to be sufficient to prevent successful spawning of sockeye salmon.

From my work as Chairman of the International Joint Commission, I know that the highway construction on Fraser River which filled the stream with huge boulders thus impeding the upstream progress of salmon enroute to the spawning beds was serious enough to destroy the run. The U.S. government provided funds to help remove these obstructions from the Fraser River—motivated in part, perhaps, because of a guilty conscience in destroying 1,000 miles of Canadian salmon spawning beds by our construction of Grand Coulee Dam without even discussing with our Canadian friends the havoc we wrought.

A little damage at one dam, when compounded by a little more at each of several dams, may well become the straw that breaks the camel's back.

John R. Woodworth, Director of the Idaho Fish and Game Department, has testified that Idaho contributes to the anadromous fish resources of the Columbia River system with 34% of the spring chinook run, 41% of the summer chinook run, and 55% of the summer steelhead.

He said the fall chinook run has already been destroyed by the dams. Bear in mind that only four of the ten dams are presently in use. Already Idaho sportsmen have had no salmon fishing for two years. What will happen when all ten dams below the mouth of the Salmon are built? Will the spring and summer chinook runs and the steelhead to be destroyed as the fall chinook have? Only time can tell.

Another threat that hangs over the continuance of the salmon runs is thermal generation. With most of the economically feasible hydro-generation projects either built or under construction, the Pacific Northwest will turn to thermal generation. A seven percent annual load growth compounds to doubling the generating capacity in a period of eleven years. Hence, by the year 2000, generation, either fossil fueled or nuclear, will provide ⅓ to ⅔ of our electricity. Already the signs of trouble from this source are real.

Biologists are researching a major difficulty that has appeared in the Columbia River—the warm water temperatures that the fish are encountering at the Hanford atomic energy plant during the summer months. Scientists say the mighty salmon and steelhead runs may be doomed unless something can be done about reducing high water temperatures. What happens when our generation is mostly thermal? Are we to stop atomic research and forego nuclear fueled generation to accommodate King Salmon?

Because it deals with the other alternative a recent news release is of great interest.

On May 31, 1968, the Corps of Engineers announced it has made a major breakthrough in solving the serious problem of getting little fish downstream through hydroelectric generators. Engineers long ago solved most of the problems of getting adult salmon and other migrating fish upstream over dams to spawn. But for years the problem of getting the fingerlings back to the ocean without losing a large portion of them in generators has baffled scientists.

The Corps said the solution is "so simple and foolproof it has astounded Corps biologists with its overwhelming success." Fingerlings collect in the gatewells above the turbine intake gates. The transportation system resulting from the discovery which will move the fingerlings safely from the gatewells to the river below the dam has been built into all projects under construction in the district—John Day, Lower Monumental, and Little Goose. It will also be incorporated in future projects and will enable the down-

stream migrating fingerlings to pass over the dams with minimal losses.

Idaho is at the crossroads. Within five years Idaho must decide which direction to take—toward achieving high reclamation potential or settling for the status quo.

The stakes are high. Use of Salmon River water integrated with return flows from the Snake River by combination storage and pump back system could double the reclamation potential of Idaho.

Without Salmon River water, Idaho's reclamation will level off at less than 5 million acres. With supplemental water from the Salmon River in a fully "plumbed" system, Idaho's irrigated acreage could go as high as 10 million acres.

And now let me say I am proud to be associated with George Crookham in the integrated and coordinated "pumpback" concept of water planning. The people who thirst for our Idaho water have learned to use this and other schemes to husband their water resources. In defense of our own water we must do no less. So before we decide now that there shall be no dams on the Salmon River let us weigh carefully our decision.

I have already discussed two possibilities either of which could open the way for Nez Perce Dam—first, the possibility of no fish due to decisions that have already been made and, second, the possibility of a breakthrough in our ability to pass fingerlings downstream. Already the Corps of Engineers have exciting news indicating this goal is within striking distance.

My plea today, to all Idahoans whether their primary interest is reclamation, recreation, power, or a blend of all three, is simply this: let us not foreclose our options until the day of decision is closer at hand. We need time to develop the facts upon which we can make an intelligent decision.

The only legislation ever introduced in the Congress that would have forced Idaho to forego its planning for full reclamation potential is the Wild Rivers bill which would have guaranteed that annually 14½ million acre-feet in the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers flow out of Idaho undiminished.

Now if Idaho is willing to proclaim to whomever it may concern that we have no use for this 14½ million acre-feet of water—that it is surplus to our needs—then how can we object if our covetous neighbors take us at our word and come and get it. This is more water than the total annual runoff of the Colorado River and all of it originates in Idaho.

I have tried desperately to slow down this legislation until we knew what we were doing. The Jordan amendment which removes the main stem of the Salmon from the "instant" section of the bill and places it in the "study" section under a five year moratorium is only a stop-gap measure. All it does is borrow time for us to complete our inventory of water needs and water supplies.

I think you should know that it has not been easy to keep our options open. As originally proposed the Wild Rivers bill would have placed an unreasonable burden on Idaho's resources. With ⅓ of one percent of the nation's population Idaho was asked to contribute seventy percent of the mileage in the initial Wild River system.

