

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ROURDEBUSH, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.R. 18577. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 18578. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 18579. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to establish a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction or rehabilitation of housing facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 18580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1410. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the effects of the display of violence in television programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

366. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to equivalent pay for members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

367. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to reviewing restrictions on grants-in-aid to State and local governments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 18581. A bill for the relief of Peter Takis Paraskevopoulos (also known as Peter Takis Pappas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 18582. A bill for the relief of Cicely D. Norris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18583. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 18584. A bill for the relief of Teresa De Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 18585. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nazir Ahmed Bhatti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 18586. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Maria Lunetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18587. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Mueca Cadalin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 18588. A bill for the relief of Jose Antonio Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18589. A bill for the relief of Silvino Amaral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18590. A bill for the relief of Fernando Batista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18591. A bill for the relief of Manuel Mendoca Bolleiro (or Bollero); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18592. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cabral Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 18593. A bill for the relief of Marie de Trindade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18594. A bill for the relief of Ilda Marie Horta Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18595. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Antones Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18596. A bill for the relief of Francesco Viera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 18597. A bill for the relief of Herbert W. Lindsay and Marie Lindsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 18598. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Dascal Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 18599. A bill for the relief of Paul Anthony Woche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 18600. A bill for the relief of Kamal Aboul-Hosn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 18601. A bill for the relief of Maria Signorello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18602. A bill for the relief of Ayala Barel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18603. A bill for the relief of Bernardine Geertrude Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18604. A bill for the relief of Apollinar Cabiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18605. A bill for the relief of Zenda B. Paguyo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 18606. A bill for the relief of Daisy Olivia A. Caponong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 18607. A bill for the relief of Mr. Meir Dayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18608. A bill for the relief of Mr. Claudio Salerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 18609. A bill for the relief of Rui Carlos Vasconcelos and his daughter, Nair de Fatima Teixeira de Sousa Vasconcelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 18610. A bill for the relief of Polycarpus Psomladis and his wife Argyro Psomladis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18611. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew A. Ziolkowski; 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:

376. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Ore., relative to erecting a memorial to the late President John F. Kennedy and the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PATRIOTISM, NOT AN IDLE WORD

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth of July falling on Thursday, the publication day for most rural newspapers in Minnesota, prompted many of them to devote editorial space to thoughts inspired by our Nation's birthday.

One editorial, in particular, struck me as most worth while. It was written by Ed Barsness, a former colleague of mine in the Minnesota Legislature. It incorporated an oration given by one of

the girls of my congressional district, Miss Shannon Willer, a freshman at the University of Minnesota at Morris.

In order to share this fine article with my colleagues, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

PATRIOTISM, NOT AN IDLE WORD

The time has come in the months of the year that we should be observing Independence Day, commonly known as the Fourth of July. In our lifetime we have seen our Independence Day decline from the most important day of the year, to just another day on the calendar. In another life time the day may mean less except that it will be another holiday.

Go back and read what the leaders of the times that brought on the Revolutionary War had to say about the situation and note especially what the people of that time had

to go through to gain independence, an element that meant everything to them at that period. When Patrick Henry said: "Give me Liberty or Death," he meant it and so did his listeners. While being a subject of a foreign nation, England, and being subject to taxes that were imposed on colonies without their consent, the situation of the colonist could in no way be compared to those who must live under Communist rule today. The Thirteen Colonies wanted independence and freedom and they were willing to pay the price. Not only did these colonies establish the foundation for the United States of America, but they drew up a form of government that the historians have deemed to be the greatest human document of all times.

Now we have reached a stage in our history when we are taking everything for granted and when we have forgotten what it cost in human blood, suffering and endurance to

build what we have. In fact, in many ways we have lost our vision. This is a very dangerous matter as the Bible speaks about the people perishing when they have lost their vision. Many great nations of the past have gone down and are now forgotten because they neglected the vision that made this nation the greatest in the world at the present time.

There is an old saying that patriotism is only vital when it is fully Christianized and this nation still stamps on the dollars, "In God We Trust." George William Curtis says: "A man's country is not a certain area of land, of mountains, rivers and woods, but it is a principal; and patriotism is loyalty to that principle."

What do the young people, who will shape the future of this nation, think of patriotism? We have read about the student revolt over the nation and how certain students have taken over class rooms, discharged the teachers and have taken over the studies, because in their own mind they know it all. It is therefore so refreshing and consoling to know that all the young people are not like that, although it is the lawless element that is getting the publicity. On Memorial Day we listened to a seventeen-year old student, and a graduate of the Morris High School 1968 Class, give a talk on Patriotism. We thought it was so timely that we are publishing her address in full. The young lady, a recent winner in oratorical contests sponsored by the American Legion, is Shannon Willer, a Freshman at the U. of M. Morris this fall. Her stirring address reads:

PATRIOTISM—OUR NECESSARY ELEMENT

"Viet Nam, civil rights, Kennedy, Nixon, McCarthy, Rockefeller, poverty, space, the U.N., inflation, taxes—the list is seemingly endless. These things are all part of the mouthful which the United States is presently chewing on. Needless to say—we've come a long way from thirteen starving colonies.

Our nation is now the furthest advanced of any country in the world. But, while we've been progressing we've lost something. It's called 'patriotism' and to a lot of Americans it's become unnecessary. This attitude is called apathy. It means to be unconcerned or have an 'I don't care' outlook.

The idea of patriotism is completely necessary in today's world. The U.S. must hang onto its Democratic spirit, not only for our own sake, but for the good of the entire world. Once we lose sight of patriotism, our Democratic ideals and goals will be lost.

Take a lesson from what just recently happened in France. In a matter of one week, France landed in turmoil because too many of her people were apathetic and unconcerned. A handful of hotheads got these people to join the bandwagon and some of them still weren't sure what they were hollering about. This could very well happen in the U.S. if we continue in our apathetic ways.

We cannot help the dead by having a Memorial Day. But, we can help what they died for.

If there were an outstanding human being that tried very hard, we would award him the highest praise we could find. Then, why do we overlook our own valiantly trying country? Sure, the U.S. has her faults, but there isn't a country on earth that surpasses what the U.S. is and stands for.

In our world today we are faced with the challenge of Communism. Some people have adopted a more lenient attitude towards this never-sleeping foe. There is a wall in Berlin that is a silent testimonial to the 'friendly' attitude of Communism. When we consider such statements as 'we will bury you capitalists,' we see that patriotism is necessary."

Communists are easy to fight when they have guns in their hands. The problem comes in how do we fight Communist teachers in our own country? If we learn patriotism right along with our morals and religion when we are growing up, half of the battle would be won. Too many children grow up to become

the apathetic prey of Communist teachers. If more Americans would get out of that easy-chair and realize their responsibilities as American citizens, we could start to turn the tide against this flux of Communism.

Name some great Americans, such as Washington and Lincoln. There are countless others who now lie in graves throughout the U.S. and the world. If patriotism is no longer necessary then those people were the greatest fools in history."

WEST VIRGINIA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT INDICATED GOOD GROWTH

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is a good growth in West Virginia's industrial development, according to Angus E. Peyton, commissioner, West Virginia Department of Commerce.

It is believed that there has been a 5- to 7-percent increase in our State in industrial growth during fiscal year 1968.

Commissioner Peyton addressed members of the Public Utilities of the Virginias group, meeting in Charleston.

The Charleston Gazette, of Saturday, July 13, reported on his appearance, in part.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be included in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT RISES

Preliminary reports indicate a 5 to 7 per cent increase in West Virginia industrial development activities for fiscal 1968, State Commerce Commissioner Angus E. Payton said Friday.

Peyton addressed members of the Public Utilities of the Virginias group meeting in Charleston.

Peyton pointed out that during fiscal 1966-67 new and expanding facilities announced, under construction or completed, represented a total investment of \$487 million.

"While this was a record high for the state," Peyton said, "all indications now suggest that we have exceeded this figure at least five per cent during the 1967-68 fiscal year."

Peyton also discussed the state's export trade, and quoted a report from the United States Department of Commerce which shows West Virginia to be 17th in the nation in per capita value of exported manufactured products.

The report also stated there was an increase of 52 per cent in the value of manufactured products exported from the state during the period from 1960 to 1966, the most recent yearly data available from the Census Bureau. The state's volume of bituminous coal exported increased 85 per cent from 1960 to 1966, and represented nearly three-fourths of all the bituminous coal exported by the United States.

In reviewing the activities of the Commerce Department over the past year, Peyton cited the efforts of the various divisions to provide for total economic and social development.

"We realize that if we are to continue to maintain an attractive climate which will encourage investment in new and expanded industrial facilities, we must devote our efforts to an overall development concept," Peyton said.

Indicating the importance of comprehensive planning, the commissioner reported that through the efforts of the department's Planning, and Research Division, projects with a total cost of \$728,606 were approved by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development during the past year.

CORN CREEK UNIT

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study of the Corn Creek unit, located in south central Goshen County, Wyo.

The principal features of the Corn Creek unit would be the Corn Creek Dam and Reservoir, a diversion dam and a system of pumping plants, canals, and laterals. The unit would provide a full water supply for 11,000 acres of land and supplemental water for 9,505 acres now irrigated but receiving an entirely inadequate supply. The plan also involves rehabilitation of some existing facilities.

The Bureau of Reclamation conducted a reconnaissance study of the Corn Creek unit in April 1965 which indicated that while the development is somewhat marginal, detailed studies are warranted to firm up the plan and fully evaluate its economic justification.

The plan, presented in the regional director's reconnaissance report of April 1965, was based on using surplus waters of the Laramie River and water savings from lining the Fort Laramie Canal of the North Platte project.

Since that time, it has been determined that full concurrence of all who presently have an interest in the use of the North Platte water supply would be needed to effect the plan. Since that would be so time consuming, alternative water supplies would be considered during feasibility studies. Possible alternatives would be the 11,000 acre-feet of uncommitted storage in Glendo Reservoir, or unappropriated flows of the North Platte River.

The Corn Creek unit is strongly supported by the local people and the State of Wyoming. Petitions have been obtained which show that 90 percent of the owners of presently irrigated land and 94 percent of the owners of the new land area are highly in favor of proceeding with the feasibility study.

The urgent need for the Corn Creek unit is unquestionably demonstrated. Due to the cyclical precipitation pattern, droughts are not uncommon in the area to be benefited by the Corn Creek unit. These droughts result in serious depletion of the livestock-carrying capacity of rangelands. The nature of the watersheds and presently insufficient storage capacities of existing reservoirs too often result in low water yield for irrigation. The three existing irrigation districts of the Corn Creek unit provided storage for an annual average of 0.56 acre-feet of water per acre at the farm headgates during the critical period between 1952 and 1962. This is far below that needed for satisfactorily irrigated farming op-

erations. Bureau of Reclamation studies indicate a requirement of an annual delivery of about 1.6 acre-feet of water per acre.

For agriculture communities located in the vicinity of the Corn Creek unit—especially Torrington—drought conditions have created tremendous economic strains adding drought to low agricultural commodity prices and the cost of living. It is incumbent upon us to do what we can to ease the conditions imposed upon this agricultural area of Wyoming.

I urge approval of authorization for a feasibility study of the Corn Creek unit. This accomplished, we shall have moved one step nearer to realization of this desperately needed project.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS
OF THE AMERICAN REVOLU-
TION—ORATORICAL CONTEST

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, each year the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution sponsors a nationwide historical oratorical contest for high school junior and senior boys. I am happy to announce that the winner this year was Mr. T. Francis George, a 1968 graduate of Chattanooga High School, Chattanooga, Tenn.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. George's speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ONE MAN

One man—alone—can change the course of a nation's history. It happened in 1775. The man was Patrick Henry; the place Williamsburg, Virginia; the date, March 23. From the dimly-lit windows one could see and hear the horse-drawn carriages as they rumbled over the cobblestoned streets. In one of these carriages sat Patrick Henry. He was a young man who had been a farmer, a lawyer, and was now a member of the House of Burgesses. No ordinary citizen was this Patrick Henry, no mediocre politician was he! He was a radical, perhaps even an extremist in his political views. For example, he contended that Britain had no right to govern the colonies without their consent. He argued that free men should not be subject to taxation without representation.

The eyes of every person in the building were focused on the brawny frame of Patrick Henry as he rose to address the Virginia Continental Congress. His sandy hair and fiery eyes marked him as an impetuous patriot. His words were even more vehement. At the climax of his speech his booming voice belted forth like clashing thunder.

"Gentlemen may cry, 'Peace, peace,' but there is no peace. Our brothers are already in the fields. The next report from the north will bring to our ears the sound of clashing arms. We must fight, and again I say—we must fight! Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

To the Tories these words meant treacherous treason, but to the patriots they were the call to arms. One man, Patrick Henry, had

ignited the brushfires of freedom, which eight months later, were to burst into a blazing holocaust at Lexington and Concord.

But are these words just cold print in history books? Do they have a message for us today? Let us ask the men who have given their lives in the service of our country, "What meaneth these words to you?" From battle sites such as Saratoga, the marshy swamps of the Carolinas, the blood-bathed fields of Gettysburg and Chickamauga, the mud and malaria of San Juan Hill, in the torrid trenches of the Argonne Forest, in the mass murder at Iwo Jima, the human slaughter at Pork Chop Hill, and now—even now—in the hatred, the horror, the hell of the rice paddies of Viet Nam our men have given and are giving the supreme sacrifice that we in America may enjoy this freedom.

Perhaps we do not fully appreciate our freedom until we have been deprived of it. So let us ask these brave patriots of the Hungarian Revolution whose feeble resistance was crushed by Russian tanks like a cat on a mouse, "What meaneth these words to you?" Then let us ask the scores of young men and women whose only crime was a desire to be free—yet whose bodies were blown into mincemeat as they tried to cross the Berlin Wall, "What meaneth these words to you?" Then let us ask the Cuban exiles whose fellow countrymen were killed like rats at the Bay of Pigs, "What meaneth these words to you?"

Together in one united anthem, in one celestial chorus they all answer: "To us life was not so dear, nor was peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. We knew not what course others would take, but as for us, we chose death instead of slavery."

Does this not prove that freedom is not free; our country is not cheap? There is a high price tag that each of us must pay. Let us reaffirm in our hearts, that with the help of God, we will live and if necessary die so that all men everywhere may be free.

SIERRA CLUB—CAUSE BY
DISTORTION

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks seem particularly appropriate at this time. For too long too many good people who make up the membership of the Sierra Club have been deceived by their professional, paid leadership. Emotion and distortion have led the concerned, lay conservationist to endorse causes that are created to develop a cash flow rather than to solve a genuine problem. I include herewith an article from the column, "The Fearless Spectator," by Charles McCabe:

THE TRUTH ABOUT REDWOODS

(By Charles McCabe)

The big tanned guy in the Stetson shaped into a Wyoming roll was standing on the grass at Stinson Beach a while back, and he was telling me about the redwoods. I had never heard the story told in quite the same way:

"I'm in the business in California," he said. "And it gives me a pretty good dollar. But on the subject of the redwoods themselves, I've never known anything to be so bathed in blarney.

"On the one side, there is this outfit called the Sierra Club, which professes conservation and acts as if it invented public morality. Here in Marin County, for instance, if you own a house and don't belong to the

Sierra Club, your conduct borders on the reasonable.

"If you do belong, and you're on the side of all the bees and birds of the world, and the redwoods too, you can bask in the certainty that you are one of the anointed. Unless they come from the East, or somewhere, it is seldom that a non-Sierran is invited to the dinner table of a true Sierran.

"On the other side, you have the wicked predators, the lumber industry, which sells redwood to people who are perfectly willing to pay for it because it makes good houses and other kinds of things.

"In these boys' makeup, there is no slightest trace of righteousness. They want the wood, and they will do whatever they can to get it, because they want the loot, which is of course the name of the game.

"The struggle for the redwoods, which Fortune and other tony magazines rattle on about, is represented as a great big fight between these two groups—white-hatted Sierran, and black old lumber baron.

"You can take it from me it's nothing of the sort, when you get to the truth of the matter.

"There are few groups anywhere who need each other as desperately as the Sierra Club and the lumbermen. The Sierra Club has to have a villain, to justify its existence, and reap in all those lovely dues. The lumbermen are their villain No. 1. If the lumbermen decamped and went into some other business, the conservationists would be hard hit, and the sweet moral security of its members terribly shaken.

"The lumbermen, for their part, need the conservationists for the simplest of reasons: They keep the price of lumber up. Each alarm and excursion which the Sierrans emit helps to persuade the American public that the redwood stands are almost eliminated. This makes the sucker willing to pay what the traffic will bear. Q.E.D.

"And the funny thing is, most of the redwoods in California are perfectly safe from both the salvationists and the predators. They belong to the Federal government, which ain't about to give 'em to anyone."

The man had finished. His story had the ring of truth.

Unfortunately, it is not the kind of yarn you go to the Sierra Club for confirmation of, or the timber interests either. The denials on either side would curdle your blood and boggle your mind.

But there have been numberless examples of high-mindedness bedding down with corruption, to their mutual good. It is a strange ecology. Cops need criminals in order to dramatize their wickedness, so more and bigger appropriations to fight crime are forthcoming.

Temperance workers need drunks, and for the same reason. Baseball teams need opposing spitballers. The press needs sinners and vicious types in abundance, to get the old products sold. Etc., etc.

The parasitism of the forces of good and evil on each other, like most other things in nature, tends to be about equally beneficial to both parties. The good guys get that great warm moral glow, so necessary to them. The bad guys pick up the marbles.

VIETNAM CASUALTIES

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I recently received a copy of a letter from Texas State Senator Joe I. Bernal to Walter Cronkite of CBS news. Senator Bernal outlines in his correspondence the out-

standing record of patriotic service performed by the Mexican Americans during World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war. He also cites the unproportionately great loss of men suffered by this particular community. I take this opportunity to recognize these facts, and I ask unanimous consent that Senator Bernal's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SENATE OF THE STATE
OF TEXAS, AUSTIN, TEX.,
June 26, 1968.

Re Vietnam casualties.
Mr. WALTER CRONKITE,
CBS Building,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. CRONKITE: On June 24, 1968, there was mention of Ontonagon, Michigan in your news program.

I can understand the grief of that community and the sorrow they must feel for their brave fighting men who have died in Viet Nam. In South Texas, we have communities similar to Ontonagon, both in size and number of casualties. Uvalde, Texas, a city of approximately 12,000 people, has lost eight men in Viet Nam. Edinburg, Texas, a city of approximately 10,000 people, has lost six men. Falfurrias, Texas, a city of some 7,000 people has lost four men in Viet Nam. However, I feel a much greater sense of sorrow and grief than the people of Ontonagon in that these dead soldiers have all been Mexican-Americans. We, the Mexican-Americans of Texas, are only 14% of the population in the State of Texas; yet, our casualty rate in Viet Nam is 28%. Like the people in Ontonagon, the Texas Mexican-Americans generally choose to work rather than attend school and as a consequence, got to Viet Nam in greater numbers.

The loyalty and patriotism of the Mexican-American in the United States is beyond reproach. In both the Korean War and World War II, the majority of the Congressional Medal of Honor Winners from Texas have been of this ethnic group.

The solution to this problem is reasonable. The local boards should, first of all, include proportionate numbers of minority representatives. Texas has 655 local board members and only 7% are Mexican-Americans. Secondly, the local board members should be representatives of the local major occupations, for example, farm laborers in those areas where large concentrations of farm workers are found, labor union members where unions have large memberships, blue collar workers where many workers are unskilled and skilled laborers. At the moment, the local boards are made up of mostly professional men, doctors, lawyers, dentists, and ranchers and industrialists. Thirdly, the local boards should consider the rate of casualties incurred by their local communities when calling men up for induction so that no one community or minority is carrying the greater share of the burden. Lastly, the local boards should attempt to notify the military branch receiving a young man from an area of heavy casualties, that all efforts should be made to place him in an area where the least possible danger exists.

These proposals only attempt to limit the high rates of casualties incurred by one community and/or one minority group and is in no way meant as any commentary on the Viet Nam war. Hopefully, you will find a way to air this problem with more frequency in your broadcasts in order that people will demand of the Selective Service System sorely needed reforms in the draft laws, local board system and make-up, and of the discriminatory practices of the System.

Sincerely,

JOE J. BERNAL.

SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR., ON
FISCAL SOLVENCY AND TRADE
WITH VIETNAM

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the position of my distinguished colleague from Virginia, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., on fiscal solvency and trade with Vietnam continues to draw attention from the press of the Nation. I am pleased to include in the RECORD four recent editorials which I believe will be of great interest to my colleagues as follow:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, June 20, 1968]

WHAT OTHERS SAY: SENATOR BYRD'S PLEA:
SOLVENCY

Not long ago, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., took to the floor of the Senate to discuss the rising cost of servicing the national debt. The Treasury Department had just announced that the interest on the national debt for the current fiscal year had increased by \$1.1 billion, or seven per cent, over the past fiscal year.

Senator Byrd was dismayed by the necessity of having to pay \$14.5 billion in interest costs this year; he sees this soaring cost of debt service as an important economic indicator that should not be ignored.

He pointed out that if the Federal government were to confiscate all income above \$50,000 for an individual and \$100,000 for a couple, the increase in tax revenue would be but \$700 million, or \$400 million less than the increase in interest costs for the current year. The burden of paying this higher interest actually falls heaviest on taxpayers earning \$15,000 or less a year, who pay 72 per cent of all income taxes collected, he said. Broken down further, 50 per cent of income tax collections comes from taxpayers with taxable incomes between \$7,000 and \$15,000; those with taxable incomes of \$7,000 or less pay 22 per cent of the income tax collected.

The Senator emphasized that continuing Federal deficits that result in these higher interest costs are one of the primary causes of inflation, which places a hidden tax on all taxpayers, but which falls heaviest on those on fixed incomes and on those in lower-income brackets. Thus the taxpayers must pay twice for unwise deficit spending, by having more and more of their taxes go to meet rising interest costs and by losing purchasing power of the dollars they have left after paying their taxes.

He concluded his plea for fiscal sanity by saying, "Unless the government is willing to get its financial house in order, we will face a financial crisis." Yet Congress continues to vacillate on a needed tax increase, while squabbling over where an insignificant sum of \$6 billion should be cut in spending. The spending cut, of course, should be at least twice that amount; one member of Congress has suggested several areas in which \$17 billion could be cut without causing the sky to fall. Unfortunately for the American taxpayers, and for their pocket-books, the voices of economic realists such as Senator Byrd—and his father before him—continue to fall on deaf ears.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader & Press, June 16, 1968]

THOSE WHO PAY

On the issue of federal taxes, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, made this pertinent statement recently:

"If the federal government were to levy a 100 percent tax—yes, 100 percent—on all income over \$10,000 (\$20,000 on a joint return), the revenue gained would be only \$13.2 billion—not enough to pay the interest on the national debt. This dramatizes not only the seriousness of the financial crisis our nation is facing, but it dramatizes that the bulk of the federal government's revenues must come from the middle income and lower income groups."

All too often, this is a very important fact the liberal big spenders, for welfareism and poverty in particular, prefer to ignore in making a big noise on what they are going to do for the people. Because the revenue must come from those in the lower income brackets these people are hurt the most.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register,
June 20, 1968]

GRIM NEWS ON VIETNAM

The strong public concern in this country about Vietnam may grow stronger in the face of facts just brought to attention in Congress by Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., of Virginia.

Free world shipping to the enemy is increasing at a time when American casualties are increasing. This sums up Senator Byrd's report, in which he stated:

"Figures obtained by me show that for the first five months of 1968—January through May—61 free world ships carried cargo to North Vietnam.

"This figure of 61 for the five-month period compares with 78 free world ships carrying cargo to North Vietnam for the 12 months of 1967 and 74 for the 12 months of 1966.

"Thus the number of free world ships going into North Vietnam is running at a rate almost double each of the past two years. "It is significant and disturbing that just as the shipping trend is sharply upward, so are American casualties.

"For the two calendar years 1966 and 1967, the United States suffered 106,000 casualties, for an average of 1,000 per week.

"But for the first five months of 1968, namely, January through May, U.S. casualties totaled 58,812 or an average of 2,700 per week.

"The most disturbing fact of all is that one-third of all the casualties the American people have suffered in Vietnam has occurred in the first five months of this year, and casualties of the past two months are at an all-time high. . . .

"To me these figures are tragic—one-third of the 175,806 casualties suffered during the entire war have occurred during the past five months. . . . The free world shipping is increasing and American casualties are increasing."

Senator Byrd asked these questions against the background of the facts he called to attention:

(1) "When will our government demand an end to the free world shipping going into North Vietnam?"

(2) "When will the Congress demand an end?"

(3) "And when will the American people demand an end to this trade which is prolonging the war and increasing substantially the number of Americans being killed and wounded?"

Vietnam—dissatisfaction among the American people over Vietnam—undoubtedly is one of the prime reasons for the apparently growing prospect of a far-reaching house-cleaning in Washington, D.C., when the voters go to the polls in November.

Opinion survey after opinion survey in congressional districts has revealed a strong current of dissatisfaction over the handling of the Vietnam war. The experiences discussed by Senator Byrd cannot be expected to ease the unhappiness, but on the contrary could easily add to it.

If the voting in November covers the Washington, D.C., landscape with political

casualties, Vietnam can be counted for sure as a main reason why it happened.

Many and justified as are the grievances the people of the United States have over the way the Great Society bunglers and their parrots have been performing, Vietnam could be at the top of the list, and certainly it is near the top at least.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader,
July 8, 1968]

TOO MUCH TO EXPECT

Many persons simply cannot believe that allies of the United States are continuing to undermine the U.S. position in Vietnam by carrying on trade with Ho Chi Minh's henchmen in North Vietnam. So the nation should be indebted to Virginia's Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., for disclosing that not only is the Free World trading with North Vietnam, but it is doing so at the rate double that of the past two years.

Said Senator Byrd recently:

"... For the first five months of 1968 (January through May), 61 Free World ships carried cargo to North Vietnam. This figure... compares with 78 Free World ships carrying cargo to North Vietnam for the 12 months of 1967, and 74 for the 12 months of 1966." And which of the Free World countries still rules the waves to North Vietnam? Britain. "The figures show that of the 61 Free World ships [that carried cargo to North Vietnam in the first five months of this year]," Senator Byrd said, "49 flew the British flag, again a rate double each of the past two years."

Well, now. There are some obvious things the Johnson Administration could do to remedy that situation: (A) It could offer the British government and all other Free World countries an alternative—i.e., trade with North Vietnam or trade with the U.S., but not with both; (B) it could impose a 20 per cent profiteering tax on those American businesses that continue to trade with countries which trade with North Vietnam; or (C) it could say to the most flagrant offender—Britain—that either the British support our policy in Vietnam by cutting off all trade with North Vietnam, or the U.S. shall proceed to recognize the Smith regime in Rhodesia and to enter into mutually desirable trade agreements with that admirable little country.

But then, of course, the Johnson Administration never would go to such lengths. Out of one side of its mouth, the Administration says it wants to bring an honorable end to the Vietnam War; out of the other side, it says that through trade it wants to build bridges to our would-be Communist executioners. And sure enough, while our soldiers are getting mowed down in Vietnam, the U.S. government is busily trading with the Communist satellites of Eastern Europe. So in spite of Senator Byrd's disclosures, it is too much to expect the Administration to impose a policy on others that it cannot even impose on itself.

FREDERICK J. WEILER CITED BY
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as a Senator from Arizona, I am pleased that Frederick J. Weiler, Director, U.S. Bureau of Land Management in the State of Arizona, has received the Distinguished Service Award of the Depart-

ment of the Interior. Both as Governor and as Senator, I have observed Mr. Weiler's work. He has, as the Secretary of the Interior's citation notes, "achieved rapport among users and managers through cooperative planning and acceptance of multiple use concepts." In Arizona he has been particularly active in the field of parks, greenbelts, lakes, wildlife, recreation, and watersheds. Before coming to Arizona Mr. Weiler served in Alaska and Washington.

In commenting on the award the Phoenix Gazette has termed Weiler "a public servant extraordinary."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Public Servant Extraordinary," published in the Phoenix Gazette of June 7, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PUBLIC SERVANT EXTRAORDINARY

There is a big difference between a public servant and a bureaucrat. On the job, the bureaucrat is enthusiastic only about collecting his paycheck; most of the time he hides behind snarls of red tape and civil service security, doing barely what has to be done and no more. The public servant, on the other hand, does his job with zest and imagination, always acting in the people's best interests and never timid about challenging the occasional foolishness that is inevitable in government.

Arizona is fortunate indeed that it enjoys the labors of Fred J. Weiler, public servant extraordinary, as Director of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management in the State. This is a much better place because he has handled Federal land matters here.

During his seven years in Arizona, Weiler has displayed amazing eagerness to put Federal land to the best possible beneficial use. He doesn't arbitrarily decide what is beneficial use, either, but confers with local interests. His byword has been "expedite."

For his accomplishments here and during previous assignments in Alaska and Washington State, Weiler has been accorded the highest honor the Department of Interior can bestow on its employees: the Distinguished Service Award and gold medal. It was an honor richly deserved, and every Arizonian owes him gratitude and a congratulatory salute.

NAVY LEAGUE CALLS CONTROL OF SEAS VITAL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

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

NAVY LEAGUE CALLS CONTROL OF SEAS VITAL
(By Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, USN, Ret.)

America is confronted by internal and external dangers posed by Communists and others who are dedicated to destruction of the nation. But these enemies do not go unrecognized.

The Navy League of the United States accurately identifies the Soviet attempt to drive the free world (and the United States in particular) from the world's oceans.

The internal threat also is far-reaching.

Loyal American citizens, in every walk of life, therefore will cheer Mayor Walter Washington for his recent move toward restoring law and order in the nation's capital, incident to ending the disgraceful spectacle of "Resurrection City."

We find in this courageous move on the mayor's part a glimmer of hope that perhaps the pendulum is starting to swing the other way, and that the vast majority of our people are fed up with having their constitutional rights trampled upon by exhibitionists and militant minorities who overtly seek to destroy our homes, our businesses, our schools, our properties and our government, and who prostitute the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the right of peaceful assembly into the practice of sedition, riot, arson, murder and general anarchy.

Recognizing that our survival as a nation depends upon a prompt return to government of law by due observance of constitutional processes, we hope that Mayor Washington's action may initiate a return to that happy state where our citizens may proceed on their lawful occasions with less likelihood of being murdered, mugged, maimed, or robbed than is now the case. (Under existing conditions, one of these will overtake one out of every 47 persons in the United States in the next 12 months).

We hope that an aroused citizenry will deal promptly and effectively with the enemy from within, so we may better appraise, appreciate, and deal with the enemy threatening us from without.

There is no longer anything covert about the enemy from within. The blatant, insolent declarations of the Stokely Carmichaels, the H. Rap Browns, the Bettina Apthekers and the dozens of their ilk, and the rash of organizations which (under a variety of names but with a common purpose) have sprung up around the country, overtly dedicated to our destruction, prove this.

These organizations (of which the Revolutionary Action Movement is typical) openly publicize their plans for violent overthrow of government by mass riots, crippling transportation, sabotaging public utilities, instigating street fighting and graduating to full-scale guerilla warfare. And they do this with complete impunity. One is constrained to wonder why.

It follows that these internal and external dangers are not unrelated, being elements of the Communist plan for world domination.

In recent years, the Kremlin leaders have awakened to the fact that the nation which controls the seas controls the world, and have embarked upon a comprehensive program to achieve this control—a program which includes the whole gamut of maritime activity.

Their progress has been phenomenal. Unfortunately it has been assisted materially by our own inertia and apparent indifference to what is going on.

The Navy League of the United States, under the capable direction of Charles F. Duchain, does not share this indifference. On the contrary, at the league's last annual convention its members adopted and promulgated a Declaration of Objectives and Resolutions which, although specifically intended as "policy direction and guidance for the membership," could be accepted with profit for the same purposes by the national administration.

It is undeniable in today's world that the survival of our country requires a strong, well-balanced military establishment capable of meeting any threat to our national security from whatever source. The Navy League, emphasizing this fact, regards control of the seas as being of dominant importance in the provision of national security. It identifies seven basic areas into which the over-all problem of command of the sea logically can be divided. These areas are:

National maritime policy.
National maritime strategy.
Ship construction.
Oceanic education.
Oceanic research.
Current world crises—"limited" wars.
Personnel.

The league urges the United States to formulate and execute a formal, dynamic and aggressive maritime policy in furtherance of our national interests. It urges that our national strategy include emphasis on a maritime strategy "which gives full consideration to the need for mobility achieved through nuclear power, weapons superiority in both defense and offense, a merchant marine which truly serves as an extension of a modern Navy, the maintenance of a Navy capable of operation in all waters of the world, and the retention of military aid as a part of our foreign aid program." More to the point, if possible, the league urges the practice of this strategy and the appropriation of sufficient funds to achieve the objectives sought.

Both a Navy and a merchant marine require ships. This the Russians are well aware of; this we seem to have forgotten. Lack of a long-range, comprehensive, well-planned shipbuilding program has produced block obsolescence in our Navy, and a state of near collapse in our merchant marine, whose over-all condition is really shockingly bad. This lack has hampered updating and modernizing our shipbuilding facilities. One immediate result is that we cannot compete with foreign ocean shipping or merchant shipbuilding. These grave deficiencies need to be corrected at once.

Because the free world is in reality an oceanic confederation, and because our survival depends so heavily upon our uninterrupted ability to use the oceans in peace and in war, we Americans as a whole need to know much, much more about the oceans than we now do. Hence, the league intends to "continue to foster the broad spectrum of oceanic education and research" in our educational institutions across the country, in order to build a foundation of knowledge which will enable us to make better use of what we now know about the oceans, and to appreciate what we shall find out later. It further recommends that the Navy be designated as the agency to carry out an expanded, adequately financed, and carefully-planned program of oceanographic and hydrographic research in order to increase this store of knowledge, vital to exercising all phases of control of the seas.

Limited wars now seem to be the order of the day. Recognizing this (and perhaps having in mind the embarrassing situation we are now in where our involvement in Vietnam leaves us apparently helpless to act anywhere else in the world in defense of our interests), the League advocates a major increase in mobility of sea power by augmenting merchant shipping and amphibious craft, and supports as a minimum strength for the Marine Corps the legally prescribed three divisions and three air wings at adequate strength and fully supplied with modern weapons and equipment.

Finally, recognizing that the priceless ingredient of our military establishment is people, the league urges that continuing attention be given by Congress and the Defense Department to the problems of attracting qualified personnel to the services and retaining them. The league urges "a constant review and upgrading of the incentives, opportunities and compensations affecting the status, prestige, morale, welfare and performance of our military."

These recommendations, in my view, deserve the thoughtful consideration of every citizen, to the end that Congress may be moved to act while there is still time.

UNIVERSAL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last Tuesday, July 9, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously reported the Omnibus Education Act of 1968, S. 3769. Contained in that bill is a provision for a Presidentially appointed Commission on Universal Educational Opportunity to make a study of alternative means of financing postsecondary education in America and report back to Congress and the President with a suggested plan for implementation.

I am proud to have cosponsored this measure with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. I have worked with him on it and share with him the sense that the Commission's study will make a major contribution to the Congress in dealing with financial assistance to postsecondary education.

On Saturday, July 6, Senator YARBOROUGH addressed the national convention of the National Education Association in Dallas, Tex. The title of his speech is "Affecting Eternity," and it deals with the concept of universal postsecondary educational opportunity. I recommend it to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFFECTING ETERNITY

(Excerpts from a speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, to the national convention of the National Education Association, July 5, 1968, Memorial Auditorium, Dallas, Tex.)

Good morning. Let me begin by telling you how honored I am to address this convention. Next to the people of Texas you are the most important group of people in America today. I say that in all seriousness.

Henry Adams once observed that, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." Each one of you, as you work with the children entrusted to you, can be one of the most powerful forces for good in the life of those children. Those children, when they first come to you, are like clay in the hands of the potter. And to a degree it is your decision whether they leave you as a work of art or unchanged—an intellectually shapeless lump of clay.

I have come here not just to talk with you, but to salute you. As individuals, as teachers, you do affect eternity; and there is no doubt that with each passing year you are doing a better job of it under great and growing difficulties. Additionally, I wish to salute you collectively; I wish to salute the National Education Association for the work, the hard work, it has done in molding education in America. Let me give some examples of the work your organization has done, and the accomplishments it has made.

Right now, back in Washington, I am in the middle of an appropriations fight for the Bilingual Education Act. It was signed into law providing \$30 million for the coming fiscal year. The Administration came back with a token request of only \$5 million. Then, nearly two weeks ago, the House Appropriations Committee recommended that it re-

ceive no money whatsoever. Later, on the floor of the House in an attempt to appropriate at least the token \$5 million for the program, the bill was defeated by a 96-95 vote with some representatives from my own State voting against any money for bilingual education.

Now we have it in the Senate and I am struggling to obtain funding.

The point, though, is that if it hadn't been for the National Education Association I wouldn't be in the middle of this struggle right now. The Bilingual Education Act would still be a dream, and not a law that we can fight for.

The NEA invited me to a conference on Bilingual Education problems in Tucson in October of 1966, and as a result of that conference and the continuing assistance of Monroe Sweetland and the entire NEA legislative organization we saw that bill, that idea, written into law last year.

The NEA has been a force for good in many areas. I noted recently, for instance, that you are urging your affiliates to develop plans for voluntary Summer programs for disadvantaged children living in urban ghettos. That's another example of taking the lead where action is needed.

At your behest Senator Morse has introduced S. 3400, a bill which incorporated many of the ideas concerning education developed by the NEA in recent years. The bill is controversial in many respects. But it raises questions that need to be raised and need to be faced. Because you have pushed, because you have worked, the United States Senate is going to face those questions and try to come up with answers.

I note further that in the resolutions you adopted last year in Minneapolis that you advocate, "that educational opportunity extend for at least two years beyond the high school for all high school graduates. These opportunities should be supported by local, state, commonwealth, and national appropriations and be should be provided free of tuition charges." That is part of Resolution Number 67-3.

Universal Post-Secondary Educational Opportunity is something I have been working on since I have been in the Senate. Last September I introduced the first bill designed to examine the possibility of providing Universal Post-Secondary Educational opportunity. I am happy to report to you that that amendment is now pending in the Senate Education Subcommittee. It is my understanding that the House Subcommittee has adopted a similar proposal modeled along the lines I have advocated.

The amendment is modest, but its implications are far from modest. It will provide that the incoming President of the United States appoint a Senate-confirmed commission to make an intensive study of alternate means of financing post-secondary education. Like S. 3400, this is an area which is no stranger to controversy. My advocacy of free universal educational opportunity, much along the lines the NEA has resolved, goes beyond the first two years after graduation from high school. Others advocate different methods. The study will provide the basic information which Congress needs to move ahead in this next frontier of education.

It is time that America took a fresh look at post-secondary education—the benefits it covers and the costs it exacts—and time to decide whether our current system of financing it is obsolescent, inadequate, and inequitable.

Back 139 years ago, Charles Kent, a student at Ohio University wrote the following letter home:

"I shall want about three dollars more before the session is out. I have laid out for expenses on the road, for lodging the first night at Athens, for a trunk, chair, quire paper, pen-knife, quills, latin tutor, Walshe's

arithmetics, slate, hire for bed, college tuition, entrance into society . . . and I have several other necessities, which I will present in a bill of my expenses . . . and things are so dear that such articles run up to quite a sum. What I have laid out altogether amounts to about 22 dollars, and I have yet wood, candles, and some other little affairs to get. I shall endeavor to be as parsimonious as possible . . ."

Young Charles Kent, back in 1829, was trying to hold the line on his total expenses in attending college at \$50 a year. In the 1968-69 school year just his tuition and fees at public college or university will run him better than \$300; at a private higher educational institution—more than \$1,000. His total cost of attending college—tuition, fees, books, room, board, transportation, clothing, miscellaneous—would run him something like \$1,700 at a public college, \$2,640 at a private college per year.

And it's getting worse; the projections for 1980-81, for total costs of attending college, are \$2,400 for public institutions, \$3,600 for private institutions. In the ten years from 1956-1966, student charges went up 80 percent—even though the cost of living increased only 17 percent.

Earlier, I mentioned the inequities of our present system. I think the following statistics bear that observation out.

As of the last census 78 percent of high school graduates from families with incomes greater than \$12,000 went on to college; only 33 percent of those same graduates from families with incomes of \$3,000 or less went on to college. Similarly of the graduating high school seniors who do not go on to college, 50 percent fail to do so because of lack of an adequate system of paying their way.