In Idaho, we have a double loyalty in our great love for our vast forests, mountain meadows, open ranges, lakes, and streams. We are determined to protect our great wild life and recreation resources and we are equally determined to utilize the natural resources of these areas to help us grow and develop fully our industrial and agricultural potential. I believe that these objectives are not incompatible.

Lest someone lay down the challenge that recreation is being shortchanged by keeping our options open it is well to keep in mind that even with the main stem of the Salmon excluded from designation as a Wild River,

Idaho still contributes fifty percent of the total mileage in the initial Wild Rivers system—the Selway, Lochsa, and Middle Fork of the Clearwater and the Middle Fork of the Salmon constitute this fifty percent. Moreover the St. Joe, Moyle, Priest, and Bruneau rivers have been placed under study thus proving that Idaho is not under-represented in this category.

How do we answer the charge that reclamationists want all the water and are blind to other uses? Well, let's look at the record.

About 39,000,000 acre-feet of water flows out of Idaho each year. An additional 7,000,000 acre-feet is used consumptively by Idaho irrigators. This represents about 15% of the total.

The Snake River upstream from the Weiser gage is a working river dedicating about 40% of its average flow to consumptive use. In contrast, the Columbia River discharges annually about 165,000,000 acre-feet into the Pacific Ocean after providing only about 15,000,000 acre-feet for consumptive use upstream, which is nine percent of the total.

Compare this with the overworked and overcommitted Colorado with an average annual flow of 14,000,000 acre-feet to meet adjudicated rights for 15,000,000 acre-feet and a treaty commitment to Mexico for an additional 1½ million acre-feet.

Sometimes reclamationists are charged with regarding every river as an irrigation ditch or a potential irrigation ditch and are warned that they must weigh in the balance the important new factor of recreation. From the statistics I have just recited, I don't think that anyone could reasonably argue that recreation is being shortchanged in water resources planning for Idaho or for the Columbia Basin. As a matter of fact, measured by actual visitor days, the man-made reservoirs on the Colorado such as Lake Mead and Lake Powell have increased the recreation use of that river by at least twenty times.

The point I wish to make is first, that most of Idaho's river mileage is likely to remain in its natural state for such recreation as free-flowing streams provide; and second, that man-made reservoirs are more likely to enhance than destroy recreation use. Jackson Lake and Lucky Peake illustrate this point.

Reclamation planners are under attack from four quarters:

1. Those who think any man-made obstruction in a free-flowing stream is a desecration of a natural resource.

2. Those outside government who would replace the doctrine of appropriation, upon which our western water rights are bottomed, with a nebulous and specious philosophy illustrated by this quotation from a Northwest Public Power Association newspaper in February 1961 voicing its rejection of a Columbia River Compact. I quote:

"The facts of life show that certain industrial uses of water will support a dozen jobs in industry to one job in irrigation farming. We hope that such a shift will not be necessary in the Pacific Northwest but we are beginning to see some disquieting evidence in the relative needs of pulp mills, plastic industries, steel plants, and others. A flexible, balanced, reasonable approach appears to be called for in our region. Let's not 'tie our hands' by means of the absolute irrevocable rights which this compact gives to irrigation against industry."

If this philosophy were to prevail it would mean that in a showdown the headgates would be lowered to make more water available for the turbines.

3. Those in government who would assert the reservation doctrine, with which you are all familiar. At the federal level, these advocates of federal supremacy form a solid barrier against the satisfactory resolution of the federal-state water rights controversy.

4. And finally, as if these other trouble

makers are not enough, there are those who covet our water. I remember several years ago when I was Governor all of the western states were invited to the dedication of the great pumping plant at Grand Coulee which would pump water for the Columbia Basin project. Each governor was supposed to send or bring a gallon of water from his own state to mingle with the flows of the Columbia. All complied, except one—Arizona sent not a gallon but a pint.

The best way to protect our water is to use it. And that is what we propose to do. The important thing is to work together. Competition will increase—not only competition between the priorities for water use but geographical priorities that pit the "have not" areas against the "haves."

The time is near when no area of abundance can defend its right to waste water.

In our planning, time is of the essence. Idaho faces a bright future—what I would call a balanced development with something like ten million acres of irrigated land with the industry and people such an economy would attract. I think we can do this and more and still enhance our recreation potential at an even greater rate. Or we could settle for half that much and maintain the status quo but we couldn't be very proud of our effort.

I repeat—the stakes are high. Recent figures from the Idaho State Department of Commerce and Development tell the sad story that about 65% of the graduates from our four year universities are living outside the state, presumably for lack of opportunity at home. It is inconceivable that they are leaving because Idaho lacks recreational opportunity or all around "livability." Rather, I suspect that, if Idaho does not fully utilize its great land and water potential, we will find ourselves the unwilling exporters of water, power, and young people—a combination that would bring prosperity anywhere but not to the state of origin.

In planning as in other endeavors, our accomplishments will never be greater than our aims. Daniel H. Burnham said it this way:

"Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever growing insistency."

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Frank Meyer, writing in National Review, has turned his attention to the question—in the minds of some—of "The Right of the People To Bear Arms."

Before arriving at his conclusion that the present "campaign is a utopian assault upon the freedom of Americans" he covers ground that is not often seen through the haze of hysteria.

The "simple knee-jerk reactions" that pass for wisdom are leading to the situation where "An unarmed citizenry is potentially the victim, first of anarchy, then of tyranny and totalitarianism."

It is not bad enough that we ponder at such great and awful lengths the issue of arms, but so many, as the author shows, are more than willing to exhibit

"political and intellectual bankruptcy" in the process.

I include the article at this point:

THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO BEAR ARMS

PRINCIPLES AND HERESIES

Since Adam ate the apple, the per capita quantum of violence and potential violence in human society has remained, century in and century out, reasonably constant. Indeed, the third person in the world killed the fourth—or, if you prefer more secular images, primitively there was always present "continual fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

What has made the difference between the quantum of potential violence and actual violence has been the power of the moral authority of civilizations to inspire the members of society, and the firmness with which force has been exerted in defense of civilizations against external and internal barbarians. Against external barbarians, sometimes the moral authority of a great civilization has played a part, but primarily it has been force which has held the *Ums*. Against internal barbarians, the problem has been more mixed, since a civilization with sufficient moral authority tends to civilize its internal barbarians.

The abysmal ignorance of history, as of the elements of political philosophy, that characterizes so much of the political and intellectual leadership of the United States today is all that can explain, although it does not excuse, the torrent of nonsense about "violence" with which we have been assailed these past days and weeks and months. The simple knee-jerk reactions that pass for high political wisdom might be understandable in a local official of the League of Women voters; they are proclamations of bankruptcy when they come from men of supposed political or intellectual sophistication.

Violence is bad? Of course; then let us do away with it. Problem; solution: instant Utopia. Guns kill people? Put government control on guns: domestic peace in our time.

Despite its appealing simplicity, this enthymeme conceals a double fallacy. In the first place, violence is not always evil *per se*. In the public sphere it is morally legitimate when employed to resist or overthrow tyranny. In the private sphere it is equally legitimate when employed against criminal incursion upon life or property. For the latter purpose it may fall into desuetude in times when, unlike our own, the constituted authorities are able to keep crime and riot under control. But it is always a residual right, and in times like ours it becomes the citizen's duty to use violence when necessary in his own defense and the defense of his family.

The second fallacy is that weapons or the accessibility of weapons creates violence. Violence, for good or ill, arises from the souls of men. Gun control would have no more effect ultimately upon the quantum of domestic violence than disarmament agreements have had upon the prevalence of warfare. Indeed, in the one case as in the other, the logical effect is only to strengthen the bad guys and weaken the good guys. It was Nazi Germany that was armed, it was Britain and the United States that were disarmed, in 1939. If gun-control legislation at any level were to be enacted in this country, it would be the criminals, the rioters, the insurrectionists, who would find illegal means of procuring weapons; it would be the solid citizens who would be disarmed.

These are the considerations, derived from a philosophical understanding of the nature of man and from practical experience, that make nonsense of the hysterical clamor for gun control now emanating from the serried megaphones of the Establishment. It is a clamor that might be ignored if the basic law of the land were still respected by the judi-

clary, if the Constitution had not become a paper document to be manipulated into its opposite by the Warren Court. The Founding Fathers whose wisdom was based upon theory and experience, tried almost 200 years ago to defend the United States against such mischievous incitations to tyranny and crime as are invited by a disarmed citizenry. Boldly and unequivocally, the First Congress and the states, in the Second Amendment to the Constitution (Article II of the Bill of Rights), proclaimed that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The constitutional principle is strong and sweeping, so strong and sweeping that even the present Supreme Court, one hopes, will not be able to work its sinuous way around it—should Congress prove to be so subject to utopian pressure as to pass legislation defying it. The key word is "infringe," and there can be no doubt in common sense or in law that any proposals for registration are direct infringements of the free citizen's right to keep and bear arms. If I may paraphrase an old maxim: the power to regulate is the power to destroy. The patently unconstitutional Sullivan Act in New York State has shown, in its administration over the years, that registration of firearms (in this case of concealable weapons) has made it next to impossible for anyone legally to possess such arms. Criminals and insurrectionists, of course, get hold of them easily. Even the prohibition of sales by mail, while it is less integrally objectionable than registration, seems to be of doubtful constitutionality.

An unarmed citizenry is potentially the victim, first of anarchy, then of tyranny and totalitarianism. The present campaign to infringe the right to keep and bear arms is a utopian assault upon the freedom of American citizens—an assault scornful of the testimony of history, the counsels of morality, and the express mandate of the Constitution.

THE FREEDOM SHRINE: ITS MEANING TO ME

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, each year the Exchange Club of Miami sponsors a contest in which high school students are invited to express their thoughts in an essay entitled "The Freedom Shrine: Its Meaning to Me." The Freedom Shrine is an exhibit set up by the Exchange Club in the local schools. It contains 28 major U.S. documents including the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Gettysburg Address.

This year's winning essays are a tribute to the interest of the Exchange Club in fostering knowledge of our Nation's heritage and love of country. They are also a tribute to the high school teachers who have used the Exchange exhibit and have interpreted its documents into meaningful lessons for the students of today.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the winning essays are a tribute to the students themselves. America has little to fear for its future with such fine citizens and students of government now preparing themselves for U.S. leadership.