Our founding fathers, contemplating our society which would do away with title and nobility, referred to "an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity." Sadly, for want of a democracy of opportunity we are getting a plutocracy of achievement.

Today, the only way a low-income, or even a middle-income student can attend college is by going into debt.

I question whether a student, or his family, should have to go into a long-term debt to cover the expense of what, in the long run, turns out to be a benefit to all of society. As President Kennedy stated in his message to Congress in February, 1962: "The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, and improved citizenry, and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality."

I concur. And I suggest that what needs to be done is to provide outright grants to students embarking on post-secondary educational ventures.

There are precedents: Our current system of public support of elementary and secondary education, the experience of foreign countries, and the marvelous record of the GI Bills.

Today, college tuition in America is higher than anywhere else in the world except Canada. We are shackling future generations with the cost of educating this one.

Back in the nineteenth century a fierce debate raged over public finance of elementary and secondary education. Free public schools, said some, would mean unjust taxation of citizens without school-age children, and besides, it would never be worth the unaffordable expense in taxes.

The classic response of a Pennsylvania Representative is applicable today: "I do not fear taxes as much as I fear ignorance."

And today we have a system of elementary and secondary education which although not perfect—has made mighty contributions to America's current economic status in the world arena, and is, in my opinion, the best any large nation has ever provided its children.

In Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, higher education is looked on as a national investment and is free to students who qualify for admission to programs of higher education. In France, Austria, and much of Latin America student charges are minimal.

In Switzerland, the Canton of Geneva recently voted into law a measure which provides all regularly-enrolled university students with a \$70 a month stipend plus expenses for books and supplies. Students in advance fields, such as medicine, are receiving double that amount.

Our own success with the GI Bill of Rights is perhaps the most dramatic and persuasive argument for moving as quickly as possible to provide "free" post-secondary educational opportunity to every student capable of qualifying for admission. As author of the Cold War GI Bill, I speak with some knowledge on the subject.

The GI Bills gave access to post-secondary education to more people who used it more effectively in a concentrated period of time than did any other program in the history of this country. The United States government committed more than \$15 billion to the training of American servicemen—both in higher education and in vocational education.

As a result of that \$15 billion investment—for that is what it was—America got back 450,000 medical personnel, 383,000 construction workers, 180,000 teachers, 360,000 scientists, 107,000 lawyers, 243,000 accountants, 36,000 clergymen, 288,000 metal workers, 711 mechanics, 17,000 journalists, 138,000 electrical workers, 83,000 police and firemen, 61,000 printers and 700,000 businessmen.

On the average each individual who received GI benefits—tuition and fees paid plus living allowances—is making \$2,000 to \$3,000 more income annually than he otherwise would have been earning.

Most impressive, however, in simple financial terms is that the \$15 billion investment has already been paid back to the government and to our economy in the form of increased income taxes. In fact, as a direct result of their training, GIs have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes, so that they have not only already paid back their debt to society, but they will continue to repay it during their earning lifetimes two and three times over.

The issue of whether or not to provide free post-secondary education has been described as a value judgment; either it should be free to all who have the requisite ability, or those who benefit from it should be required to pay some user cost. This ideological reduction of issues, however, ignores the fact that, just as under the GI Bill, all Americans who improve their educational standing—and their ability to contribute to society and earn higher incomes, pay a user cost through our system of graduated income taxes.

I feel most strongly that this is the direction in which we should move. I am pleased beyond words that the NEA feels the same way. I learned, with the Bilingual Education Act, what a powerful and effective force you are. It is good to know that once again we will be working shoulder to shoulder for a common goal.

Just as the individual teacher affects eternity because he never knows where his influence stops, I think the collective teachers—the NEA—never know where their influence stops.

We are about to embark on a major venture in education. A major adventure, too. The future looks most exciting and challenging, and I can think of no harder workers—nor

better friends to have with me—than the teachers of America.

PAUL C. HARPER SPEAKS TO THE CONFERENCE OF BETTER BUSINESS BUREAUS

REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul C. Harper, chairman of the board of Needham, Harper & Steers, Inc., the well known advertising agency in my district, on June 3 addressed the National Conference of the Association of Better Business Bureaus at the Hotel Commodore in my district.

His provocative address entitled "The Invisible Man" has some timely things to say about the need for businessmen to be involved in public and civic matters.

I know that my colleagues who many times criticize public apathy, will be very much interested in his remarks, which follow:

"THE INVISIBLE MAN"

(An address by Paul C. Harper, chairman of the board, Needham, Harper & Steers, Inc., to the National Conference of the Association of Better Business Bureaus, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, June 3, 1968)

Gentlemen, the theme of this conference is "Business Deserves Public Confidence", and so it does. I could not agree more. But this theme has a plaintive note to it. What it really says is "Business Deserves More Public Confidence than it's getting." And so the question has to be, why is it not getting its share?

Do most products fall apart shortly after purchase? Are most salesmen pushy and mendacious. Are most products unfairly priced? Are the airways littered with false claims? No!

Then why this crisis of confidence?

Let's try another answer? Are there just enough poorly made products—false claims—high pressures salesmen—price distortions, to queer the public image of business. We all know the ripple effect in human affairs. (We are watching it with astonishment in France this week.) In business the victim of ripples in public opinion created by a few malpractitioners within its own ranks?

It could be. They certainly don't help.

But I would like to suggest another answer this noon. I would like to suggest that even if the record of American business were totally free of overt malpractice of any type—and had been for the past 40 years—that American business would still be in trouble today—in trouble with the consumer, in trouble with the intellectual community including large numbers of students, and in trouble with the government.

Why?

I believe for three fundamental reasons—that go deep into the nature of what American business is all about today.

These three reasons are:

1. The technical naivete of the consumer.
2. The depersonalization of selling.
3. The invisibility of business leadership.

When I was a boy we had a farm we went to on weekends. The most complex device on the farm was the hand pump over the old brick well. Being a weekend farmer my father didn't know what to do, one day, when the pump stopped working. So he called Mr. Rieke, the local well driller. Mr. Rieke went

down into the well and came out ten minutes later with a big smile and a dead gopher—which had been clogging the pipe. Now I submit it's going to be a cold day in hell when our tv repairman reaches into our color tv set and comes out smiling with a dead gopher. You know what will happen instead. The tv set will be hauled away and fixed at a price—and then sooner or later it will blow again, since it never was designed for eternity. But the point is that my wife and I will never know whether the set was well made in the first place or if it was fixed properly. Not because we are distrustful of the industry, but because we are totally incompetent in this area of technology. We just don't know and we never will and there is therefore an area for doubt. And so it is with every highly technical consumer product and the service functions it requires. There is a knowledge gap between supplier and consumer that is so great that it spawns doubt even when there is no record of overt abuse.

How about the depersonalization of selling? There is now a food store in Louisville where the housewife need never leave her car. She observes sample merchandise through a large plate glass window, presses appropriate buttons, and the merchandise is brought to her car. She communicates with no one. This is just an extreme. Except perhaps for the clothing and furniture industry where highly individualized personal tastes and styles are involved—the selling of goods to consumers has become more and more perfunctory and impersonal. Here again the contact between the seller (who represents, after all, the whole business community) and the buyer (with all his hopes and fears) has become attenuated and strained. Again, nobody is doing anything bad. But *business* has become more and more remote in what used to be the prime area of contact with the consumer, the daily bread and butter transactions of life. There is nobody there anymore to grind the coffee beans and comment on the weather. There is nobody there to complain to about prices, who knows anything about pricing. And when you finally find the stock boy he tells you it isn't his aisle. Thus we see gap number two between the consumer and businessman. It is a result of vastly increased distribution efficiency, which may mean lower prices—but also means loss of human contact—and understanding between the buyer and the seller.

Finally, we face what has to be the great disappearing act of all time. The *businessman*, the archetype of our time, has virtually disappeared as a public figure. The men who wield the greatest economic power in our society are by and large invisible and unknown to the consuming public—except when they quit being businessmen and go into public service.

I asked some college students the other night what leading businessmen they could name. These boys could give the name and identification number of every leading politician in the country. But in answer to my question they were able to name just one man; Henry Ford. It stopped there, except for one student who came up with Hugh Howard—later identified as Howard Hughes.

I watched Sunday tv last week from noon until midnight and concentrated on public affairs programs. I recommend it to all of you who are concerned with the problem I'm talking about. I saw 10 programs featuring among others Governor Reagan, a panel of students and professors from Columbia, Mr. Dellinger, the leader of the New Left, being dismembered by Bill Buckley, a commentary on Viet Nam, the Reverend Abernathy, and our own distinguished Mayor on his extraordinarily effective weekly interview show. But where was the businessman? Virtually every facet of political and economic life came up one way or another except *business*, its problems, and its point of view. There was no businessman on the air representing

business—or anything else. Business was represented only by commercials.

Businessmen, individuals, are not a visible part of the public environment.

What we are looking at here in all three of these areas is an estrangement of business from the consumer. And although most consumers are "in business" too—as employees—or as wives of employees—this fact helps to bridge none of the gaps I am talking about.

What to do about it?

Do we abridge our technology and cut back on research and development. I hope not. I enjoy convenience.

Do we go back to the Mom and Pop stores and decentralize our distribution. I hope not. I like low prices.

I think what we do have to do is to recognize that business by its very genius in technology and administration has created a Frankenstein—a remoteness and impersonality which provides a rich field for misunderstanding and opposition—and we should attack that problem directly in its own terms.

What do we do about it?

My answer will sound simplistic. (This is a word people use to express disappointment when the answer they get isn't as complicated as the question they asked.)

The answer is in the slogan that appears on the letterhead of one of my leading competitors. These words are, "Truth well told."

In any human situation where suspicion, doubt or strained relations exist the greatest therapy is candor—the frank and personal admission that the flaw that one party sees may really be there, along with the shining virtues the other party sees. The quickest way to bridge any communications gap is to say the truth and say it yourself.

Let us speak first of advertising, which has become—with the decline of personal salesmanship—the principal contact between business and the public.

I am a member of a committee of our industry organization which reviews examples of advertising considered by members to be grossly untruthful or in bad taste. I can report that my duties on this committee do not take much time, because the number of advertisements in any media which are demonstrably untruthful is small indeed. In spite of this, my own observation is that there still seem to be many people in our industry who think that there are shades of truth. These people have righteously cast aside the black lie, but they persist in telling what might be called "gray lies". What is the difference? The black lie is a direct and deliberate misstatement of fact. (*Guaranteed to restore your hair in 30 days.*) These days, as I say, it is rarely used in advertising. The "gray lie", on the other hand, is the cunning use of words or pictures to convey an impression that is false without being literally false. (*Men, don't you wish you had your hair back?*) In these days of growing product parity, there seems to be a great temptation to try through "gray lies" to communicate values that the product doesn't offer. The "gray liar" is the first to recognize that what is said and what the consumer hears may be two entirely different things, and he counts on this as a way of selling goods.

I have said to our own people, and I will say to you that the distinction between truth and falsehood lies not only in what we say, but in what the consumer hears. We, in our industry as communications specialists, should be able to judge or to measure at least what is being communicated. And this should never represent a use value or the emotional value that the product can't really deliver. In our own advertising agency we have the following rules. "To test the truth of an advertisement, ask two questions: One, what use values and what emotional values does the advertisement really communicate? What does the consumer really hear? If you

can't answer this question, do some penetrating communications research."

"Secondly, can the product really deliver these values? If you can't answer yes to this question (we say, to our creative people) start over."

In our society as never before, the truth, if it is spoken with friendliness and wit, can have an overpowering effect. In this day when communications are so powerful and so expensive to use, the tendency however is to hedge every communications bet and to make statements which skirt but do not penetrate the heart of the matter. At best, this results in a kind of bland but meaningless honesty. At worst, it results in bland but damaging dishonesty. The force of truth told with wit has never been better demonstrated than in the famous Volkswagen campaign for which I wish our agency could take credit. In this campaign, this unprepossessing little car was presented for just what it was—an unprepossessing little car. Both its limitations and strengths were spelled out with disarming candor. This campaign was a landmark in advertising because it recognized the fundamental truth I am talking about. In an impersonal society, the next best thing to a handshake or a kiss is hearing words which you know deep down are true.

And advertising, bearing the weight of social responsibility as it does, should always speak straight and clear and well. In its basic communications with the consumer, through its advertising, business can afford to speak in no other fashion.

Now let us turn to the Invisible Man himself. The key man of our society, the man who takes more risks, works longer hours, under greater pressure than any other—and who gets less public credit for it.

Long ago he used to be the man in the big house on the hill. His idiosyncracies were known and discussed. He was either loved or hated—but at least he was recognized—as an individual.

Today, he is known only to his peers. No one else knows who he is, where he lives, or what he stands for as an individual.

The communications media are crowded with statesmen, politicians, entertainers, and ordinary citizens airing their gripes, but somehow the businessman, the man who really makes things go around, has gotten left out. His critics are part of the communications environment, but he is not.

Sometimes he thinks of himself as a public figure, but more often than not, this is an illusion created at conventions—where businessmen spend so much time talking to each other. It is perfectly clear that the time has come for the *maker*, the head of the business to once again become part of the *visible environment* of our society. He can become, under the right circumstances, the most effective means of closing the gap of understanding between business and public because he is a *man* and not a medium, a *person* and not a slogan.

I suggest he has two means at his disposal. Neither is new, and both are being used, but not widely enough.

The first route was chosen by the President of a company we do business with in a medium sized city in the Mid-west. He and two or three other businessmen there perceived that their city was on the verge of civil strife. This was due partly to the fact that an open housing ordinance had been bottled up in a committee of the town council for several months, aggravating an atmosphere of deep suspicion in the black community. This businessman personally, openly, and quite visibly led the fight to have this ordinance fairly considered and acted upon by the Council at large. And partly at least as a result of his actions, civil balance was preserved in that city. Now, the point is that regardless of how any citizen of that town feels about open housing—they now know

from his own words, first hand, where this businessman stands.

They know that he cares about his community, and is willing to fight for what he thinks is right. He, as an individual, has become part of the visible environment of that town—and in that town, both short and long term business, as well as the town itself, will have been well served.

Of course businessmen all over the country have for years been lending their names and their time and giving their money to worthy causes—and many have personally and visibly led attacks on a wide variety of social problems. But what I am saying is that for business to remain a fully accepted member of an increasingly depersonalized and complex society—business has to be represented personally, first hand and all the time by its own leaders.

Business can make better use of the media to project the words, the impact of personal leadership. For several years now the Xerox Company and its officers have boldly identified themselves via television with leading social issues and the most advanced art forms. The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey has, and is, doing the same. And yet there is a growing need on a broad front for personalization of issues by businessmen on the popular media. I am not talking here about defensive statements on the contributions of business to the common good. I don't think this kind of communications work. They are necessarily too abstract. I am talking about bold and visible deeds, acts, of *espousal, sponsorship, advocacy*, that clearly identify the businessman as a living, breathing, thinking, and fighting individual—rather than as part of a great, grey, impersonal monolith.

Managers must manage their businesses. This is our first obligation. But if we seek to improve the environment in which we do business, we had all better recognize the gap that exists between business and home. It is a gap that has only been created perhaps ten percent by knaves. The other ninety percent by the gradual depersonalization of relations between business and the common man. And when you have a problem of communications, the only solution is to communicate in the most meaningful way you can. And this means in American society today that American businessmen must speak loud, speak clear, and speak simple. But above all, they must speak.

POSTAL SERVICE MUST REMAIN AT PRESENT LEVEL

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the laws of mathematics are immutable.

Postmaster General Watson has discovered that and the mail-using public will discover it very soon unless the Postal Service is permitted to have the manpower necessary to cope with its constantly increasing workload.

Mail volume this year is expected to reach at least 84 billion pieces. Mail volume in 1966 was less than 76 billion pieces. Despite this fact, the postal service is required under the tax bill to cut back its employment to 1966 levels.

Postmaster General Watson pointed out last Friday what this will do to postal employment. He said:

This means a total loss to us in this fiscal year of 30,780 workers. It comes in two categories—15,780 who were needed to meet the

growth of mail volume, but can't be hired, and 15,000 who will not be replaced when they retire, quit or leave the service through other means of attrition.

Over a four-year period—when our total volume of mail will grow to 91.2 billion pieces, we must cut back our workforce to 685,000 people while filling only three out of four job vacancies.

The postal service should be exempted from the employment ceiling imposed by the tax bill. This would not increase the postal budget. But it would permit the Post Office to maintain service at its present level.

BATA GIVES FIRST GIFT TO SALVATION ARMY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, The Bata Shoe Co., of Belcamp, Md., recently opened a drive to raise \$160,000 to build a new community service center for the Salvation Army. I would like to commend this fine endeavor by including the following article in the RECORD:

BATA GIVES FIRST GIFT TO SALVATION ARMY DRIVE

Bata Shoe Corporation kicked off the "Great" Gifts division of the Capital Fund Campaign to raise \$160,000 minimum to build a new Community Service Center for the Salvation Army, serving Harford and Cecil Counties, at a meeting held this week. Augustine Dolezal, President, announced, "Bata Shoe Company believes so strongly in the important work this agency is doing for our area that it is our intent to contribute \$2,000 for each of the 5 years of the campaign pledge period. We also are organizing a company-wide solicitation of our employees to occur the end of July for this worthy project."

At this kick off meeting, Judge Albert P. Close, General Campaign Chairman, announced other initial gifts: \$10,000 from Lester J. Conkling of Aberdeen, Chairman of The Salvation Army Advisory Board, \$3,000 from an anonymous Harford County business, and other pledges for a total of \$31,300.53.

The "Great" Gifts division is the first actual solicitation in The Salvation Army effort to raise a minimum of \$160,000 to build a new Community Service Center to meet the needs of the local Salvation Army's extensive welfare and character-building program. This division includes individuals, business firms, and other organizations capable of giving more than \$1,000 over a 5-year pledge period. Many prominent individuals have agreed to work on behalf of the Salvation Army in this project. Among those working on the "Great" Gifts division are: from Aberdeen—Lester J. Conkling, J. Wilmer Cronin, Howard Falk, Richard Harvey, Lynn Tanner, Rev. Weldon Bittkofer, from Bel Air—Werner Buchal, Mrs. Brodnax Cameron, Jr., John Pons, Woodley Richardson, Howard Marshall, Charles Irwin, Paul Lefever, Albert Close, from Belcamp—Augustine Dolezal, Frank Novak, from Churchville—Michelle Coale, from Conowingo—Paul English, Henry Roberts, from Ceclton—Samuel F. DuPont, from Creswell, John Gayley, from Edgewood—Eugene Ekblad, John Wise, from Havre de Grace—George Hipkins, Cecil Sale, Charles Stephans, J. Lawson Gilbert, Harry Mitchell, Dr. Gunther Hirsch, Arnold Pfaffenbach, Fred Bergren, and from Joppa—Albert Wise.

MARATHON MARVEL NOW DANCES TO JUKEBOX TUNES

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the Akron Beacon Journal each Sunday has presented a "Biography in Brief" of a local citizen who has made an impact on our community.

Last week one Anthony James Castle was so honored.

In this day and age with so many people complaining, Tony's biography was particularly inspirational. Having just returned from an international conference in Geneva, Switzerland, I heard world complaints first hand. Tony's biography proved that it can happen in America. Today we have over 2 million people who are on the waiting list to come to America, but not one on any list desiring to leave the United States. America can be thankful that the Castelluccio family chose America to become their adopted country. In their so doing, we gained Tony Castle.

I wish this "Biography in Brief" could be read by all those who think opportunity in this great land is passé. The shoeshine boy can still wind up owning a shoe factory. The Beacon Journal article follows:

MARATHON MARVEL NOW DANCES TO JUKEBOX TUNES

(By Kenneth F. Cole)

A single jukebox and eight coin-operated hockey games. Not much to build a business out of. Tony Castle did.

But he had to convince a lot of people that he belonged in the coin-operated vending business. That took 24-hour-a-day doing.

It started with the jukebox and the hockey games Tony bought when he came out of the Army in 1946. He was 34 and had no job to come back to when he doffed his uniform.

"Like a lot of guys, I went into the service with nothing and came out the same way," smiled Tony. "I knew I had to get started fashioning a career or I was going to be one glorious flop."

Jukeboxes and other coin-operated gadgets (even slot machines) fascinated Tony Castle, from the time he was a youngster on North Hill.