I am anxious to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 1968 essays. They are written by Miss Judy Barnes, Citrus

Grove Junior High School; Christopher Bronson, Miami Coral Park High School; Miss Janice Fay Cook, Thomas Jefferson Junior High School; Miss Rosemary Noga, Kinloch Park Junior High School; Miss Margarita Fausta Ruiz, Miami Senior High School; and Miss Ellin White, Rockaway Junior High School.

On the day before July 4, Independence Day, I think it fitting to congratulate the Exchange Club, the teachers, and students on this significant accomplishment.

The essays follow:

THE FREEDOM SHRINE: ITS MEANING TO ME
(By Judy Barnes, Citrus Grove Junior High School)

Those writings, documents and bills all very pretty in frames mean a lot more than just words to me. My life and every other Americans' life is built and led by those writings. My freedom to speak the way I feel is stated there. Mine and everyone's freedom of press is also plainly stated. The right to work and worship the way that you wish is the happiest, freest feeling you can have.

The freedom to own, buy and sell property and other items is found here, in America, our country and not in many far off lands. We can live the poor way, live the rich way or just be inbetween, but your freedoms never vary, because some people, some very important people wrote these papers, and signed and resigned them. They passed and repassed them. They read and reread them, talked, made speeches, voted, argued, and fought over certain things so that today in the United States of America we, the citizens, could be free. Believe me, some people don't realize how free they really are.

There has to be law, and also restrictions. This is true everywhere. Some are for safety and others for the good of owners of personal property.

Some people still can't understand they are free to live a happy, rightful life on their own land, to worship, write, read, speak, work and listen however they wish. These are the ones who take this wonderful type of life for granted and go out to get more. Why can't they do it in a rightful manner instead of starting trouble. But why, why can't more people realize you can't get much more freedom and still remain organized. We have the freedom to vote however we wish so actually, we, the people of America put the President and other political leaders in their places of today.

One man or even two or three can't run an entire nation without any flaws, so realize your freedoms, recognize your rights, and use them both wisely before we have none of either one left.

The world all together is changing. The jobs are more complex, the education is harder and needed worse than ever before. But the natural things in life haven't really changed a bit, it's the people who are changing and try to put the blame, or whatever you wish to call it, on the world situation. If they could abide, obey, live and understand the old ways of life, such as when our first or even our sixteenth presidents were alive. Things could be the same, but too many people want to start over in the world. Why can't they see the true light, the light of the past that has led us to where we are today.

Some Americans today don't realize how lucky and safe we are. Without many freedoms they take for granted each day they might realize how tough life can really turn out to be.

Crime is now a serious problem but it was also a serious problem 200 years ago. Then there were also laws but not half as many people in the world. With so many people in the world today we have to be more conservative, more thoughtful and obey the

rules and laws set by qualified officials and stop trying to run the world by ourselves.

Man has a brain and also the ability to use it. Why can't the people of the world recognize this problem all over our world today of crime, and not knowing rights and how to use them. Maybe if they could recognize it they would also try to learn to control their emotions and their behavior of everyday life.

Communism takes so much from living people, it's hard to have to see it happen. In my heart, I feel like one of the happiest people on this earth to know someone cared enough about the way I might have to live the days of my life, to sit down very seriously with many other people, just like us, to plan and write out the true and correct paths to a free and wonderfully happy life.

Although documents and bills can't tell you how to live and how to act as an American citizen they are true, written proof of how we should guide ourselves and how we are able to guide ourselves.

If the persons involved in crime could see the thousands of Americans who risked their lives and died for the meaning of these documents and bills, maybe deep inside it would hurt and tell them how much they missed in life.

I only hope the world realizes this before it's too late and takes the path to the better instead of the worse.

WHAT THE FREEDOM SHRINE MEANS TO ME
(By Chris Bronson, Miami Coral Park Senior High School)

The Freedom Shrine, to me, a symbol of America. A shrine dedicated to the expression of liberty in our country. It stands for many of the most illustrious moments in our proud history.

The shrine in itself is not important, nor are the papers it contains. The importance lays in the ideals the papers represent, the ideals held dear by some of the most distinguished patriots in our history. These ideals are devoted to freedom and equality; and the preservation of such. Some of the documents represent the promise of our country to uphold its ideals, for which no cost is too great.

These ideals are the mainstay of our country. Without them, our whole system of government and way of life would be changed. There would be no more freedom to do as you choose or live as you would like. Others would choose what your life would be like and gradually you would lose your sense of identity. You would become a tool of the state and the words freedom and liberty would become meaningless.

To defend ourselves against this fate, we must be willing to make sacrifices as great as those represented by the documents in the Freedom Shrine.

THE FREEDOM SHRINE: ITS MEANING TO ME
(By Janice Fay Cook, Thomas Jefferson Junior High School)

From the first moment you are born to the very last second that you live, in an indirect or direct way you are experiencing the freedoms, rights, and privileges that all citizens of the United States possess. Some take for granted these valuable freedoms or misuse them. Since we are born into this democracy with full liberties many do not realize the value and importance of these freedoms. The following question might arise in your mind. "Why should I bother to read meaningless words written on paper?" "I have rights guaranteed to me and that's all I'm concerned about!" But every alert citizen understands what the Freedom Shrine Documents represent. Although they appear to be a menagerie of words, the documents truly express the liberties, government, and laws of the United States. Just by reading these documents a foreigner can partially understand how life in our country is.

Can you imagine what your life would be like without these documents? First of all if not for the Declaration of Independence, the United States would not be a nation. Our country might still be a possession of England, of another nation, or our lives could've been controlled by a minority as in a communistic nation. Then there's the Constitution which contains our cherished freedoms and the outline which our government follows. Without the Constitution do you think the United States would be a world power today? Maybe some other type of government would've been constructed, who knows? Also think how America has played an important part in World Wars I and II. If the founders of America had not organized our Constitution as the basis for our government we might not have been able to defeat the enemy with our allies. Our government had to be well planned to supply the men and equipment needed to fight in the wars.

There are many "if" possibilities, so many that you begin to wonder how everything did end up as it is now. Before understanding the end of an item it is logical that you understand the beginning of it. How it was formed and who formed it. The reason everything turned out as it did may be stated as that the creators or authors of these documents had ideas which were put down in words in such a way that from these thoughts and ideas come a rule, freedom, or an outline. Many are responsible for the formation of our priceless documents. Great scholars the majority were not, but inside them rang the vigorous feeling of justice, freedom, and equality. They saw the need for a sound construction of our nation. Or in some cases to add or change any liberties according to our needs, such as an amendment. Some contributors may not be as well known as others, but their importance and value are the same as those who are well known for their outstanding deeds. You and I are equal as is every human being.

There will continue to be a fight for freedom in the United States. Even though we have documents which state laws by which we live there will always be those who purposely disobey the laws. Laws aren't made to deprive us of freedoms but to add to our freedoms. If one person decided to steal another's money for which that person had worked hard for and there was no law, the thief would get away with the crime unpunished. Living could possibly become dangerous. It could come to the point where you couldn't be sure that you'd be alive the next day. Law and order could get so out of hand without proper rules and enforcement.

Each document has its own separate meaning and was written for a special reason. You wouldn't declare the United States independent from England because an Englishman made a face at an American. There is a sound reason behind every idea and the individual idea was written down intelligently and legibly such as in a document.

To live in America is indeed a privilege made possible by documents. Documents are the basis of our lives in America. Although we may not obey laws word for word it is not wrong for no one is perfect and we all make mistakes.

I believe that without these documents, America would never have grown to be a powerful nation and our lives here, in America, would be extremely different. Our Freedom Shrine documents are indeed valuable and should not be taken for granted.

THE FREEDOM SHRINE: ITS MEANING TO ME
(By Rosemary Noga, Kinloch Park Junior High School)

Our American Bill of Rights is contained in the United States Constitution, and is probably one of our most precious documents. These first ten amendments to the Constitution guarantee our privileges as citizens of this country. We read in them many

of the things which our government will do for us.

In reading, however, it is necessary for us to understand that none of these privileges come without responsibilities. These are the ways in which we prove ourselves worthy of the things we receive from our country.

As I look through the newspapers today, I am constantly reminded of the true meaning of this Bill of Rights. When I notice an article describing governmental oppression in another land, I say to myself, "That wouldn't be possible in America."

In history classes, we often study the cruelties of other governments, other leaders, and even our own government in past times, before any Constitution or Bill of Rights was conceived. From those times, it is easy to see what the ten amendments do for us.

In the days before the American Revolution and a Bill of Rights, the colonial government took great advantages of the people. A citizen had no privacy of property or life. He had few of the freedoms which we enjoy today. I am grateful for the fact that men were brave enough to stand up for what they knew was right and put down the tyrannical control. It is hard for us to see just what our lives would be like, had this courageous group shirked the duty which they clearly saw for themselves.

I hope that when I am of voting age and become an adult citizen in the United States, I can still appreciate what the Bill of Rights holds for me. It is my thought that when people wonder why they should bother to vote and take their part in our government, they should look up documents, such as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, with the Bill of Rights, and see just what our American heritage is founded upon.

I feel that if we, the people of this country, would think over what we get by just being born here in the United States, we would all be most greatly appreciative of what our forefathers did two centuries ago.

We all know how the Bill of Rights keeps us from any wrong on the part of the government, but, if we don't protect our freedoms, they may be taken from us, one by one. If we do not vote or show that we care about our government and officials, we may find our treasured freedoms slipping away. Any un-American individual might step in, without our knowing it, and eliminate even the last traces of the American freedom and way of life.

The amendments that make up the Bill of Rights guarantee us everything which we have grown to accept as part of everyday life. They cannot be stolen from us, except by our own apathy. I know that I would fare quite badly if I were suddenly plunged into life without the privileges of living in the United States. I doubt that I could exist under the terroristic governments about which I read.

These precious amendments to our Constitution protect us from evil government and an existence not unlike a herd of cattle or some experimental guinea pigs.

Each man, woman, and child in the United States is a separate individual, an essential to our country's welfare. Each person speaks, acts, and prays as he wishes, and when he wishes. No one is told what school to attend or what occupation to take up. It is doubtful to me that we could find such wonderful freedom anywhere else on earth.

This is the reason that I wonder about people in this country who despise our governmental set-up. I think to myself, "Could they possibly be real Americans?"