"I was plenty naive, too. A guy like me just doesn't suddenly decide he wants to put jukeboxes into places and start collecting coins. It didn't take me long to find out that other guys were in this business. They didn't like newcomers."

But Tony got his jukebox into the Green Room at the Howe Hotel, now closed. And he got the hockey game boards into other spots. Miniature players could be moved about, chasing a metal puck after coins were inserted.

Established operators of jukebox businesses harassed the 5-foot, 4½-inch Castle. They offered proprietors of bars, restaurants and lounges wonderful deals to keep Tony's machines out.

"They would do almost anything to keep me from getting established. If it hadn't been for so many friends, I don't think I ever would have made it. I just had to provide better service than the other guys. When somebody's jukebox went bad, I had to get it back into operation in a hurry."

Tony rented a truck which he drove himself to haul his jukeboxes and make repairs. "I even had to scrounge telephone service

in the early days. But we got more and more locations for music and began branching out."

Now Tony's Castle Music Co. (he's president and sole owner) has jukeboxes, cigaret machines and piped-in background music in scores of the top restaurants, lounges, short-order houses, professional offices and motels in the area.

Because he remembered his struggles and those early years on North Hill, Tony has tried to help others along the way. He's a big booster for the United Fund and other organized charities.

But the scores of little people he has helped directly tell his story, too.

"If you can't give somebody a lift when they need it, you haven't learned much about life," is the way he puts it. And with it all goes that broad smile.

The name Tony Castle was a familiar one around Akron before he went into business. Thousands who watched the dark-haired former professional dancer (it's gray now but it's still all there) in the ballroom marathons at East Market Gardens knew him.

The marathon dance craze ended in Akron on Aug. 3, 1932, the day a city ordinance banning it went into effect.

The night before, a sultry evening, tiny Tony and his blond partner, Kitty Kavanaugh, won the final marathon at East Market Gardens, long ago torn down.

Tony and Kitty shuffled 2,810 hours—over three months—to crawl off with the cash, trophies and other loot that went with first place or to the last on their feet.

"You have to remember the marathon craze hit during the Depression. I liked to dance and they were handing out cash to folks to compete. I got suits, shoes, spaghetti dinners, everything just to advertise the donor on my back during marathons," Tony recalled.

How do youngsters' popular dances compare today?

"When I see some of the dancing on TV today, I wonder how I could have called my performance 'eccentric,'" smiled Tony. "We at least danced with partners. Today you can't tell which boy is dancing with which girl. It's crazy."

Anthony James Castelluccio was born in Waukegan, Ill., March 25, 1912, one of a family of seven. His mother died when he was 13 and the family moved around a bit—Chicago, New York—before ending up in Akron. His father went to work at Goodrich, retiring after 40 years. He died in 1961.

Tony went to Bryan School and to North High School. "I went to high school just a few weeks. I had to quit to help out at home. I shined shoes at the Star Shoe Repair, hustled odd jobs, anything to make a buck. I think I learned my first dance steps from other shoe shiners."

During his days as a dancer he became known professionally as Tony Castle. "Whoever heard of a name like Tony Castelluccio in lights?"

Along came the war and Tony, two names and all, went into the Army. He landed in the 1252nd Combat Engineers at Camp Swift, Texas. He spent two years in Texas, almost enough to qualify him for Lone Stardom when his outfit was ordered overseas.

"I saw a lot of Europe before getting that discharge," Tony said. "I guess that whetted my interest in travel. I've been back there four times since and I'm planning to go again next year. But nothing looked better than getting back to Akron and making my move into the coin box business."

Tony's early years in the vending business were made tougher because the public was suspicious of anyone making a living from coins dropped into slots. It just wasn't considered legitimate.

So Tony, with some of his friends in the same enterprises, Ed George, Charles Marvin

and others, organized the Summit County Music Operators' Association.

"We wanted to be a part of the community. Now we take part in the United Fund, Area Development Committee and other worthwhile ventures. We've brought some stability and good will into our business and proved we're good citizens," said Tony.

For the last 10 years, Tony has played a big role in the activities of Boys Town of Italy, operated in Rome by Msgr. John Carroll Abbey. Since World War II Boys Town has helped orphaned boys get an education and acquire a trade. Groups throughout the United States help to finance Boys Town.

Tony married Frances Nell Galus on Jan. 5, 1950. "The business I'm in requires an understanding wife because of the long hours. I've got one," smiles Tony.

The Castles have lived for 10 years at 2515 Falls av., in Cuyahoga Falls. There Tony spends all his spare time. A French poodle "Gilm" and a cat "Kitty" complete the family, although the Castles have nieces and nephews staying with them most of the time.

"We have them with us so much that it's the next best thing to having children of your own," Tony says.

Castle likes to swim, play a little golf and work in the yard when he can. "That golf is a problem though because I can't play much and it's no fun when everybody can hit the ball but you."

Travel, vacations in Puerto Rico or "anywhere to get away for a few days" provide the 56-year-old Tony's relaxation.

He drinks and smokes very little, unusual for a man who has spent so much time in bars and lounges. "I light an occasional cigarette out of habit, but I never inhale them." And I switch brands as often as I buy them."

But his first love are machines into which people drop coins and get something for their dough.

"I've had offers to sell the business. But I'd be right back where I was when I came out of the Army. Nothing to do, even though I'd have money to do it with."

He won't sell. He likes the action.

VIETNAM WAR—TOO LONG AND FAR TOO FRUSTRATING

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the undeclared war in Vietnam is a source of frustration among most of the Members of this body, as well as Members of the other body, and most of our individual constituents.

Scarcely understood in origin, even less understood in direction and solution, it is a war of words, weapons, and waste. The socioeconomic, not to mention the political or psychological, impact of that war is felt not only within our country and in Vietnam itself, but in most states throughout the world.

To try to say to what extremity these hostilities will lead and what the future effects the quagmire will render to our Nation and world is worthless speculation. Not one of us knows for sure, or can know for that matter. On the other hand, what every person in the United States does know and perceive is that we are experiencing an ever-increasing loss of our human resources, material and prestige, and losing them to a seemingly futile cause.

The following editorial from the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, on June 23, 1968, expresses quite concisely the facts, feelings and fears that evolve from that frustrating war:

VIETNAM WAR—TOO LONG AND FAR TOO FRUSTRATING

The war in Vietnam today became the longest in America's history—six years, six months, one day—far too long and far too frustrating.

And most exasperating of all is that the end to this expenditure of American blood and treasure is not in sight.

So far, that conflict in far-away Southeast Asia has cost about 25,000 American lives and billion upon billion in dollars.

And the cost continues at the rate of about 300 lives and a half billion dollars each and every week.

The buildup in the cost in American lives has been steady. In 1964, there was an average of three GIs killed per week. In 1965 the average rose to 26, in 1966 to 96, in 1967 to 180 and so far this year the average has been 379.

This conflict is not an official war. It has not been so declared by the United States Congress.

Thus the start of the war is dated from the day when the first American was killed there—on Dec. 22, 1961. Actually, America has been involved in the area since 1954.

That first American killed in Vietnam combat was an amiable Tennessean, James Thomas Davis, an Army Specialist 4. He was cut down by Viet Cong bullets on a road near Saigon.

Since then, the warfare has droned on and on until its length has set a record—erasing the tenure of America's first war, the battle for national independence which started April 19, 1775, at Lexington and lasted until the enemy surrendered at Yorktown Oct. 19, 1781.

In many respects that first war and the current conflict are alike. Mainly, there is a fight for independence against a singularly authoritarian rule.

But there is a distinct difference, too.

That historic Revolutionary War was an all-out military effort and it was concluded in classic military fashion—by the surrender of the enemy.

Today's war in Vietnam holds no such prospect. Even the departing American commander, Gen. William Westmoreland, has ruled out a "classic victory" for the Americans. Instead, he believes that because of our national policy of not expanding the war, the enemy must be forced to pay a continually higher price to a point where he no longer can tolerate it—

Or until the peace negotiators in Paris reach some kind of agreement on paper which will yield an armistice.

But in Paris, the war of words matches the war of bullets—frustratingly endless.

The war in Vietnam has set a record—for length—but for little else about which this nation can be proud.

THE "PUEBLO"—HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 175th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

SPEECH GIVEN BY ELTON R. CUDE, PAST COMMANDER, 20th DISTRICT, THE AMERICAN LEGION—INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION HEMISFAIR, JULY 4, 1968

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of July 4, the Worlds Fair in San Antonio, Tex., HemisFair 1968, was the scene of a significant anniversary celebration. A distinguished San Antonian, Mr. Elton Cude, who is presently district clerk of Bexar County, and is also the past commander, 20th District, American Legion, made a most impressive and enlightening speech. I insert Mr. Cude's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

SPEECH GIVEN BY ELTON R. CUDE, PAST COMMANDER, 20TH DISTRICT THE AMERICAN LEGION—INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION HEMISFAIR, JULY 4, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls, Americans all: Today we mark the 192nd anniversary of the birth of the greatest nation ever conceived by the mind of man under the guidance of God, the United States of America.

America was conceived somewhat in the nature of a noble experiment in the mind and affairs of men. She was born of a burning desire in the minds and the hearts of the founding fathers to win for themselves and to hold for future generations the basic values of human dignity and individual freedom.

Our Constitution was the climax of the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations, the pains, the sufferings, the defeats in battles and the victory in war against a mighty empire whose desires were to govern us from a far distant shore. It is for us the living to remember the meaning of this observance of Independence Day. If we will pause for a moment and consider a few of the beautiful pages of history of our republic, we may recapture the thrill of this new, bold and daring adventure.

If we will but turn back these pages we will find, landing on the shores of this unexplored, strange and unknown land, groups of persons looking for the greatest and most priceless intangible objects known to man—freedom and liberty.

It took a people of strong courage and principle to leave the land of their birth, their families and their friends but this was necessary, for in their homeland, they had no freedom and because of persecution for their beliefs they made this long voyage to this welcome land.

This was a hardy stock, it had to be, for the weak died on the way and the fearful never tried.

We read of the Puritans who landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620 and wrote that famous document, the Mayflower Compact—only 17 lines—the first document written on American soil which begins "In the name of God, Amen."

In 1624 how James I revoked the charter of the Virginia Company because he hated and detested the representative House of Burgesses and how Nathaniel Bacon won the victory over Governor Bergeley. Foundation for what was to be known as American, for at this early date it was shown that the Colonists could unite and die for that principle regarded as the rights of free men.

Then the first American Revolution when the people of Massachusetts rose and over-

threw the despotic Sir Edmund Andros who ruled with a mailed fist and ruthlessly curbed the town meetings, restricted justice in the courts and freedom of the press.

During this period of time many races of people had migrated to America. The English, Welsh, French, German, Dutch, Irish, Scotch, Swedish, Swiss, Hebrews and Negroes. With this came a toleration of beliefs, especially in the field of religion. We must remember tho, that excepting Georgia, which was formally planted by the British Government, all the other colonies were settled by trading companies, religious groups, land speculators and others. England did not even dream that a new nation was being born.

We read of the acts that followed, the war itself that lasted 8 years—but the actual revolution lasted over 150 years, beginning with the first landing on American shores. The acts, the riots, the massacres, the tea party, the committees of correspondence, all were the continuation of their faith in God and their regard for the rights of man.

That fiery and flaming orator, Patrick Henry, the extremist from Williamsburg, who rose on that long, hot eventful day in the House of Burgesses, a special session, to decide and determine whether Virginia should seek peace or join with the other colonists. His ringing words were "you cry peace—but there is no peace. If we want freedom, let us fight for it. Victory is not always for the strong, for there is a just God that presides over the destinies of men and nations and will give us our freedom. If this be treason—then make the most of it. As for me give me liberty or give me death."

We know well of the resolution of Richard Henry Lee of Virginia on June 7, 1776 asking that "these colonies ought and of a right should be free" and the five-man committee chairmaned by yet another Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, to write that immortal document which begins, "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary," etc. and embodying "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" and ending with "and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

For eight long years, enduring untold suffering and hardship, armed with little more than raw courage and a firm belief in God and in the principles for which they fought, our forefathers battled this mighty empire to a standstill and snatched victory from the jaws of imminent defeat.

This is the moral fibre of which America is made—courage, a belief in God and dedication to principles. These are the qualities that were required to win freedom. These are the same qualities needed by each succeeding generation of Americans, to hold freedom, as new and powerful forces of despotism and dictatorial forces rear their heads, seeking to destroy that concept of government embodied in the Declaration of Independence. The concept that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

For the first time in recorded history man had given credence to the divine "that man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights."

It was no new breed of man that brought this theory into being, it was the enlightened thinking of men of courage and of vision, who, based on long years of experience, living under forms of government, not to their choosing, concluded that no individual or social group could be permitted to exercise control and domination over the minds of other men.

For those who live under communism, freedom is but a fond memory to those old

enough to have enjoyed its blessing and to the young, but a dream discussed in hushed secrecy by only those left who have the courage to talk of things that used to be.

This is the threat that faces America today, for we are one of the remaining free nations that block the path of Communist plans to dominate the world. There is one all-important difference between our Nation and the fate of those capitulated to communism—we still have that freedom for which our forefathers fought and died. We still can choose between freedom and slavery—liberty and bondage.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" and we cannot afford to falter in our efforts to keep our material strength and our spiritual and moral courage, on a par, if not ahead of that of the Communists. We can even less afford to allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of complacency through ignorance of, or indifference to the problems of the times.

Freedom can be lost—by default just as surely as by conquest through force of arms.

Every individual American is important to the cause of freedom. By word and by deed, in our every day living, we must impress the fact that we in America enjoy so many blessings and so many privileges, denied to peoples of so many other lands and tongues. Our youth should be taught the sacrifices required by those who have gone before; that those blessings could be preserved for them to enjoy this day, for upon their shoulders will fall the responsibility of maintaining and securing those blessings of liberty and freedom to themselves and to their posterity.

The real purpose of this, or any Independence Day observance should be to revive a glorious reawakening throughout the land of the free, of the true "spirit of '76," those things that have made America great and have kept her great, and these are the things required to insure that she will remain the land of the free and the home of the brave.

May I leave you with these words of the late Lyman Abbott who had this to say of our country and it's people: "He who looks upon this history which his fathers have written by their heroic deeds, who accepts with gratitude the inheritance which they have bequeathed to him and who highly resolves to preserve this inheritance unimpaired and to pass it on to his descendants, enlarged and enriched, is a true American, be his birthplace and his parentage what it may."

PROMISING PLAN IN ENGLEWOOD

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1968, the Chicago American's editorial page contained an excellent editorial entitled "Promising Plan in Englewood," relative to a new study program at Chicago State College.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this article and under unanimous consent I submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

PROMISING PLAN IN ENGLEWOOD

Chicago State college in Englewood is to be commended for its summer program in which 200 ghetto youngsters from grades 7 thru 12 study mathematics, literature, art, and music under college student volunteers working as teacher-counselors.

It is a new educational experience for these youngsters, who are working on their

own initiative without the usual motivation of grades or promotion. A student-counselor ratio of 7 to 1 allows individual instruction unknown in most ghetto classrooms.

We'd like to see this idea more widespread because of the dual purpose it accomplishes: It reaffirms the college's commitment to ghetto youth, and it will bring future teachers an intimate acquaintance with the unique problems of urban children during a hot summer.

"Our hopes are high for success," the college president, Dr. Milton Byrd, says. "We are confident the program will be a model for the future." We, too, wish the college success; if the program catches on generally, the promise is great.

RACIAL REFORM AT SAN JOSE STATE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a featured article in the July 8 edition of the Christian Science Monitor justly praises the great work of San Jose's leading academician, President Robert Clark of San Jose State College. The piece points out the significant and creative steps of Dr. Clark and the college in furthering interracial communication and understanding. Dr. Clark, together with students and professors, has forged an atmosphere in which education and dialog need not be mutually exclusive.

All too often, efforts toward collegiate reform are generated not by good will and compassion but by fear. Dr. Clark's work is a significant exception to this rule. He and his colleagues at San Jose State have well understood Lenore Bennett's statement that "Peace is the presence of community, not the absence of conflict." The article follows:

RACIAL REFORM AT SAN JOSE STATE

(By Curtis J. Sitomer)

SAN JOSE, CALIF.—The black militants call it "racism." A college president, Robert D. Clark, calls it "white-ism."

Either way, both say they want to erase it from the blackboards of San Jose State College here. And they are working together to do so.

This urban, state-supported school has a near-unique approach to the racial crisis which is rocking college campuses across the nation. It neither bucks nor placates its minority militants. But it tries to gear them in to the educational processes.

For example, San Jose State blacks are developing their own black studies courses—in history, music, art, and sociology.

TEXTBOOKS COLLECTED

They are working in area high schools—under the College Commitment Program—as volunteer counselors.

They are collecting used textbooks to lend to minority and other underprivileged students who can't afford to buy them.

They are working with school-admissions and student-services officials to facilitate the enrollment of Negroes and Mexican-Americans.

They are assisting the athletic staff to work out guidelines to eliminate racial discrimination in intercollegiate sports.

And they are prodding the community surrounding the campus to provide "open housing" for all students.

Last fall these same forces—mainly militant black students—hurled angry charges of discrimination at college officials and threatened the campus with physical violence.

GAME CANCELED

The school's opening varsity football game was canceled because of these tensions. And certain community and state leaders responded by demanding that "disrupters" be banned from the campus.

The school's president, Dr. Clark, reacted differently, however. He set in motion a campuswide investigation of alleged discriminatory practices. He asked sororities and fraternities to come up with inventive plans to integrate their groups. He appointed an "ombudsman" to listen to complaints about unfair treatment of students. And he opened channels for meaningful dialogue between whites, blacks, Mexican-Americans, and other racial groups.

Dr. Clark has on his own faculty an outspoken, searing critic of the white community. Prof. Harry Edwards. This towering former basketball star turned sociologist now is the main force behind the threatened Olympic boycott by American Negroes.

VALUES IN FOCUS

To many whites, Mr. Edwards is a dangerous agitator—dedicated to undercutting athletics and keeping the pot boiling on the campuses. But to Dr. Clark—who says he wants to shake his school loose from "institutional inertia" and "indifference to the great problems of the day"—he is a valuable ally.

"I've learned a lot about the values of the American male," confides the college president. "Athletics comes first. God, mother, and country second."

"People are angered at Edwards really because he has upset the athletic applecart." In line with his campaign to stamp out "white-ism" at his school, Dr. Clark is urging his faculty to seek out minority teachers. He also is asking financial support from the local San Jose business community to supplement federal funds to support minority students who can't afford to pay for their own educations.

Next fall, the school's Educational Opportunity Program will be in full swing. Funds now are available to assist 300 ghetto youngsters. Program officials would like to enroll twice this number of "special" students.

More than 100 of the college faculty members have already pledged to devote at least one hour a week next year to tutoring and counseling these new admittees. And militant student groups—including United Black Students for Action (UBSA) and Mexican-American Students Coalition (MASC)—promise to help with their orientation to college life.

"These are our brothers and sisters. And we want them to feel that they are welcome here," says Tim Knowles, president of the United Black Students. Mr. Knowles, who has just earned his undergraduate degree at SJSC, is remaining on campus to assist with the new Educational Opportunity Program.

MOTIVATION STRESSED

"Some of these kids are from the hard-core ghetto," he says. "Their high-school counselors told them they didn't have it to go to college, and many of them believed it until we came along and gave them hope."

"Black people are motivated by what they hear from other successful black people."

Mr. Knowles—as do many of his black colleagues—insists that "racism" still exists at San Jose State College. But he sees definite progress being made at erasing it.

And Dr. Clark—who quickly admits that his campus still harbors the seeds of turmoil—is moderately optimistic about the future.

"Many of our rules of thumb—our admissions policies, for example, work against us,"

he says. "These criteria tend to wipe out the poor—the minority youngster."

"And the militants continue to condemn these things. But at the same time, they want to get into the system."

"For many of them the university can be the first transition from despair to hope."

Several of four articles on Western college students and the urban crisis.

ONE OF POLAND'S MOST SHAMEFUL HOURS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the July-August, 1968, issue of the National Jewish Monthly published by B'nai B'rith appears an article by Dr. William Korey, who is the director of the B'nai B'rith International Council's U.N. Office in New York.

It appears to me that this is an unusually significant statement, which in a brief, crystal-clear fashion describes a very poignant situation of our times. I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now because I believe that my colleagues may want to be brought up to date on one of the problems of our times:

ONE OF POLAND'S MOST SHAMEFUL HOURS

The fifth congress of the Polish Communist Party, to be held in November, will provide the final evidence of whether the six-month vicious anti-Semitic campaign of General Mieczyslaw Moczar's "Partisans" has paid off. For, as is now evident, that campaign in large measure was a cynical and unscrupulous device to obtain power. The supreme irony is that this has been waged in a country whose soil is soaked by the blood of millions of Jews massacred by the Nazis, and where the present Jewish population numbers but 20,000 survivors of the pre-war 3,500,000.

Already in the spring of 1967, Moczar and his cohorts had decided at a secret meeting to openly exploit anti-Semitism in a drive for power. The objective was simple: to obtain enough key positions in the Party apparatus and in the Central Committee to dictate the choice of delegates to the Party Congress. By using anti-Semitism they could arrange not only the ouster of Jews and other "liberals" from important posts, but also attract all elements prone to ultra-nationalism, anti-urbanism, and anti-intellectualism.

Until 1967, the "Partisans" had been careful to avoid an obvious display of their political bias. They recalled only too well that the attempted use of anti-Semitism in 1956 by a predecessor group had boomeranged and helped bring forth a liberal revolution. Instead, the Partisans assiduously cultivated a legend of heroism in the Communist resistance movement in Poland during World War II. They stressed their youth as compared to the "tired old men" in the Politburo, and quietly slipped their representatives into vital positions in the security apparatus. In 1964, Moczar himself assumed control of the apparatus by becoming Minister of Interior.

From this base, the Partisans were in a position to use the incriminating files of the secret police to remove hundreds of people of Jewish origin and others from influential offices. A special effort was made to control key posts in mass communication media. And the word was cautiously spread that

"comrades of Jewish origin are not fully reliable" and therefore "cannot be trusted". A special "anti-Zionist section" was set up in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, headed by a certain Tadeusz Walichnowski, to prepare necessary documents on the politically explosive theme that "Zionists" (a euphemism for Jews) collaborated with West Germans in a conspiracy against Poland.

When, in 1967, the Partisans decided to move into the open in their bid for power, two stunning developments played into their hands. The first was the Arab-Israel six-day war. A wave of popular pro-Israel sympathy had swept important segments of Polish society, including various state and Party offices. A veritable flood of gifts, flowers, and congratulatory letters and telegrams poured into the Israel Embassy in Warsaw.

To party boss Wladyslaw Gomulka, the pro-Israel demonstration constituted a direct challenge to Party policy on the Middle East and an indirect attack upon the Soviet Union, the major supporter of the Arabs. His notorious June 19 speech at the Trade Union Congress followed, with its frenzied warnings against "Zionist circles" in Poland. It opened a Pandora box, for the Partisans now had a legitimate platform upon which to erect a scaffolding of anti-Jewish vitriol.

The second development was far more significant. On March 8, thousands of Polish students spilled into the streets demonstrating against the closing of the popular and patriotic play of Poland's "Shakespeare", Adam Mickiewicz, and protesting the arrest of student leaders who had opposed this act of censorship. (The play contained anti-Czarist Russian lines which, when uttered by the actors, were applauded by attendees. The meaning was not lost upon the authorities, who had bound themselves to a new Russian master.) Fearful that the liberal ferment in nearby Czechoslovakia might spread to Polish soil, and deeply concerned that the student upsurge might evoke a positive response among Polish workers, increasingly alienated by the high cost of living and growing unemployment, the Party bosses desperately sought a scapegoat.

The Partisans furnished a convenient one—the "Zionists". Curiously, the first to raise the cry of the Zionist threat (on March 10) was *Slowo Powzeczne*, the newspaper of PAX, an organization created by the Party to attract Roman Catholics. It is headed by Boleslaw Piasecki, a pre-war Polish Fascist leader who, under mysterious circumstances, was spared the death sentence in 1945 by the Soviet military. Thus, a Fascist program became the slogan of reactionary Communists. On March 12, Poland's principal newspapers took up the slogan with a vengeance. Placards began appearing in factories: "Purge the Party of Zionists", "Away With the New Fifth Column", etc.

The intent was clear: at all costs, student agitation must not be permitted to infect the working class. Workers, many of whom had but recently come off the farms, were steeped in rural prejudices, including traditional feelings about Jews. An article in the leading Party newspaper *Trybuna Ludu* on March 13 is indicative of the Party's intentions. It related how workers in one plant were called out to break up a student demonstration:

This morning, when we mobilized Comrades for participating in the operation, they had certain scruples and inhibitions. They had to be told who the instigators are and then all of them went into operation. (Italics added.)

The Partisan-controlled propaganda machine now swung into high gear. The charge was trumpeted that a conspiracy existed of discredited Stalinist politicians (with convenient Jewish names), revisionist intellectuals (also, mainly, with Jewish names), and

gilded youth of Jewish origin. The conspiracy was allegedly supported abroad by "international Zionism", West German revanchism, and foreign imperialists; the supposed purpose of the plot was to stir up a student revolt challenging the political system.

Gomulka must have realized that his own authority might be undermined by the Partisan thrust. On March 19, he took to the public platform questioning whether the Zionists constituted a serious threat to Party rule. In the hope of halting the threatening torrent of reaction, he divided Jews into three categories: Zionists, who should be encouraged to emigrate to Israel; Jewish nationalists, who should not be permitted to serve in positions of responsibility; and Jews whose loyalty was exclusively Polish. He asserted that the bulk of Polish Jewry fell into the latter category.

The categorization, while bigoted in itself, nonetheless constituted an effort to moderate the growing outburst of verbal violence and intimidation of Jews. Hundreds were being fired from a great variety of jobs; others were being coerced into denouncing their brethren abroad. But the tide would not be stemmed. On April 17, the thinly-veiled anti-Zionist denunciations were thrust aside. Jozef Kepa, the Secretary of the Warsaw Party organization, specifically referred to "the Jewish question in our country" and emphasized that among the "instigators" of the student revolt "the overwhelming majority were Polish citizens of Jewish origin".

A particularly ugly turn in the Moczarski-directed campaign came when the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, which had poured millions into the economic and social rehabilitation of war-torn Poland, was accused of conspiracy, sabotage, and espionage at the behest of "international Zionism" and Western imperialism.

Thus was echoed the brutal lexicon of Stalin's infamous "Doctors' Plot", concocted in January, 1953.

But the moral nadir of the campaign was reached when the facts of Jewish martyrdom in the Warsaw Ghetto and at Auschwitz were falsified and distorted to make the Jews appear responsible for their own martyrdom. The obscenity of the charge shocked an already sickened mankind. The Partisans may ride the wave of anti-Semitic hysteria into power in November, but they and their supporters cannot escape the harsh verdict of history; this has been one of Poland's most shameful hours.

OUR LIVES, OUR FORTUNES, AND OUR SACRED HONOR

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial printed in the July 4 issue of the Manchester, N.H. Union Leader, Publisher William Loeb reflects on the fate of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence and asks an important question:

Today would you have the courage to sign a Declaration of Independence and pledge your life, your fortune and your sacred honor?

The degree of their dedication and belief should serve as a continuing example and encouragement to all Americans.

The editorial follows:

OUR LIVES, OUR FORTUNES, AND OUR SACRED HONOR

(By William Loeb)

The trouble with many Americans today is that they think these words from the Declaration of Independence are just some fancy writing, like a title for a Broadway play or a movie on the late, late show.

They don't understand that these solemn words affixed to the Declaration of Independence meant exactly that and COST many of the signers of the Declaration their lives and their fortunes.

Here is what happened to some of the men who signed the Declaration. First of all, remember that the 56 members of Congress who signed the Declaration of Independence committed a formal act of treason against the British Crown, with all the penalties that go with treason.

You might say: "Well, nothing was going to happen to them. They knew they were safe," but they DIDN'T know any such thing. After all, these men who signed the Declaration of Independence weren't a bunch of slum-dwellers who had nothing to lose.

John Hancock of Massachusetts, for instance, had inherited a great fortune. He was probably the richest man in the Colonies. You remember how he signed his name with enormous letters "so His Majesty can now read my name without glasses and can now double the reward."

Yet, while they knew the penalty for treason was hanging, they joked about it. Do you remember what Ben Franklin said: "Indeed we must all hang together. Otherwise we shall most assuredly hang separately."

Then there was Benjamin Harrison of Virginia, who was a big, fat man who told tiny Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, with reference to the hanging: "With me it will all be over in a minute. But you, you will be dancing in the air an hour after I'm gone!"

On Aug. 17, 1776, less than two months after the signing, British and Hessian soldiers plundered the mansion of one of the New York signers, Francis Lewis at Whitestone. They set it afire and carried his wife away. Mrs. Lewis was treated with great brutality and died from the effects of what had been done to her.

British troops next seized and occupied the extensive estate of another New York signer, William Floyd. His wife and children were able to escape across Long Island Sound to Connecticut, but they lived as refugees for seven years without income. When they eventually came home they found it a completely devastated ruin "despoiled of almost everything but the naked soil."

Another New York signer, Philip Livingston, had built up an immense fortune in the import business and had much property in New York City. All of it was seized and Livingston's town house in New York City and his country estate in Brooklyn Heights were confiscated. The Livingston family was driven out and became homeless refugees. Livingston, himself, continued to sell off his remaining property in an effort to maintain United States credit. Livingston died just two years later, in 1778.

Still another New York signer, Lewis Morris, saw his timber, crops and livestock taken and he was driven from his home for seven years.

The British swept through Jersey and John Hart, a signer from Jersey, risked going to Trenton to the bedside of his dying wife. He was betrayed and barely escaped into the woods, while soldiers ravished his farm, wrecking his house while Mrs. Hart still lay on her death-bed. Hart, no youngster but a man of 65, was hunted down across the countryside and slept in caves and woods, accompanied only by a dog. He finally was able to sneak home and found his wife long buried. His 13 children had been taken away. A broken man, John Hart died in 1779 without ever finding his family.

Another Jersey signer, Abram Clark, a self-made man, suffered having two of his officer-sons in the Revolutionary Army captured and treated with great brutality. The British offered to save their lives if Clark would recant and come out for king and Parliament. Clark refused.

Another Jersey signer, president of the college later called Princeton, had his college library burned. John Witherspoon's friend and signer Richard Stockton, who was a State Supreme Court Justice, was captured, brutally beaten, tortured and starved. By the time he was released his health was ruined. When he got back to his home he found it looted, his furniture and all his personal possessions burned. His library, the finest private library in America, was destroyed. Stockton died before the end of the Revolutionary War and his family was forced to live off charity.

The home of another Jersey signer, Francis Hopkinson, in Bordentown was also looted.

The merchant prince of Philadelphia, Robert Morris, used all his great personal wealth and prestige to keep the finances of the revolution. More than once he was almost solely responsible for providing the money that enabled Washington to keep on fighting. In fact, Morris raised the arms and provisions which made it possible for Washington to cross the Delaware and surprise the Hessians at Trenton on Christmas Day. This first victory was possibly the turning point of the American Revolution. In the process of the war Morris lost 150 ships at sea. He bled his own fortune and credit almost dry.

Pennsylvania signer George Clymer of Chester County had his home despoiled by the British. Fortunately Clymer and his family made good their escape.

Dr. Benjamin Rush, another Pennsylvania signer, was forced to flee to Maryland. Rush, himself, stayed on as a surgeon with the Army.

Another signer from Pennsylvania, John Morton, was so ostracized and treated by his neighbors that he died in 1777, a broken man.

In Rhode Island, on the same day that Washington retook Trenton, the British captured Newport, R.I. Here they destroyed the property of William Ellery, a Rhode Island signer, and burned his home to the ground.

One of the South Carolina signers, Thomas Lynch Jr.'s health broke from privation and exposure. The doctors ordered him to seek a cure in Europe but on the voyage he and his young wife were drowned at sea.

Edward Rutledge, Arthur Middleton and Thomas Heyward Jr., the other three South Carolina signers, were captured by the British in the siege of Charleston. They were imprisoned and brutalized until exchanged at the end of the war. Meanwhile, the vast properties and plantations of the Rutledge and Middleton families were all ravaged and destroyed by the British troops.

When it came to Georgia, signer Button Gwinnett was killed in a duel in 1777. Col. George Walton, fighting for Savannah, was severely wounded and captured when that city fell. The home of the third Georgia signer, Lyman Hall, was burned and his rice plantation confiscated in the name of the Crown.

One of the North Carolina signers, Joseph Hewes, died in Philadelphia while still in Congress—from worry and over-work. The home of another, William Hooper, was occupied by the enemy and his family was driven into hiding.

The sacrifices of the signers came right down to the very bitter end. In the last engagement of the war Washington had British Gen. Cornwallis pinned in Yorktown, using his artillery to blast the last of Cornwallis' troops to pieces. Virginia signer Thomas Nelson Jr. was at the front in command of the Virginia militia forces. Nelson's home was in Yorktown.

Lord Cornwallis and his staff moved their headquarters into Nelson's home. Nelson noticed that the gunners were not shooting at

his house. He said "Why do you spare my house?" "Out of respect to you," a gunner replied. "Give me the cannon," Nelson roared. At his insistence, the cannon fired on his magnificent house and smashed it to pieces.

Thomas Nelson, a signer, had raised \$2 million for the Revolutionary cause by pledging his own estates. The loans came due. A newer peace-time Congress refused to honor them and Nelson's property was taken. He was never reimbursed. He died a few years later at the age of 50, living in very straitened circumstances.

Yet another Virginia signer, Carter Braxton, was also ruined. His property, mainly consisting of sailing-ships, was seized and never recovered.

Here is the summary of what it cost the 56 to sign the Declaration of Independence and pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor: Five were captured and imprisoned, each case with brutal treatment.

Several lost wives, sons or family. One lost his 13 children. All were at one time or another the victims of manhunts and driven from their homes.

Twelve signers had their houses burned and destroyed. Seventeen lost everything they owned.

Not one defected or went back on his pledged word.

When you are sitting at the beach listening to the ballgame on the radio or to a dance tune, having a glass of cold beer and enjoying yourself on the Fourth of July, pause for a minute and think what this freedom of yours and ours cost.

Stop a minute and think. Today would you have the courage to sign a Declaration of Independence and pledge your life, your fortune and your sacred honor? This freedom of ours wasn't bought cheaply.

CONGRESSMAN JAMES V. SMITH REPORTS

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my desire to continually inform the citizenry of my congressional district in Oklahoma of the important issues before the Congress, I am forwarding a report to all of the citizens of western and central Oklahoma. I believe that it is only through factual reports to the people that they can be apprised of the actions of their governing body, and of their Representatives in Congress.

At this point I include in the RECORD the report which I intend to forward in the near future:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN JAMES V. SMITH REPORTS
FROM WASHINGTON, JULY 1968

As your representative in Congress, I report herein some actions I have taken in your behalf. I am doing my best to represent you fairly, accurately, honestly.

TAX INCREASE

I was one of 150 Members who voted against the Johnson-Humphrey tax increase. Already as a result of the increase on individual and corporate taxes, most companies are being forced to ask for higher prices, which means increased costs to consumers. Most corporations will eventually raise costs of their goods to pay for the increased overhead and the taxpayer will wind up paying double. Our trouble is Government overspending, not undertaxing.

The Administration "reluctantly" agreed to a \$6 billion cut in the largest budget ever

submitted to Congress in the history of the country.

However, only a week after the vote, the President announced that he had "discovered" an additional \$5 billion deficit, which whittled the cut to only \$1 billion. Also the President announced that "it might be months" before he decides where the cuts are to be made. Many House Members and the taxpayers are beginning to realize that the House has just given the Administration another \$8 billion to spend.

The Wall Street Journal now says that the measure was completely oversold as an economic curative for the most serious financial situation which our country has faced since 1931. I agree, and I will continue to support reductions in deficit spending and establishment of sensible priorities in less essential areas.

PRAYER

Judging from the mail I get, the Supreme Court refusal to allow prayer in public schools is still a live issue. I introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution so nothing contained therein can be interpreted as denying persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part by public funds, the right to participate in interdenominational prayer.

The House daily opens with prayer, and when we salute the flag we always say, "One Nation, under God . . ." Following the denial of prayer to our school children, will these other things also be taken from us?

FOREIGN AID

Foreign Aid is now 22 years old and has cost American taxpayers more than \$170 billion since its inception. The House has been presented with a bill which authorizes another \$2.8 billion requested by the Administration.

Last year this measure was authorized by only 8 votes, and this year the same old tired ideas were again presented to Congress, which even their most vocal advocates admit have not accomplished the goals set for the program.

With the expenditure of \$170 billion, we find our Allies refusing to help us in Vietnam, our embassies stoned, and our flag burned. We should know by now that friendship cannot be bought.

Farmers and ranchers have not been given sufficient voice in our Nation's AID program. In several countries only 25 percent of our assistance funds have gone into agriculture programs to help the people feed themselves. The world population will double in the next 25 years. This will require vast amounts of food. Our "agri-businessmen" and our land-grant colleges could provide the necessary research, and our technicians could provide the know-how to conquer these problems much better than a favored foreign administration which pockets the direct grants and loans of money from the American taxpayer.

WATER

The Mountain Park Dam project near Snyder was approved July 15 by the U.S. House of Representatives. This vital \$21 Million project will bring water to Altus Air Force Base, Altus and Snyder, plus irrigation water to farmers during the interim. The Waurika Dam project was approved as one of the four new starts across the country, and received \$855,000 for land acquisition. The Optima Dam project in the Panhandle was funded for \$2.5 million for continued construction.

MILITARY PROGRESS

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I helped guide through the Congress funds in the amount of \$5.8 million for military construction in Oklahoma. Altus Air Force Base is slated to receive the giant C-5A transport which flew for the first time recently. Sixteen of these planes will be stationed at Altus. Besides these training crews an additional 400 men will be added, making a total of 4,600. Tinker Air Force Base received a boost with new contracts that will

require 1,200 additional employees. I am glad my position on this key committee helps the economy and well-being of all of our district citizens.

VETERANS PROGRESS

The 90th Congress is notable in the area of veterans benefits. I voted for many newly-enacted laws affecting veterans. These included liberalizing pension programs for veterans and the survivors of deceased war veterans; increased compensation to the service-connected disabled; and increased educational benefits to widows and the wives of disabled veterans, and returning veterans. I was deeply honored recently when Herald E. Stringer, National Legislative Director of the American Legion, presented me a "Citation for Meritorious Service" to our Oklahoma veterans. Veterans groups have been very helpful to me in Congress.

SERVICE

As your representative in Washington, I am here to serve you. I welcome your letters and your opinions. When I may be of service to you, please write me at 1632 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, or contact my offices at 319 Federal Building, Chickasha or Room 2, 601 "D" Street, Lawton.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. SMITH.

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest gaps of knowledge and understanding in our country is with regard to the Soviet Union, its nature, composition, and purpose. From the highest levels of our Government to the public at large some of the most incredible myths about this empire are entertained and perpetuated to our distinct disadvantage.

The book on "The Vulnerable Russians" explodes these myths and shows the course open to us in meeting successfully the numerous Soviet Russian challenges. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

The work has been receiving many favorable reviews. The renowned columnist of the Chicago Tribune, Mr. Walter Trohan, sees it as presenting an "unusual and startling insight into Russian imperio-colonialism." For the benefit of those who have not yet read the book, I commend Trohan's full review:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune Jan. 24, 1968]

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON—SCHOLAR LOOKS AT RUSSIA AND FINDS IT VULNERABLE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—An unusual and startling insight into Russian imperio-colonialism is presented in "The Vulnerable Russians," [Pageant, \$5.95] by Dr. E. Dobriansky, Georgetown university and originator of Captive Nations Week.

It is his contention that 112 million Russians are holding 123 millions of other peoples in captivity of psychopolitical warfare. He lists among the captives not only the nations taken into the communist orbit after World War II, but such segments of

the old czarist empire as the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Cossackia, North Caucasia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and the Far East republic.

Dobriansky holds that Russia is not a union in the sense our 50 states are, but an amalgam of peoples held together by deceit, lies, subversive propaganda, and fear. If the central communist apparatus were to fall, the union would divide into various historical entities, altho these units have not been independent for centuries.

The growth of the Russian empire in its first 50 years has been one of the most remarkable phenomena of our time. From Moscow to the Danube, and Cuba in the west, and from Moscow to China in the east within 50 years is astounding because 50 years are but the wink of an eye in history.