THE FREEDOM SHRINE: ITS MEANING TO ME
THE IDEAL THAT MUST NOT DIE

(By Miss Margarita Ruiz, Miami Senior High School)

The story is sometimes told of an old man who lived in the hill country of West Virginia. Every evening towards dusk, he would

seat himself upon the crest of a hill overlooking the fertile farms and ribbons of highways below. For hours at a time he would sit in silence gazing into the distance. One day a boy asked him: "Old man what do you see down there?" The old man thought for a while and finally he said: "Down there I see a miracle. Yes, I see the miracle of freedom and what bountiful lives men can build for themselves when they are free."¹

Truly what the old man saw was the eternal miracle of freedom at work in America—eternal only because our living Constitution makes it so.

Three hundred and sixty one years ago, a London Company, a joint stock company, sponsored a group of 104 men to travel to the New World. These men struggled against sickness, Indians, and other misfortunes which led to the permanent settlement of the Jamestown Colony. Two men saved the colony, they were: Captain John Smith, and John Rolfe, the former put the colony under severe military rule. By 1619, the settlers had their own legislature, the first representative assembly on the mainland of North America. Like the Jamestown Colony, more and more came, and by 1760 there were more than 1,500,000 persons living in the 13 colonies.

For years, the British government did not pay attention to the colonies and they grew in size as well as independently. All colonies had their own legislature and steadily the royal governor lost authority. The colonies had become strong individualists, and because of this, disagreements between colonial legislatures and the royal government.

These colonists had come to America seeking freedom, religious rights, etc., and so they didn't want any more of the British rule. The British government began to tax heavily the colonists, and they resented this because it injured American pride and independence. Because of a series of events in the colonies, the English Parliament passed what came to be called the "Intolerable Acts."

On the invitation of Virginia, all colonies sent representatives, except Georgia, to a meeting in Philadelphia. The First Continental Congress met on September 5, 1774, and resolved that they would resist the Intolerable Acts, and they sent the King of England, a petition that proclaimed a boycott of British goods.

The colonies first fought the British at the battles of Concord and Lexington, near Boston. The British routed them in what came to be known as the Battle of Bunker Hill in June, 1775, where the colonial troops had fortified Breed's Hill.

The colonists still felt a loyalty to the mother country, and hesitated to declare their independence. But in July 2, 1776, every colony in the Continental Congress except New York (which acted a week later) voted for independence. Two days later the Congress adopted The Declaration of Independence, written by a committee under Thomas Jefferson, and became one of the most important documents in the history of liberty.

The colonies won the Revolutionary War and set up the government under the Articles of Confederation, which Congress adopted in 1777. This government was weak and had no authority to impose taxes, control trade or stop quarrels among the states, also they couldn't raise money without the state's consent.

The new nation faced problems that demanded a strong government, and therefore in the summer of 1787, a group of 55 men from 12 states met in Philadelphia to frame a new government. These men worked intensively to create a more perfect union. The convention held many discussions and agreed to two main principles. The first principle declared that the powers of the central gov-

¹ Not sure who first told the story. Heard this story once in a Social Studies course's filmstrip.

ernment should be carefully defined and that the states should keep all other powers. The second principle said that the central government should have carefully balanced legislative, executive, and judicial branches. Most delegates favored a strong national government, not a league of states.

After the Constitution had been ratified, ten permanent amendments were added, that became the Bill of Rights, which safeguarded freedom of speech, press, religion and petition, and guarantee trial by jury, protected life, liberty and property.

Steadily the nation grew in size and population to become the greatest democracy the world has ever known, and the ideal of the men who came to the land of opportunity.

The U.S. Constitution means a great deal to me. The Constitution is the greatest set of laws ever conceived. The Law of the Land, which has guided this country to be greatest nation on earth, has a deep place in my heart. I, myself, not being an American citizen know what it is to live under a great form of government, like a democracy, the Constitution being its backbone.

Let the words of Abraham Lincoln be immortalized and instigated in all men's hearts, "That the government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

REFERENCES

Dates and other dates stated, were gotten from: *The Illustrated Library of the World's and Its People*, Volumes 1, 2, 3 dealing with the United States.

THE FREEDOM SHRINE: ITS MEANING TO ME (By Ellin White, Rockway Junior High)

When God created this world He bestowed upon it many blessings, the greatest of which are generally forgotten, ignored, or taken for granted. Among these are nature's beauty, a family's love and, of course, freedom.

The Freedom Shrine, to me, represents a place where a mad, rushing society can stop and think about the wonderful gift of freedom so lavishly bestowed upon it. Towering skyscrapers, high-rise apartments, and the ever-flowing time seem to have forgotten the importance of freedom. But what if all society forget?

Mr. Wilkins awoke to the beauty of the new-fallen November snow and the cheery chorus of a few hardy birds willing to brave the coming winter. He was a newspaper reporter for an important paper in Washington, D.C. and he had to rush off to work. He glanced at the morning paper dated 2000 A.D. on the table beside him, to see what the results of yesterday's Presidential elections had been. He didn't really care, but he decided he might as well find out so he could tell anyone else who didn't know. The headlines momentarily surprised him, but he figured that someone would do something about the situation later so he forgot about it and went to get breakfast.