Of course, the Communists did not come to power in Russia thru revolution, as they claim, because they seized power after the revolution of Alexander Kerensky. Nor did they build their empire by conversion to communism or love of communism, but by fear.

DEMOCRACIES CONTRIBUTE TO SUCCESS

Along the route they were helped by those who should have opposed them in the most, anti-communist nations including the United States, Karl Marx recognized the genius of the Russians in using others for the advancement of Russian aims. Marx wrote:

"The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing."

Dobriansky blames Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt for much of the rise of the Russian empire. He blames Wilson for failing to apply the principle of national self-determination to the many subjugated non-Russian nations, like the Ukraine in the Russian empire he blames F. D. R. for diplomatic recognition of Russia, for economic contributions, and for naive trust of the Russian word at Yalta and Tehran.

The United States, he finds, has allowed itself to be fooled and used by the Russian leaders with the result that it has been losing ground every day. He insists that the United States should fight in the cold war with the same weapons the Russians are using, psychopolitical tactics.

HOW TACTICS CAN BOOMERANG

Dobriansky launches into a point by point discussion of the ways Russian expansion can be halted by using their own tactics against the Russians.

"It is only a question of time before further cumulation of evidence in rationalized failure, compromise, and no-win psychosis will move sufficient minds to adopt this realistic policy," Dobriansky concludes.

He knows the weak spots and would have the United States work on those weak spots to eliminate this world's major tensions, threat, dangers and fears, which are posed by Russian imperio-colonialism.

THE ADMINISTRATION GUN CONTROL BILL SHOULD BE DEFEATED

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 9, I testified before the Rules Committee in opposition to H.R. 17735, the administration firearms control act. I feel strongly that passage of this bill is not in the best interests of

the country as a whole, and urge that it be defeated. My statement before Rules carries in detail my reasons for opposing this measure. I take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of all of my colleagues:

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

(Statement of Congressman LAURENCE J. BURTON of Utah before the House Rules Committee of the House of Representatives on H.R. 17735, July 8, 1968)

I am honored to present to this Committee of the House of Representatives my views on firearms legislation, a subject with which the people of Utah are very much concerned. Parenthetically, I might note here that I receive a great deal of correspondence on this subject—as much as on any other subject with which the 90th Congress has been concerned—and that almost without exception the letters are thoughtful, well-considered expressions of individual opinion. Their general tone is one of dissatisfaction with part or all of the Administration proposals. In most cases their points are well taken. I, too, have serious reservations about parts of the bill.

In the State of Utah, as in all western states, the tradition of gun ownership and use is strong. Utah's population is now estimated to be slightly in excess of one million, and in 1965 its residents purchased almost 197,000 licenses for hunting. I am proud to point out that about 7,000 of these licenses were purchased by juveniles between the ages of 14 and 16, with the approval of their parents. In my opinion, this is a healthy sign, since the delinquency rate among juveniles who hunt and fish has been shown to be well below the national average.

Not all guns in Utah are used for hunting. We have a great number of target shooters who use smallbore and high power rifles and shotguns in their sports. I suspect that some firearms are purchased solely for some defense, a use I believe to be entirely proper. In a survey conducted by the Utah Department of Fish and Game it was determined the average number of firearms per household in our state is slightly in excess of four. Too, we have a certain amount of "seasonal importation" of firearms into Utah—in 1965 we sold about 38,000 non-resident hunting licenses. Revenues to the Department from these sales exceeded \$900,000. The additional money those individuals spent for goods and service while hunting in Utah is of great significance to our retail merchants.

This last may seem to you to be beside the point insofar as your deliberations here are concerned. I think it is very much to the point. In writing firearms legislation we must be careful that, in our zeal to prohibit "interstate shipment" of certain classes of firearms to certain classes of people, we do not unwittingly place prohibition or undue impediments in the way of law-abiding citizens who wish only to purchase sporting firearms by mail or to transport firearms—in violation of no state law—across a state line.

This brings me to my first point, the prohibition of mail-order sales to individuals who do not live in the same state as the dealer. I assume this is meant to prevent sales to individuals who are barred from such purchase under the laws of the state in which they reside; or that it is intended to make easier the enforcement of existing Federal Law.

Regardless of the purpose intended it has the effect of denying the would-be-purchaser his choice of dealers and, in many cases, limits his choice of models of firearms. It is easy to say that he can order through a local dealer, but not quite as easy of accomplishment if the arm he chooses is limited in quantity or if it happens to be one which

July 15, 1968

dealer profit is low (as is the case with many special target arms for example). The bill apparently does not provide for the individual who wishes to send a firearm to an out-of-state gunsmith for work or repair, for example, to a custom stockmaker or a gunsmith who specializes in accuracy work on target arms. Under this bill, the dealer may ship to the individual, but how does the individual get it to the dealer? You may say he can send it through a licensed dealer, but this is not always possible. Gunsmiths of this type would have to increase their charges if another dealer's profit is to be accommodated. The result, increased cost to the gun owner and needless complications. Surely a better way can be found to deal with this particular part of the firearms problem.

I share with you a desire to keep non-sporting weapons of destruction such as bazookas, flame-throwers and explosive devices, anti-tank guns, and machine guns, out of the hands of the private citizen. In my opinion the relatively unrestricted traffic in such weapons has been reprehensible. I believe most responsible gun owners would join with me in censuring the shabby, profit-without-conscience motives of those engaged in this business. Too, I believe they would agree that we need tighter controls on importation of "junk handguns" and surplus foreign military arms that are not adaptable for sporting use.

The proponents of firearms legislation have said much about accidents with firearms and have quoted fearsome statistics. Their opponents have shown, with equally fearsome statistics, that many other facets of our life today are more dangerous. There is much to be said on either side, but I do not propose to enter into this kind of discussion. Firearms safety is a problem, and we in Utah have faced it head-on. Rather than to make our rallying cry the right to own firearms, we have concentrated on the concomitant responsibility to use them safely, and we have focused our efforts where they will do the most good—on our young people.

The Utah Department of Fish and Game started a Hunter Safety Program in 1956. That year, with 165,000 hunters in the field, we had 128 gun accidents, 79% of which were caused by juveniles. Almost every year since 1956 we have had an increase over the previous year in numbers of hunters afield, a decrease from the previous year in gun accidents, and a decrease in the part of those accidents that was caused by juveniles. In 1966, ten years later, with 231,000 hunters afield, there were 19 gun accidents, 16% of which were caused by juveniles. Attached to this statement is a compilation of these statistics for the period 1956 through 1966. The Hunter Safety courses were conducted with the aid of Junior rifle clubs and were broadcast over an educational television station. The National Rifle Association was a cooperator in this endeavor and a most welcome one.

To my mind this is an example of spectacular success, spectacular enough perhaps to make one think Federal help should be provided for such a program. I am being facetious, of course. This program is being financed by the gun-owning public now and I have every reason to believe the gun-owning public will continue to recognize and to discharge its private responsibility for firearms safety.

In 1963 and 1964, the number of home firearms accidents in Utah which involved children (included in the above compilation) increased significantly. At once the Department of Fish and Game, again in cooperation with the National Rifle Association and station KUED (the educational television station of the University of Utah), set out to do something about the problem through a series of televised "Home Firearms Safety Programs." These six programs were the first of their kind in the Nation and the response was most gratifying. I can highly recommend

it to others as one of the logical alternatives to restrictive, "blanket", firearms legislation.

Unfortunately, there is an all-pervading idea that the mere ownership or possession of firearms in some manner causes crime. It is an injustice to the millions of decent, law-abiding citizens who own and use sporting firearms. We in Utah probably have as many firearms per person as any state, yet our crime rate is lower than most. I see no practical values in attempting to prove this with statistics, although the statistics are available. Rather, I would prefer to discuss the ideas and purposes which are involved.

It seems to me that the use of a firearm is *only one* way in which a criminal can assert power over other citizens who are unarmed or otherwise unprotected. The easy availability of a weapon is undoubtedly a factor in crimes of impulse, but every household contains weapons that can be used if firearms are not available. To single out one type of weapon as a cause of crime is oversimplification of an extremely complex problem, and is no more accurate than viewing the bookkeeper's pen as the cause of an embezzlement.

We Americans are prone to react violently when we are shocked into it. The rash of anti-gun sentiment and legislation with which the Congress has been besieged ever since the brutal assassinations of President Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Senator Robert Kennedy, is but one example of this tendency. Another example is the equally ill-considered reaction of some against any form of firearms control. Obviously, the public needs to be protected from violence with firearms at the hands of the criminal, the insane, and the stupid. Yet we should not permit such protection to negate the rights of those who would use firearms in a lawful manner for their own protection and enjoyment. The proponents of either point of view could go too far.

I do not believe the Second Amendment to the Constitution can be considered to hold the individual free from *any* limitation on his right to keep and bear arms. Neither do I believe the ownership or possession of a sporting firearm—and I include handguns in this category—is necessarily bad.

Although I cannot support the proposed legislation, I would support regulation of destructive weapons such as bazookas, flame throwers, anti-tank guns, explosive devices, etc. I would support legislation aimed at parental control of, and responsibility for, both ownership and use of firearms by juveniles; I would support the regulation of the carrying of concealed handguns; I would support the regulation of both use and ownership of firearms by irresponsible persons; and I would support legislation providing severe penalties for the use of *any* dangerous weapon in commission of a crime. These, I think, are all constructive approaches to our crime problems.

Too often in the past, however, the rules and regulations issued for administration of a law have gone far beyond the intent of Congress when it considered the bill and passed it. For this reason, I also believe any Federal legislation giving regulating authority in any of these areas to a branch of the Federal Government should also provide specifically for periodic Congressional review to assure that objectives of the legislation are not exceeded.

INDIA

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, evidence is coming in that American aid to Indian

agriculture will be successful. Already, we have received optimistic, but credible, reports that Pakistan in the next 3 and India in the next 5 years will be self-sufficient in food grain production. Given the enormous problems of these countries, these reports are a remarkable tribute to the quality and persistence of the Indian—and the American efforts.

One such encouraging sign appeared in a Washington Post article this week. It bears out the observation of myself and several other Members of this body who have investigated our food grain programs in India and Pakistan.

Under unanimous consent I include the Post article in the RECORD at this point:

INDIA'S PILOT DISTRICT GROWING HUGE WHEAT CROP

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

LUDHIANA, INDIA.—Jagjit Singh Hara is a husky and handsome six-foot Sikh who runs his father's 100-acre farm a few miles from here. He has just harvested a wheat crop that averaged 65 bushels an acre—nearly 2½ times the yield in the United States.

He has cleared a profit of 65,000 rupees (about \$8700) and is using the money to replace one of his two tractors, to add several rooms to his comfortable brick and plaster house, to buy some more big dolls for his baby daughter and to put his younger brother through a mechanical engineering course at Manchester University in Britain.

The Haras, whose rooms are cooled in the humid Punjab heat by electric ceiling fans, who ride to town in their little Fiat or one of their two motor scooters, and who listen to pop music on their big radio-phonograph, have come a long way since they fled from Pakistan in 1951.

GIVEN 20 ACRES

The Haras were given 20 acres of unpromising sandy soil vacated by Moslems fleeing in the other direction and the family slept behind sheets hung from the big tree in what is now their garden.

Today, four tubewells with electrically driven pumps irrigate their land. Experts from nearby Punjab Agricultural University work with 30-year-old Jagjit to determine the best mix of chemical fertilizer and to experiment with high-yielding seeds.

Bakshi Ravinder Mohan is the Massey-Ferguson Tractor dealer in Ludhiana, the bustling, slovenly city that is the center of a farming district with one million persons. When he first came here six years ago, he sold just 15 tractors, traveling from village to village. Last year, he sold 130 and his waiting list today numbers an astonishing 1200.

"I don't get to the villages anymore," he says happily. "They come to me. They have gone crazy with money here. Farmers pay me the equivalent of \$2900 for a tractor—and about one-third of them don't even borrow to raise this. Some of them resell the machine for 50 percent more."

NOW A BREADBASKET

Hara and Bakshi epitomize the astonishing transformation that has taken place in the Ludhiana district and, indeed, through the northwest Indian State of Punjab in which it lies. High-yielding wheat seeds from Mexico, a high-yield millet developed at the local university, hybrid corn, fertilizer, water and hard work have turned this region into a prosperous breadbasket that hints at what impoverished India might someday become.

The statistics almost surpass belief. In 1961, just before Ludhiana was selected as a pilot district for farm development, the region produced 170,000 tons of wheat. Last year, while much of India suffered from

drought, Ludhiana harvested 400,000 tons. This year, the crop is estimated at 540,000 tons, a gain of more than 200 percent in seven years.

The rest of the Punjab has been quick to follow. Sardara Singh Johl, the bearded and turbaned head of the Agricultural University's economics department, estimates that the state's entire wheat harvest skyrocketed 40 percent this year to 3.8 million tons. He calculates there will be another one-million-ton gain next year.

So much of the Punjab now has a sure supply of water for irrigation that even a lack of rain should not disturb his forecast very much.

UNEXPECTED OUTPOURING

State and central-government officials themselves did not believe the outpouring from the Punjab and its neighbors would be so great. A few weeks ago, grain in 220-pound bags was lying stacked four layers deep, covering every inch of the huge open market at Khanna, 25 miles east of here. India's peppery press and energetic Punjabi administrators cried that a scandal was brewing, that the wheat would be ruined by monsoon rains. Luckily, the rains have been late and the national railway dug up the needed freight cars. Now the Punjabi wheat has been cleared away, although there are reports of damage to the bumper crop in Haryana and Uttar Pradesh next door.

Big landowners have, of course, profited most from Ludhiana's farming revolution, but it has not been confined to them. Nandpur, for example, is a nondescript village of 500 families, each of whom typically owns five acres and leases five more.

This year, Nandpur's farmers sowed almost all their acreage in high-yielding wheat for the first time and paid off a good share of their debts. Some bought transistor radios, some bought bicycles and several earned enough for portable electric fans to cool their cramped but solid brick warrens.

Even the miserable landless are gaining. At harvest time last year, casual laborers were paid about 90 cents a day; this year, they got about \$1.60 and were hard to find. Many had deserted the fields for the machine and repair shops and small factories mushrooming in Ludhiana City. As low as these rates may be, they are handsome compared to the 53 cents a day that is standard elsewhere in India.

MATERIAL DESIRES

The Punjab's sudden prosperity has sharpened appetites for material goods, close observers of the state's habits agree. Farmers no longer serve visitors tea in glasses but in china cups like city folks. Ludhiana City is a dusty, difficult perpetual jam of tractors, motorbikes and bicycles. Sales of the potent and legal country liquor have jumped 50 per cent this year in Ludhiana district.

Much of the money is going back into the farms. The number of tubewells sunk this year in Ludhiana rose 10 per cent and there is now one for every four of the district's 45,000 farming families. Professor Johl of the Agricultural University predicts that the traditional Persian well, a wheel with buckets rotated by a camel or bullock, will be extinct in two years. Mechanical threshers are replacing the heavy tread of bullocks.

A properly run farm in these parts now nets up to 1000 rupees an acre, about \$130, and this has given the farmer a new status.

Prakash Chand Bahl is the district collector or principal state official in Ludhiana. Like most college-educated Indians, he sought the prestige of a government job and his forebearers have been public officials for three generations.

But, he tells a visitor, he is trying to persuade his son, a student at Illinois University, to come to the Punjab and farm. "That's where the future lies," he says emphatically.

OFFICERS OPPOSE GUN REGISTRATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Marietta Daily Journal, a newspaper published at Marietta, Ga., carried an article in its June 28, 1968, issue pointing out that area police officers were opposed to proposed gun registration legislation. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this excellent article, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

COBB POLICE COMMENT: OFFICERS OPPOSE GUN REGISTRATION

(By Lynda Barron)

A check with Cobb lawmen this week revealed almost unanimous opposition to the controversial proposed gun registration legislation.

While most law enforcement officers are acutely aware of the increase in violence, they argued—almost to a man—that the registration measures are not the answer. They do generally favor some gun control proposals, including a ban on mail order sales.

"I think it's going to turn gun sales into a black market, just like in the days of prohibition, and then we will have problems," Cobb Patrolman George Hansen said. "I am in favor of a waiting period for gun-buyers," Hansen added.

Cobb Police Lt. Bill Reid, who also opposes the legislation, said, "It's not going to affect anyone but honest people. Crooks will continue to break into stores, just like they do now, and steal their weapons. They certainly won't commit crimes with guns registered to them."

"New York has very strict gun control laws, and it has one of the highest crime rates in the country," Lt. Reid added.

Chief investigator for the Cobb sheriff's Department, Jesse Cooper, said, "I don't think it's worth the paper it would take to write it." He echoed Reid's feeling about criminals stealing their weapons, adding, "The bill proposed by the President will take the guns away from law-abiding persons who need to protect their homes and property."

Cooper said he had discussed the proposed legislation with his men and they all agreed with him. "Everyone I have talked to is opposed to disarming the public the way they're trying to do it," he said.

Cobb Patrolman Troy Smith pointed out the availability of compressed air rifles and pistols. "You don't even have to have a permit to carry one of those, and it wouldn't have to be registered, but it'll kill a man just as dead as this one," Smith said, with his hand on his service revolver.

"I can make a gun that'll kill a man in 15 minutes time," was the comment of Cobb Patrolman James Wright. He said the necessary "ingredients" for a gun are not hard to obtain, and building a "zip gun" is relatively simple.

Capt. H. P. Craft, of the Marietta police department, said he does not feel the proposed gun-control will do any good. "The ones we want to register them won't," he said. "I think if a man sells a gun, he should check the buyer out and see that he has a permit for a gun. I think the seller should keep a record of the serial numbers," he added.

I have mixed feelings about what I've heard," Cobb Police Chief E. H. Burruss said. "However, I don't think the proposed legislation is the answer to the problem."

"I do think we need a waiting period on the sale of these little inexpensive hand guns and I think parents should have to sign for a minor to own a gun," Burruss said. He added that gun registration would be helpful in the recovery of stolen guns.

Most of those questioned agreed with Capt. Walter Cates of the Cobb Police Department, who stated, "I don't think teenagers should own guns."

Patrolman Hansen added that a good preventative for gun accidents would be to teach children about guns and impress them with the danger of deadly weapons.

Gun sales through the mail was also in disfavor with law enforcement officers.

Cobb Patrolman G. W. Houze commented, "There've been guns ever since I've been in this world and they're not going to pass a law against them now. It'll all backfire."

NEEDED: A NATIONAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, publication of the report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders has awakened many in the private sector to their responsibility for initiating programs to help ease the burdens of ghetto life. It is indeed a tribute to the imagination and spirit of those participating in such programs that notable progress along these lines has been achieved. In marked contrast to the spirit and dedication which have inspired private enterprise to face up to its responsibility is the persistence of the fire and liability insurance companies in conducting their business in such a way as to frustrate both private and public efforts to bring light and hope into our ghetto areas.

Just within the past few days insurance was canceled covering the public school system in Paterson, N.J. In Missouri, \$52 million coverage on public housing was canceled. Policies are being daily canceled in Trenton, N.J., in Detroit, Mich., in Illinois, in the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant sections of New York City. What is remarkable about these widespread and wholesale insurance cancellations is that State insurance departments confess that they are helpless to stem the tide.

The problem of insurance cancellation is not a new one in the ghetto scene. Three years ago, as the senior member of the New York State Assembly Committee on Mortgages and Real Estate, I urged the enactment of an assigned risk plan for fire insurance and for liability insurance. In testimony at public hearings held by the New York State Insurance Department on September 12, 1966, I warned that:

The failure of these companies to write such insurance and their cancellation of existing policies, subject homeowners to the full risk of fire loss, expose those who enter upon such premises to the full risk of damage or injury because of possible disrepair of such properties, prevents such homeowners from making urgently needed repairs because of the inability to obtain mortgage financing in the absence of fire and liability insurance.

July 15, 1968

The litany of evils attendant upon the refusal to write insurance and the cancellation of insurance can be elaborated upon without end. Much of this is elaborated upon in the excellent report filed by the President's Commission on this subject, under the chairmanship of Gov. Richard J. Hughes, the Governor of New Jersey. Based upon my own experience and studies of these problems in the State of New York, I know* that these evils impinge upon every facet of the ghetto life and economy.

The simple truth is that for all practical purposes insurance of all types is not available to ghetto residents at fair and standard rates. As a consequence, ghetto residents, landowners, and businessmen are compelled to take out insurance from excess line companies, at five and six times normal rates. Abrupt cancellation of policies, without specific reason, has become a standard practice, a practice which in many cases results in mortgage foreclosures and loss of life's savings.

Insurance practices have a devastating impact in the ghetto, in relation to living costs, employment, and business opportunity. The high cost of fire and liability insurance, of burglary and plateglass insurance reflects itself in higher ghetto rents, food costs, and costs of the commodities. If such insurance is not obtainable, mortgages are foreclosed, building rehabilitation and modernization becomes impossible, businesses close, and jobs go down the drain.

A few statistics will illustrate during the past 5 years membership in the Associated Grocers of Harlem declined from 140 groceries employing 850 persons, mostly Negroes, to 90 establishments employing 400 persons, a loss of 450 jobs and 50 business enterprises.

Equally significant is the refusal of the insurance companies to write surety and fidelity insurance in behalf of ghetto residents. For example, countless Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and others trained in truckdriving under the auspices of the Port of New York Authority and the Manpower Training Institute in New York City, as well as in other trades, find that they are unable to secure employment in the trades for which they have been trained because of the refusal of bonding companies to provide necessary surety and fidelity bonds. Thus the investment of thousands upon thousands of private and public funds in the war against poverty is frustrated by the intransigence of the insurance companies in refusing to issue such bonds.

The significance of this problem was highlighted last year when a score of elected Negro officials elected in the State of Mississippi feared that they would not be able to assume the office to which they were elected because of difficulties they encountered in obtaining surety bonds. The fact that such bonds were finally made available at the last moment simply demonstrates that the insurance companies responded to the one thing they detest more than doing business with Negroes and Puerto Ricans—national regulation of the insurance business.

While less dramatic, a score of trained

truckdrivers, unable to secure employment because of discriminatory practices of the insurance companies are equally deprived of both their civil rights and their opportunity to earn a decent living for themselves and their families.

As the insurance companies have red circled slum areas out of community redevelopment, so have they red circled Negroes and Puerto Ricans out of economic redevelopment.

Thus the insurance companies frustrate the war against poverty and other social programs designed to improve living conditions in the ghetto. The insurance companies will create new slums at a rate faster than they can be cleared through the model cities program. Through their control over liability insurance, these companies determine who shall own an automobile and who shall be employed in those areas of work where automobile ownership is a necessary incident to employment.

What is particularly tragic about the immediate spurge in insurance cancellation is that the ghettos are being made scapegoats for losses incurred by the carriers in other areas. Huge losses were incurred by the carriers as a result of Hurricane Betsy and as a result of other natural phenomena. Huge losses were incurred by them because of the break-up of the *Torrey Canyon* and other huge oil tankers, the McCormack Place fire in Chicago and other disasters. Contrasted to these and similar losses, those incurred through riots are penny ante stuff.

Mr. Speaker, what is urgently needed is a Federal program of insurance controls. Insurance is so deeply affected with a public interest, that it is the height of folly to permit them to exert such untrammelled control over the lives and well-being of our people, particularly when the evidence persuasively demonstrates that State insurance departments are either unable or unwilling to exercise essential controls. I urge that appropriate congressional committees explore the prospect of enacting a comprehensive Federal insurance program, to protect the people of our Nation from the power of the insurance companies.

CITY DOCTOR WRITES PAGE IN HISTORY

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, as long as there are new worlds to explore, men of courage and an adventurous spirit will find them. Such a man is Dr. Weston Cook, a constituent and close personal friend of mine from Columbia, S.C.

This spring, Dr. Cook joined a group of three other men on a journey to the North Pole. It was the first expedition to the pole by land travel since 1909, the year of the famous Perry exploration.

Just recently Dr. Cook described this unique and fascinating journey to members of the Columbia Rotary Club. As a part of my remarks I include a news-

paper account of his talk before the Rotary as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record,
July 9, 1968]

CITY DOCTOR WRITES PAGE IN HISTORY

(By Margaret Nicley)

The South Carolina flag, which flies here in temperatures often near the 100 mark, also waves above the North Pole, blown by gusts as cold as 68 degrees below zero.

It was planted there in April by Dr. Weston Cook, a Columbia physician who was a member of the first expedition to reach the pole by land conveyance since Adm. Robert E. Perry in 1909. Cook described the experience to Columbia Rotarians Monday as "a feeling of pride at being part of an expedition which would write some small page in the colorful history of the North."

He was both doctor and radio man for the Plaisted Polar Expedition party, which reached "North 90" April 19 after 44 days on ice and a blustery journey of 474 miles from a base camp at Ward Hunt. The banners he left behind were those of the Palmetto State, the Confederacy and the Columbia Sailing Club, though the geographic pole is far from the sun-drenched South and no smooth sailing distance, even by modern snowmobiles and Ski-Doos. (The Perry expedition half a century ago had to travel by dogsled.)

Cook used graphic slides to illustrate his first public description of the trek.

The Columbia doctor said the four men who finally reached the North Pole were eager that theirs be the first expedition officially confirmed as having reached the pole, but faulty navigation by the U.S. Air Force almost dashed their hopes. The Air Force had agreed to fly over the group and verify that the pole had been attained, but first indicated that they had traveled too far across the polar ice cap and bypassed the specific geographic point they were seeking.

Cook said the party navigator had enough faith in his own calculations to maintain their accuracy, and the Air Force had to apologize the following day. "Maybe you'd better tell us where we are," the military navigator said.

At Cape Columbia, the Plaisted party found a coffee pot buried by Perry's team with a message indicating their attempts to locate the pole. Perry had started his exploration from Cape Columbia. Cook said the party added a second message of their own and headed home.

They had spent more than a month traveling across the Arctic ice, which Cook said is bluer than the vast expanse of white most people imagine despite their modern equipment, a great deal of their time on the trip was spent in "highway construction" because of deep depressions in the ice that were unnavigable and night winds that shifted the snows around their camp, he said.

He described the terrain as "barren, made up of rocks, snow and ice," but surprisingly dry. The annual precipitation around the North Pole is only 2 inches, compared to 3 in the Sahara Desert.

The men lived in canvas huts heated with fuel oil stoves. Cook said the upper parts of the tents were comfortable, but anything placed on the floor would freeze. They had 24 hours of sunlight a day during part of the trip and had to wear goggles to prevent snow blindness from the glare. However, nothing they wore could prevent their beards from freezing, and most of the pictures Cook showed revealed as many weird ice formations on the men's faces as on the land around them.

Cook said they saw very little animal life—only one bird at the North Pole itself—although Arctic hares, foxes and musk oxen manage to survive in the area. After the party reached their destination, the doctor took time out for hunting and bagged

a polar bear, but the feat required riding 190 miles by sled, which he described as "an instrument of torture."

The successful expedition was the second attempt to reach the pole by Ralph Plaisted, a St. Paul, Minn., insurance man.

Cook joined the group after hearing about it through the Medical Amateur Radio Council, which advertised for a combination physician and radio operator for the party.

So the 52-year-old grandfather set out to write his "small page of history," and became one of the second group of men ever to reach the North Pole. No human being had seen it for 59 years except from the air or from under the ice from a nuclear-powered submarine.

RESOLUTION ON LAW AND ORDER

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a resolution on law and order, approved by the Association of Oilwell Servicing Contractors. This resolution reflects the views and concern of millions of Americans.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON LAW AND ORDER IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas, we have watched with mounting concern the utter disregard of the law and order which is a vital part of the free enterprise system of this country, and have been appalled at the lack of support for law enforcement as regards the protection of the property rights of the individual citizen and,

Whereas, this defiance of the authority of the properly-constituted police power of the various cities and states has led to the loss of hundreds of lives of innocent men, women and children, and to the destruction of millions of dollars worth of private and publicly-owned property and,

Whereas, under no guise of deprivation and poverty can the continued use of violence and force be justified or tolerated and,

Whereas, the continued use of violence, looting and unlawfulness is leading inevitably to the destruction of our democracy,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that we, members of the Association of Oilwell Servicing Contractors through its Board of Directors and Officers here assembled in San Antonio, Texas, on this 14th day of June, 1968, with deepest concern for the preservation of our democracy, deplore these acts of violence and this wave of lawlessness; and urge:

- (1) That law enforcement agencies, local, state, and national, take whatever steps are necessary to insure the safety of citizens, our homes, our businesses, and all public properties, and
 - (2) That the 90th Congress, now meeting in its Second Session, with all deliberate speed pass such legislation as will be needed to support effective law enforcement, and
 - (3) That Congress take immediate steps to restore those safeguards to effective law enforcement which the Judiciary has curtailed or eliminated to the detriment of the rights of law-abiding citizens, and
 - (4) That the news media, press, radio, and television immediately adopt standards of quality and restraint in reporting news incidents in an inflammatory manner, and
- That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson and appropri-

ate members of Congress and appropriate state officials and the members of this association represented hereby.

ASSOCIATION OF OILWELL
SERVICING CONTRACTORS,
LAMAR DEUBREE,
Executive Vice President.

BIG CUTBACK IN MAIL SERVICE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the impact that an arbitrary cutback in postal employment would have on mail delivery and other essential postal services is outlined in an excellent article in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. As the magazine points out, mail is pouring into post offices across the Nation in unprecedented amounts, and yet Postmaster General Watson is being forced to cut employment. Under unanimous consent I insert the U.S. News article in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Drastic cuts in U.S. mail service are being threatened by postal officials because of Government-wide economies ordered by Congress.

All types of mail—first-class letters, magazines, advertising matter and parcel post—may be delayed if service cutbacks have to be made.

With the postal system already "in a race with catastrophe," postal officials say, curtailments would increase the danger of mail logjams on a national basis.

ACTION TAKEN

Already, Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson has ordered a freeze on post-office employment, despite a mail load that is nearing 85 billion pieces a year. Also ordered:

Effective July 27 two steps—a cut in mail collections on Saturdays to Sunday schedules, and a closing of all window service at first and second-class offices on Saturdays and Sundays, except for a period of two hours.

Effective at once—no extension of delivery services to new communities, a speedup in closing many fourth-class offices, and delay in handling second, third and fourth-class mail, if it interferes with first-class mail.

Other curtailments may come in the months ahead unless the Post Office Department is exempted from a personnel-cutting provision in the recently enacted law raising income taxes.

WHAT'S AHEAD

At closed hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee on July 10 and 11, Mr. Watson is reported to have said the country may face:

Elimination of home deliveries on Saturdays, perhaps by October.

A cutback in parcel-post deliveries from six days a week to five.

The tax law's personnel provision requires the executive branch of the Government to fill no more than three out of every four vacancies until employment is reduced to the level of June 30, 1966.

Instead of adding 20,000 employees in this fiscal year, as the Post Office had hoped to do, it is estimated that 15,000 jobs may have to be eliminated.

About 80 per cent of the Department's budget goes into salaries, so economies based

on job reductions hit the Post Office especially hard at a time when mail volume is soaring and the Post Office has no control of the work load being created.

EXEMPTION FROM CUTS?

Sentiment built up to exempt the Post Office Department from the employment curb. But fears were expressed that this might open the door to exemptions for many other agencies.

"It'll be the most ridiculous pennywise, pound-foolish action we've ever taken if we don't exempt them," said Representative Tom Steed, (Dem.), of Oklahoma. Another Congressman said, however, he would favor repealing the whole tax law and economy provision rather than exempt one agency.

Some members of Congress were inclined to think the Postmaster General was being "alarmist." Other said the Budget Bureau could exempt the Post Office from the economy order without action by Congress.

Others recalled that Congress thought Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield was bluffing in 1957 when he threatened curtailments unless he got an extra 47 million dollars in funds.

Mr. Summerfield proceeded to halt Saturday deliveries, closed post offices on that day and made other cutbacks.

Congress yielded within three days, giving Mr. Summerfield 41 million dollars to restore the services.

MARINE PRIVATE IS SOUTH VIETNAM CASUALTY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Carroll S. Dieudonne, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, July 11, 1968]

MARINE PRIVATE IS SOUTH VIETNAM CASUALTY

A Silver Spring (Md.) Marine private was killed by rifle fire July 5 in South Vietnam, the Pentagon said yesterday.

Pfc. Carroll S. Dieudonne, 21, had been in South Vietnam's northern Quang Tri province with the 3d Battalion of the 3d Marines since last December, his mother, Mrs. Erasmus L. Dieudonne, Jr., said.

Mrs. Dieudonne, of 501 Sherbrook drive, Silver Spring, said the Department of Defense reported that her son died of a head wound.

The young Marine was a 1965 graduate of Sherbrook High School in Silver Spring and attended Temple Business College before enlisting in March, 1967.

He trained at Farris Island, S.C., Camp Lejeune, N.C., and Camp Pendleton, Cal., before he was sent overseas last December, Mrs. Dieudonne said.

Mrs. Dieudonne said her son taught radar while in Vietnam and went on patrols from K company's camp near the Demilitarized Zone.

"He just went out on patrols with the rest of the boys," she said. "He seemed to think they were doing the right thing and we belonged over there."

Survivors, besides his mother and father, include four sisters, Mrs. Maurice Rose, Mrs. Robert Harper, and Mrs. William Fox, and Miss Christine Dieudonne, and a brother, Matthew Dieudonne.

**COINAGE COMMISSION CONSIDERS
CHANGE IN U.S. SILVER POLICY**

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the Coinage Commission is meeting today to consider changes in U.S. silver policy now that the period for silver certificate redemptions has passed and the transfer of 165 million fine troy ounces of silver to the national stockpile has been accomplished.

The effect of the decisions made by the Commission today will undoubtedly have an impact on the silver industry for some time to come.

Last week, I sent Secretary Fowler my personal recommendations on silver policy, and I include the text of my letter at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1968.

HON. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Chairman, Joint Commission on the Coinage,
Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOWLER: The fact that the transfer of government silver to the national stockpile was carried out in an orderly fashion—and entirely in .999 fine silver—is in no small measure attributable to the diligence of the Coinage Commission. You now face further decisions as to the disposition of the remaining silver, and it is in this connection that I would like now to offer my personal recommendations for the Commission's consideration Monday.

First, it seems to me that a re-evaluation of the stockpile requirements for silver should be made. In light of the increased industrial consumption that has occurred since the last evaluation, such a step appears mandatory.

Second, I hope the Commission will approve continued use of silver in the minting of 50-cent pieces in order to maintain some small relationship between our coinage system and precious metals.

Third, the Commission should provide for a retention of sufficient silver supplies to meet the future needs of the Government. It would seem the height of fiscal folly for the Treasury to divest itself of silver at today's lower prices only to repurchase it at some later time when the price has increased.

Fourth, since the certificate and stockpile problems have, for the most part, been resolved and since it is government policy to divest itself of surplus silver stocks, it seems to me most unfair to deny private citizens a corresponding right to market the silver which they hold in coins. In this connection, I wish to call to your attention a bill I introduced recently to legalize the melting of coins. This right, when granted, would reduce the potential acquisitions of silver and therefore the potential for sales of government-owned silver. There is no reason why the Treasury should continue to possess a silver monopoly.

All four of these steps point to the need for phasing out the sales of Treasury silver, and I think we must recognize the market disruptions that will occur if the phasing out period is not an orderly one. The alternative would mean feeding the fires of speculation. It has been suggested by many competent economists in the silver industry that the weekly offerings by the General Services Administration be reduced in quantity each month. An approach along those

lines would certainly have my personal approval.

I wish to thank the Commission for considering this statement and the recommendations I have made. The decisions you are about to make will have a profound effect for some time to come on both silver producers and silver users. It is a responsibility not to be taken lightly, or in haste.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. McCLURE,
Member of Congress.

**GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE AND THE
IMPORTANCE OF THE DECISION
IN THE MILLER CASE**

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the controversy currently surrounding the Supreme Court as a result of certain decisions in the field of criminal law, I would particularly call attention to the following statement of the Grievance Committee of the Illinois State Bar Association.

On February 13, 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court, in an opinion, stated that the prosecution had "deliberately misrepresented the truth," in contending that a pair of undershorts found a mile from a murder was stained with blood.

They stated the garment was stained with reddish-brown paint and freed the defendant. Because of the serious implications of these charges regarding the prosecutors, the Grievance Committee of the Illinois Bar, on its own motion, investigated to determine whether disciplinary action against the prosecutors was warranted.

I suppose it takes little imagination to see what effect this statement by the U.S. Supreme Court could have on the professional standing and careers of the prosecutors involved.

In the trial in 1956, the State chemist testified that there were blood stains on the shorts. Prior to the trial, the Illinois State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation gave a laboratory report disclosing that the shorts did contain blood.

Perhaps many prosecutors, like myself, would rely on a State chemist or bureau of criminal investigation report as to whether a substance was or was not blood, since the prosecutor may not be, and is not required to be, a chemist.

I hope everyone can take time to consider the statement of the Grievance Committee and the importance of the decision in the Miller case.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE OF THE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION IN THE MATTER OF THE PROSECUTION OF THE CASE OF PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS v. LLOYD ELDON MILLER, JR.

In 1956, Lloyd Eldon Miller, Jr. was tried and convicted in the Circuit Court of Hancock County, Illinois of the murder of an 8-year-old Canton, Illinois girl, Janice May. On February 13, 1967, the United States Supreme Court overturned the murder conviction on the ground that the prosecution had knowingly used false evidence to convict

him by introducing into evidence a pair of undershorts which it contended were stained with blood. The Court based its decision on testimony given seven years later at a habeas corpus hearing in the U.S. District Court in Chicago, to the effect that the only stains on the shorts were paint stains. In its opinion the Supreme Court said that the prosecution at the original trial had "deliberately misrepresented the truth" in regard to the shorts.

The prosecution was conducted by Blaine Ramsey, then State's Attorney of Fulton County, and Roger W. Hayes, as special assistant.

In view of the serious implications of such charges, the Grievance Committee of the Illinois State Bar Association, on its own motion, commenced an investigation in April of 1967 to determine whether disciplinary action against the prosecutors was warranted. The investigation extended over a period of approximately nine months. The voluminous records in the case included the transcripts of testimony at the original trial and before the Pardon and Parole Board and in the habeas corpus proceedings in the U.S. District Court. Also reviewed were the abstracts of record and the briefs in the several appeals to the Illinois Supreme Court, the U.S. Court of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court. These documents, all of which were minutely examined by the Committee, comprised some 3300 printed and typewritten pages. In addition, the Grievance Committee interrogated the attorneys who prosecuted and defended the case at the original trial, and in response to these questions received detailed answers concerning every area of possible misconduct on the part of the prosecutors.

It became apparent to the Committee early in its investigation that the United States Supreme Court had misapprehended the facts of the case. At the trial, which took place in 1956, the States chemist testified that there were bloodstains on the shorts in question. Prior to the trial, the prosecutors had been given a laboratory report from the Illinois State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation which disclosed that the shorts did, in fact, contain blood. The State chemist further testified at the trial that the blood on the shorts was type "A" which was the same type as that of the victim.

The Committee found no reason to doubt that there was blood on the shorts at the time of the trial and no reason to doubt that the prosecutors in the case believed there was blood on the shorts. Accordingly, the Committee found that there was no basis for the view of the United States Supreme Court that the prosecution had been guilty of a misrepresentation when it asserted as a fact that the shorts contained blood.

The Committee investigation further disclosed that, in addition to the blood, there was paint on the shorts. It is clear that the prosecution knew, or at least assumed, there was paint on the shorts as well as blood, and the prosecutors contend that the difference was apparent.

The question before the Grievance Committee, then, was not whether the prosecution misrepresented the fact that there was blood on the shorts, because clearly its statement to this effect was not a misrepresentation. Instead the question was, assuming the defense did not know of the paint, whether the prosecution was guilty of unethical conduct in failing to disclose its presence to the defense. The resolution of this question depended, in the judgment of the Grievance Committee, upon whether there was any reason to believe that the prosecution felt the facts concerning the paint would have been helpful to the defense and, knowing of its relevance, nonetheless concealed it. The Grievance Committee deter-

mined that the presence or absence of paint on the shorts was not a material question in the case. There was blood on the shorts. The theory of the prosecution was that Miller had discarded the shorts because of the incriminating bloodstains they bore. The presence of paint on the shorts was not inconsistent with this theory because the shorts were found in an area in which there were paint cans. The paint on the shorts might have had some tendency to corroborate Miller's confession that he had left them in that area.