At the news building everything would have seemed quiet and normal to any casual onlooker, but in reality there was a continuous current of whispered questions rolling throughout the modern establishment. Phrases such as "Is it true?" and "Is he really a Communist?" found their way into everyone's ears. At 10:00 A.M. the editor's voice came booming over the speaker and announced that there would be a meeting of all employees in the auditorium following the lunch break. All personnel were to attend. Then the speaker went off. All was silent for a moment and then everyone started talking at once.

"What's it about?" asked one woman.

"You can bet it has something to do with that no-good president this country just elected!" said a young man.

"Did you vote, mister?" another woman snapped.

The young man could only answer meekly,

"Well . . . you see . . . I didn't have time." After some thought he regained his pride and confidence and shouted out, "How many of you voted?" pointing to Mr. Wilkins.

"Me?" Mr. Wilkins asked.

"Yes, You!"

"Oh, I was going to but I just didn't get around to it. My wife was supposed to but I don't think she did either. She had shopping to do and the house to clean. You know how it is."

"Yes, I know how it is. The whole country is lazy, plain lazy!" shouted the young man.

"OK., OK. I agree," said someone else. "But who cares? That guy is just the president. We still have Congress and the Supreme Court."

"Well, it's time for lunch. I'm leaving," interrupted Mr. Wilkins. "See you all at the meeting."

The meeting started promptly at 1:00 p.m. A somewhat foreboding stranger stood on the stage with the microphone. All the murmuring stopped when he began to speak. "All right, I'm here just to tell you some new rules that are going to be enforced around here. Number one—You print only what is okayed by the state authorities. Number two—There will be no advertisements or editorials. And Number three—There will be no 'discussion groups.'"

"That isn't fair!" someone shouted. "It's unconstitutional, I'm going to report this to the Supreme Court!"

"Oh, yes, that reminds me. The morning paper tomorrow must include the following letter from the president:

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., November 12, 2000.

"To: The people of the United States of America.

"Subject: U.S. Government.

"I would like to take this opportunity to announce to you that the 'rumors' you have been hearing concerning the communistic faith are true. I am a Communist and this is my country. You are my people. You will do as I say. Congress and the Supreme Court have been abolished and I have been installed as your dictator. Anyone opposing the policies set up by my cabinet and fellow comrades will be severely punished. This country will grow to new heights under the Communistic faith and all will profit from it. I hope you will all accept graciously the enormous opportunities for advancement that are being so generously given to you. Communism is by far the best form of government and it will reign supreme!

"CONRAD BATÓN,

"President of the United States."

The Auditorium was silent. Everyone was utterly stunned. Could this really have happened? During the afternoon, the grinding presses printed their alarming words. The papers came forth with increasing rapidity and each was inscribed with the letter that would shock the nation.

All over the country people gathered to discuss the surprising news and to devise a plan to defend themselves. But it was too late. Communism spread like a vast fire with each new flame leaping to greater heights. It spread until the flames were too numerous and fierce to be controlled. Those that refused to become part of the ferocious and mighty fire were destroyed by it.

Why had this happened? How had communism come to engulf the nation with its vicious claws? The whole reason lies in the minds of the people. Each man was too tired and busy to care about the other. The world dozed until something shook it awake. If today's American society is to keep alive the wonderful system of Democracy practiced here it must crawl out of its deep sleep and put into use some of the freedoms so generously given to it by the documents of the Freedom Shrine. The freedoms must be used

wisely and not at random. They must be used so that they are effective, yet just. It was God that gave us our freedoms, but it is man himself that must guard them and see that they are kept alive for the sometimes indifferent, yet always freedom-loving descendants of American citizens.

FOREIGN AID PAYS DIVIDENDS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the July 1 Washington Post describes an outstanding success of the U.S. foreign aid program, described as "The Agricultural Revolution in Asia":

U.S. AID RESULTS ARE STANDING OUT

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Now that Congress is about to vote the biggest slashes in foreign aid in history, evidence is accumulating that aid is beginning to pay significant dividends. In the first months of the Marshall Plan, there were critics who said it would not work. Yet today there is no doubt anywhere outside the Communist world that it was an enormous success.

In the underdeveloped countries, the task is magnified many times over what it was in Western Europe. Yet there are successes even now to suggest that at some point in the future men may agree that the aid investment was a good one.

In the current *Foreign Affairs*, Lester R. Brown of the Department of Agriculture reports on what he calls "The Agricultural Revolution in Asia." It is a revolution that did not just happen. It was sparked by an army of men who believed that there was hope of development. These included countless local leaders as well as technicians and teachers from AID, the World Bank, the United Nations, the Peace Corps, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations and other groups committed to the idea of development in areas of undevelopment.

A few years ago, Lester Brown received considerable attention because of his dire warnings that the underdeveloped world faced the threat of starvation.

In the 1930s, Brown wrote, Asia, Africa and Latin America exported some 11 million tons of grain annually to the industrial countries. But during the decade of the 1940s the flow was reversed, with the underdeveloped world importing some four million tons of grain annually to feed its growing population. By the early 1960s, the underdeveloped countries were importing 31 million tons of grain a year, and still they faced the constant threat of famine and starvation.

Today Brown finds reason for hope. In the *Foreign Affairs* article, he says that the change and ferment evident in the Asian countryside, from Turkey to the Philippines, cannot be described as anything less than revolutionary.

"This rural revolution, largely obscured in its early years by the two consecutive failures in the monsoons, is further advanced in some countries—Pakistan, the Philippines and India—than in others," he says, "but there is little prospect that it will abort, so powerful and pervasive are the forces behind it."

Several years ago, United States aid officials, and many officials in less developed countries, recognized that too much emphasis had been put on industrial development and too little on agricultural development. President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman were among the first to understand that the emphasis had to be shifted to agricultural development.

Public policies designed to encourage farmers were adopted in many countries. New seeds, fertilizer, irrigation and new farm practices became the objective of governments as well as those involved in development work.

By mid-1968, Brown says, "both the food situation and food production prospects in Asia have changed almost beyond belief." The Philippines is self-sufficient in rice for the first time since 1903. Iran has become a wheat exporter. Ceylon's rice production is up 13 per cent in a year. Pakistan's wheat crop harvested this spring was 30 per cent above the previous record.

"The total Indian foodgrain crop, officially estimated at 100 million tons, is up 32 per cent from last year's drought-depressed levels and, more importantly, up 12 per cent from the previous record," Brown reports.

"Good weather has helped boost the harvest on the Indian subcontinent this year, but increases above the previous record are largely the results of solid technological progress—more efficient varieties, more fertilizer and better farm practices."

Brown notes that 4000 Asian agriculturalists have been trained in the last decade by AID, the Department of Agriculture and the Land Grant Colleges. Fertilizer production has increased rapidly, but still not rapidly enough. But Brown thinks that "perhaps the new exciting development" is the new, high-yielding grain seeds, which thousands of Asian farmers are competing to obtain.

The population problem, of course, remains at the heart of the problem in nearly all the underdeveloped countries, and if unchecked could destroy all the good work accomplished.

A beginning has been made. But it is only a beginning, and, as Brown says, the need for capital for new machinery, seeds and fertil-

izer, is enormous. He believes that the requirement for technical assistance is likely to rise, Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, "as the problems generated by dynamic movement in agriculture increase."

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, July 1, marked the second anniversary of the beginning of the medicare program. I find wide agreement that the medicare program has been a success from its inception and continues to prove responsive to the medical needs of our older fellow Americans. Very few pieces of legislation have, in my memory, so quickly proved their worth. Although the program is only 2 years old it has exceeded its expectations and has encountered none of the sad failures that many anticipated.

While a recitation of the statistical achievements of the program would no doubt prove both interesting and enlightening, medicare in its truest sense is more than statistical evidence, more than an explanation of expenditures; in its essence medicare is a program designed

to serve our older Americans by enabling them to receive health care in a setting of their choice, because they can pay for private care, whereas many of them simply had no choice before medicare. Further, medicare has provided our older citizens with health insurance covering a wider range of health care services than private insurance has covered even for younger people—important services such as skilled nursing home care, home health care, physicians' services in the office and in the patient's home—and now, private insurance is beginning to cover these services in their policies for younger people, so great has been the influence of medicare in 2 short years.

I could go on and remind my fellow Members of how medicare is upgrading hospital care throughout the Nation by its requirements for meeting quality care standards as a condition of participation, how it has established utilization review mechanisms for every hospital and extended-care facility which is participating—a device that was talked about for years as a means of evaluating both necessity and quality of care but which medicare brought to most health care institutions. But I do not think I need to. I think we know how much medicare is achieving and how well it is being administered by the Social Security Administration and the insurance industry intermediaries and carriers who share the administration under contracts with the Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 8, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Solomon B. Shapiro, Congregation B'nai Abraham, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

אבינו מלכנו

Our Father, our King, receive our prayer in mercy and in favor.

We approach Thee in humility and with gratitude that by Thy grace we are fortunate to live in these blessed United States of America.

Thou grantest unto us great men who are Thy messengers to free us from spiritual and physical slavery, to lead us to a world in which man will live a meaningful and harmonious life.

Our thanksgiving, therefore, we offer unto Thee, for bestowing upon this great land legislators and statesmen who guide the destiny and stir the hearts of all inhabitants to serve their country in truth and loyalty. May Thy spirit dwell richly within them as they manifest abiding courage and sincere faith in the cherished traditions of our Founding Fathers, to work for justice and peace. Grant them loving kindness and patience, understanding and foresight, that they ever be warmed by Thy love and nurtured by Thy teachings to faithfully seek Thy guidance in pursuing the welfare and advancement, growth and security of our country.

Gracious Guardian, protect and bless our distinguished President, his family, and all the people of this great democracy, that freedom and tolerance in-

crease, peace and prosperity endure throughout the length and breadth of our borders. Send Thy light and Thy truth unto all the peoples of the earth, so that the ideals of freedom and fraternity, of justice and equality forever be the heritage of all. Hasten, Thou, the era of universal peace, when all the families of the earth shall be blessed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 3, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9098. An act to revise the boundaries of the Badlands National Monument in the State of South Dakota, to authorize exchanges of land mutually beneficial to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 705. Concurrent resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1764. An act to repeal section 7 of the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968);

S. 2715. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 3575. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments;

S. 3620. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, Calif., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 319, and for other purposes;

S. 3621. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Muckleshoot Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 98, and for other purposes; and

S. 3679. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1968 (Public Law 351, 90th Cong.).

THE PASSING OF HUBERT B. SCUDDER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness and deep personal regret that I advise the House today of the