The Committee concluded that the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court was based entirely upon a portion of the testimony which had been given at the habeas corpus hearing in the United States District Court at Chicago. The Supreme Court rejected the testimony given at the original trial eleven years earlier, and ignored the testimony of the State chemist who again testified at the habeas corpus proceedings that there was blood on the shorts.

At the time of the habeas corpus hearing, the defense offered an expert witness who testified that he had examined twelve threads from the shorts and had found that they contained paint, a carbon-like substance and an additional substance he was unable to identify. This chemist, engaged by the defense, admitted that he had made no conclusive tests for the presence of blood and that, indeed, he was not "permitted" to make such tests. He further added that in order to determine if blood were on the shorts, "it would require a more extensive test and would require having access to every part of the garment." The record shows, however, that the defense was given permission to send portions of the shorts to a chemist in New York City, one Dr. Leon Susman. Presumably, Dr. Susman made a test for blood, but the results of that test have never been disclosed. At the time of the original trial the prosecution was duty bound to present to the jury the results of the examination of the shorts by the Illinois State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

Although the sole basis for the Supreme Court opinion was the alleged misrepresentation concerning blood on the shorts, the Grievance Committee undertook to evaluate various other charges, since these additional charges, if true, could have provided a basis for disciplinary action against the prosecutors. The following comments relate to each of these additional issues.

One such issue which seemed to be of importance at the outset of the Committee's investigation was the question of whether the prosecutors had deliberately concealed from Miller the fact that his pubic hair did not match a hair found on a paper tissue used for a smear taken from the vagina of the child. The Committee concluded that there had been no concealment, deliberate or otherwise. Miller and his attorneys were acquainted with the fact that a microscopic comparison had been made between a pubic hair taken from Miller and another hair. At a hearing on the admissibility of Miller's confession, conducted during the trial out of the presence of the jury but in the presence of his attorneys, Miller testified that he had viewed the two hairs under the microscope and it was apparent to him that "Them hairs don't match. I says, them hairs don't belong to me." The facts concerning this comparison were not brought to the attention of the jury, either by the prosecution or the defense. It is not known for certain whether the hair on the paper tissue did, in fact, come from the vagina of the child. The hair could have gotten on the tissue in some other way, either before or after it was used to swab the child's vagina. Moreover, it is not known what kind of hair it was. There is no evidence that it was a pubic hair. If it was not, meaningful comparison was impossible because head hair and body hair are different from pubic hair.

Accordingly, the Committee concluded that the prosecution was under no duty to elaborate upon the dissimilarity of the hairs.

Another allegation made by Miller is that the prosecution suborned one Betty Baldwin to commit perjury against him. Betty Baldwin testified that Miller had admitted his guilt to her shortly after the crime. Some years later, she recanted this testimony and stated that one of the prosecutors had pressured her into testifying against Miller. It is not uncommon for witnesses to recant their testimony after a trial, and the problem that invariably arises in such cases is one of determining on which occasion, if at all, the witness told the truth. The question becomes one of the credibility of the witness. In this regard, the Committee noted that Betty Baldwin had also charged, shortly before the trial, that one of the defense attorneys had offered her \$10,000.00 to change her statement.

The final allegation against the prosecutors is that they improperly informed the defendant's landlady that she had a "constitutional" right to decline an interview with the defense attorneys. In a pardon hearing conducted seven years after the trial, there was testimony by several witnesses tending to establish an alibi for the defendant at the time of the crime. The Committee found no evidence that the prosecution had been guilty of any impropriety with regard to these witnesses. There is no evidence that the prosecutors did anything other than inform one witness—landlady—that she was not required to discuss the case with the defense. While the Committee believes that it was not technically accurate to inform the landlady that she had a "constitutional" right to refuse the interview with the defense, it is nonetheless true that, in a criminal case, the defense has no legal right to require a witness to submit to a pretrial interview. Moreover, the Grievance Committee felt that it was inconceivable that these "alibi" witnesses would not have come forward at the time of the trial if, in fact, they could have established the alibi later asserted. The crime was committed in a small town and was obviously a major topic of discussion at the time.

In view of the foregoing, the Committee determined that there was no basis for disciplinary action against the prosecutors and dismissed the charges.

Although, in cases where no disciplinary action is recommended, the rules of the Illinois Supreme Court prohibit disclosure by the Illinois State Bar Association of the contents of its records and files in grievance investigations without the consent of the respondents, it was determined that the considerable notoriety concerning this matter warranted an exception. We therefore sought and obtained the necessary consent of the prosecuting attorneys to release the foregoing information. The opinion of the United States Supreme Court left the impression that a grave injustice had been deliberately perpetrated by a ruthless and unprincipled prosecution. A thorough and objective investigation of the matter has shown that this impression is unfounded. The Illinois State Bar Association believes that the public is entitled to know the actual state of the record.

HOW DO YOU GET A FEDERAL GRANT?

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend

to my colleagues the work of my friend from the State of Delaware, the Honorable WILLIAM V. ROTH. BILL has introduced a proposal that has been long overdue. The proposed Program Information Act of 1968, would require the issuance of an annual catalog of Federal grant programs that could save Americans thousands of man-hours and frustrating encounters in discovering just what kind of Federal assistance is available and who administers it. Perhaps not headline legislation, this bill could nevertheless go a long way toward cutting the bureaucratic tape that has come to be associated with Federal programs. I am proud to join BILL in cosponsoring this proposal and I commend to all Members of Congress the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of July 9, 1968, regarding BILL and his most necessary proposal:

HOW DO YOU GET A FEDERAL GRANT?

(By Lyn Shepard)

WASHINGTON.—For a long time the game of "grantsmanship" has been confined to an elite set of expert players who know the ways and wiles of Washington firsthand.

But now—thanks to the zeal of a little-known freshman congressman—every small-town official in the nation may soon master the knack.

That, in a nutshell, is the intent of a House bill titled the "Program Information Act of 1968" which Rep. William V. Roth (R) of Delaware filed a few weeks ago.

It requires the president to issue an annual catalogue of federal grant programs and to update it monthly. The president would also be expected to report to Congress each year on his progress in unifying the myriad of aid programs.

SUSPICIONS SUPPORTED

The measure resulted from an eight-month study by Mr. Roth's staff which confirmed what many congressmen strongly suspected, namely, as the Delaware lawmaker told his colleagues:

"We found that no one, anywhere, knows exactly how many federal programs there are.

"We found that nowhere is there a central, comprehensive repository where meaningful information on all operating programs can be found.

"We found that more than \$20 billion a year is being spent on such programs, yet only with long and great effort can one begin to find meaningful information about all of them.

"We found that there is no common denomination—that is, widely used definition, of just what a 'program' is.

"We found that only the largest cities and states and universities have the necessary money and staff required just to keep abreast of the programs from which they might benefit."

A number of House members—Democrats and Republicans—have stepped forward to laud Mr. Roth's research effort and his bill.

One of these, Rep. Florence P. Dwyer of New Jersey, is the ranking GOP member of the House Committee on Government Operations, where the Roth bill is under study. If her party wins the House in November, Mrs. Dwyer will become the panel's new chairman.

"As a congressman seeking to help local officials utilize federal programs," Mrs. Dwyer charged, "I have seen frustration, delay, and disappointment."

The influential congresswoman recalled memories distressingly familiar to her colleagues: "The numberless telephone calls where only one should do; the endless round of meetings and conferences that produce

nothing; the volumes of information and reams of paperwork that hinder instead of help."

Another congresswoman, Rep. Margaret M. Heckler (R) of Massachusetts, told of the groups of officials in her district who come to Washington seeking aid for sewer systems or other public-service projects.

"Just as often," Mrs. Heckler said, "they return home both empty handed and just as bewildered as when they came."

Mr. Roth has also enlisted strong Democratic allies in the House. These include senior members like Reps. Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas, Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, and Dante B. Fascell of Florida.

Messrs. Reuss and Fascell expect the Roth bill to win broad bipartisan support in Congress.

"I've heard only one argument against it," Mr. Roth says. "This is that it will increase demand for more federal spending."

LISTED 1,090 PROGRAMS

The congressman, a conservative on fiscal issues, counters that spending won't increase but its dispersion will be fairer and more clearly based on need.

As things stand, he maintains, a "fourth establishment" has sprung up amid all the grants programs "responsible to no one, self-perpetuating in nature, and too often duplicative in effort."

The Roth study found that 1,090 grant programs exist today, although the most complete federal catalog (compiled by the Office of Economic Opportunity) lists only 530. The differing figures are traced largely to the confusing issue: What is a program?

Mr. Roth feels that the Bureau of the Budget should prepare an annual compendium to unify all such programs governmentwide.

Only one federal department refused to answer the Roth questionnaire on grant programs. But this one, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, handles nearly half the total programs.

When Mr. Roth sent 478 questionnaires to HEW "program administrators," the department contended that it would take 1,600 manhours to complete them. That's too much time to be spent for a single congressman, the HEW officials said.

MAJOR PANAGOULIS RETIRES AS CHIEF OF POLICE

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a retirement ceremony for Maj. George J. Panagoulis, chief of police of Prince Georges County, Md., on June 29, 1968, at the Shoreham Hotel. Major Panagoulis' speech was extremely timely and discussed a number of vital issues facing our Nation these days. As the man who built the Prince Georges County Police Department into one of the best in the United States, and as a grandfather who went to law school at night while serving as chief of police, Major Panagoulis has left the police department and the county with some valuable words based on a broad background of education and experience. I commend this speech to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH PRESENTED BY MAJ. GEORGE J. PANAGOULIS, CHIEF OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT ON OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT, AT DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR ON JUNE 29

In the last three weeks one has heard again and again the question—"Is America sick?"—It resounds on the radio; is emblazoned on our television sets and assaults our eyes in the newspapers and on the magazine racks. Do we have a fatal cancer in the American system? As a police officer of thirty years, I have an answer! No . . . Do we have problems? Yes. . . . We are sick, there is a tumor in the belly of America, but it is non-malignant! To deny that our beloved America has serious problems is to retreat from reality. No honest American can deny that there have been many injustices over the years, but by the same token, these same Americans must admit that great strides have been made, and are still being made to overcome these injustices. Any deprivation of equal justice which we can not deny, we must truly deplore.

This audience above all others knows that however the battle of the statistics involved in crime reporting is resolved, crime is on the increase. It rises more rapidly than the population. And no one can deny that the visible, external crimes of violence are increasing disproportionately.

Student unrest has escalated from the democratic petition to the Dean to the occupation of university offices, the false imprisonment of university officials, physical violence, and resistance to arrest. All this accompanied by obscenities shouted from ivy-covered towers and scrawled across the personal belongings of college officers. And when some timid college administrators ask you and me as police officers to remove these illegal demonstrators we are greeted with a shout of *Police Brutality* when we use only minimal force to accomplish our mission.

And we hear more and more about civil disobedience! I submit to you that the ultimate act of civil disobedience was committed on June 5th when a gunman smashed a bullet into the brain of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Surely no one can deny that civil disobedience such as stretching of bodies across highways and runways, blockading of ingress and egress of public officials merges into criminal activity. Once the merger takes place, an escalation into violence is almost inevitable. We see still another symptom of our illness when we read in a national magazine that several of the six or seven college graduates interviewed for a feature story are thinking of flight to Canada rather than be drafted. One is tempted to yomit.

Why is a segment of America Sick? I suspect the root answer lies in the erosion of basic American values. There has been a breakdown in the basic unit of our society—the family. This thesis was accentuated several years ago by a startling book "Where Are You Going? Out! What Are You Going To Do? Nothing!" It has been called to our attention recently by the question: "Parents—Where is your child tonight?"

We see the problem on weekends in suburban America when our stationhouses are crowded with teenagers bloated with beer and we call their homes to have a youngster picked up by an equally beer bloated parent. We see it when parents and children alike casually disregard our traffic laws. We see it on the newsstands loaded with erotic literature, tolerated by the parents and eagerly purchased by their children. We see it on the screen in movies like "The Graduate" which symbolize the problem.

We see over and over again that some parents have abdicated their responsibilities

as parents because they, the parents, also wish to be fulfilled. This idea of self-fulfillment is the mother-cell of our difficulties. Self-fulfillment is simply another way of saying self-pleasure or self-indulgence. It reminds me of the ancient Romans who induced regurgitation so they could eat more. Parents are permissive because either they seek personal fulfillment or they genuinely feel their children should be sated with life's pleasures. In either event, it inevitably leads to an "I'll get mine and you get yours" idea, of society. To put the frosting on the cake, liberals of the last third of this twentieth century have pushed our basic freedom to their limit. Some misguided, irresponsible libertarians will sanctimoniously insist that all forms of protest including certain conduct are protected forms of free speech or freedom of assembly. They are joined by power-hungry college students and fuzzy faculty members who equate student power and faculty power and love the mix. The result is anarchy in our academic institutions which threatens to spill over into the political arena this fall. Throw in for good measure some of our appellate judges who feel all acts, good or bad, are the result of irresistible compulsion with the consequent determination that people really aren't responsible for what they do. Therefore they shouldn't be punished!

In the face of all these disturbing symptoms the overwhelming majority of Americans appear to be in a hypnotic trance. Some call it apathy, some call it despair. A few prophets of doom state that democracy has finally run its course in America, that the great American dream went up in smoke the past two summers. In summary, Our problems are due, to a large degree, to the breakdown of family discipline, a corruption of the academic process, an erosion of the idea that one must answer for his conduct, a misguided effort to push our basic freedoms to a breaking point, and a general public apathy.

What can we do about it?

Edmund Burke, the English-Irish statesman, gave the answer when he said: "Men are qualified for civil liberties in an exact proportion to their dispositions to put moral chains upon their own appetites . . . society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

And St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, said: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers."

He said in his Epistle to Titus: "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to do every good work."

A great philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas has said: "Freedom is willing obedience to law."

Thus we are exhorted to respect law and authority.

I submit the following concrete steps fully confident that no man in his right mind can deny their efficacy.

I suggest that Americans quit being mere spectators who deplore the actions of their public officials but do nothing themselves except raise hell about the taxes they're paying. I suggest that all Americans, not just a vocal minority, participate in democracy by making their beliefs known.

I suggest a return to family discipline. Parents can control children. Unity of spirit and effort on the part of all parents in the community will help. The psychologists tell us we must deal with teenagers pragmatic-

ally. If that is so, so be it! We've got to quit coddling our children. Can anyone tell me, what has happened to the Boy Scout Oath and Vows. I suggest they are a good blueprint for living. I would ask every parent in the nation to put a copy of these into the hands of his children at once.

I suggest a return to the Golden Rule in our constant relations with all peoples. The overwhelming majority of Americans, black and white, are as sick at the excesses of a few Americans, black and white, as are you and I. Be kind, courteous, and helpful. Be color-blind in your race relations. Resolve now to attack the root causes of our ghetto conditions. Work for better housing, better schools, better employment and better welfare for our disadvantaged.

I suggest that college administrators counsel their students that acts have consequences. Students should be warned that those who exceed lawful authority will be dealt with promptly and firmly. College authorities should give academic response before resorting to the police. Trespassing or similar criminal acts must be punished with alacrity with proper regard for due process.

Our liberal philosophers should take another look at civil disobedience. Civil disobedience of any kind must be discouraged. Any deliberate violation of law, even though it is regarded as unjust, should be undertaken only when the law violated is itself thought to be unconstitutional, and then only with a willingness to suffer the consequences. The early sit-in cases testing the segregation laws are a good example. To violate an admittedly constitutional law to dramatize a social practice felt to be unjust or a different law believed to be unconstitutional cannot be tolerated. The recent traffic disruptions in the streets during the Poor People's Campaign is an example of intolerable civil disobedience. The disobedient must be reminded that where law ends, tyranny begins. The protestors should also be reminded that mass felonies will be dealt with on the same basis as individual felonies. Protestors and would-be criminals should be warned that society will not tolerate violence on the streets, that such force as is necessary to maintain law and order will be used promptly. We must return the streets to the people. It is unthinkable that Americans walk their streets in fear. The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act signed by the President last week together with other fine legislations of the last two years indicates there is a light at the end of the tunnel. Accordingly, I am optimistic that our law enforcement officers will at long last receive the public support that they deserve.

And last, we must no longer treat the police officer as a second class citizen. When riots occur, the police officer is our daily first line of defense. Policemen have become the whipping boys of modern times. Where were the cops? Why are the cops so brutal? Why don't we have more cops? Why don't cops understand the Constitution?

We ask much of our modern policeman. However, I, for one, am reminded of Winston Churchill's praise of the R.A.F. during W.W. II:

"Never have so many owed so much to so few". Policemen are in fact the bastion of our free society. Let us not take our policemen for granted. When they do a good job, tell them so. They are people like you and me, entrusted with society's most important task, the protection of life and property and the preservation of law and order.

This is a sad day for Claire and me. For 30 years, my heart, soul and body have been in police work. My body will remove itself Sunday night. My heart, my soul, my mind and my prayers are still with you and the people of Prince Georges County.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the annual observance of captive nations here in America is taking place between July 4 and 20. This 1968 observance marks the 10th year of a highly important commemoration.

I join with my colleagues here in Congress in calling the attention of Americans and all people of the free world to the duress of communism.

The fate of those in Asia and east-central Europe who have recently become targets of the Communist spiral is one which we cannot ignore. Only too well have we learned that the right of our most entrusting developing nations to chart their own destiny is fast becoming a goal of the past.

We are at this very moment witnessing what certainly may well be our most serious effort to block Soviet expansion in Southeast Asia. This effort must not be abandoned. Our determination to preserve freedom and a just future for the people of South Vietnam must not falter or for a moment be impaired.

Our recognition today of the struggle being waged by the captive nations is the very basis and foundation of our efforts to insure the inherent rights of self-determination for the people not only in South Vietnam, but all of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago I proposed that this Government use every method available to bring the question of Vietnam before the United Nations. I reaffirm my proposal and believe it totally justifiable that the admission of both North and South Vietnam to the U.N. be allowed so that the intent of this peace-keeping organization may be exercised.

While our attention, for the most part, is presently focused around the problems in Southeast Asia, we can never be over-alert to the persistence of Communist aggression in many other areas of the world. It is for this reason that our support to those suppressed Iron Curtain countries is proclaimed, not only at times of designated observance, but daily through our sincere efforts to inspire the principles of democracy both at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of including in my remarks at this point the Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1968, which was jointly issued by the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO, 1968

The undersigned organizations dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as "Captive Nations Week."

Recent developments in East-Central Europe indicate that the Communist system is confronted with built-in problems and deep-seated strains and tensions. The record of over two decades of Communist rule brings

into sharp focus continued opposition of the East-Central European peoples to unpopular, self-perpetuating regimes, which have deprived them of their inalienable right to chart their future.

The failure of the Stalinist regime in Czechoslovakia to relax its stiff rule and raise the living standard of the people has brought to power more progressive elements of that country's Communist Party. The new leadership has been compelled to respond to popular pressures and vocal demands by the intellectuals and the students by granting more freedom of expression. The Czechoslovak people, animated by a consciousness of twenty years of injustice, have been the crucial motivating force behind the change sweeping their country.

In Poland, the March 1968 student demonstrations were a poignant protest against repressive censorship and the curtailment of the fundamental right to free speech. These legitimate demands were met with retaliatory action by Party leadership, including court trials of writers and university professors and mass arrests of students. A policy of official anti-Semitism was hastily introduced to divert public attention from the real issues involved.

The intellectuals and the younger generation in the captive countries must be made aware that their humanist protest is supported by the free world. It is therefore deemed essential that the plight of the intellectuals—who also voice the aspirations of the workers and the farmers—be fully aired at meetings and conferences held in conjunction with the International Year for Human Rights, proclaimed by the United Nations as well as by the President of the United States.

This year thus opens up new horizons for a closer look at the pressing problems of fundamental human rights in East-Central Europe and for a timely initiative to make the implementation of these rights an objective of Western policy.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to suppress the will of the people by denying periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all people held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To use every opportunity to press the Soviet Union and the Communist regimes of East-Central Europe to restore to the peoples of these countries the full enjoyment of the rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central Euro-

pean peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national sovereignty and individual freedom and dignity.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 14-20, 1968, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the
Captive Nations.

GEORGE M. DIMITROV,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive Eu-
ropean Nations.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSING FACILITIES FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which has as its purpose the establishment of a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction of housing facilities for the mentally retarded.

It is a measure which fills an urgent and pressing need.

At this moment there are approximately 6 million mentally retarded persons in the United States. But the number of facilities in existence to provide diagnosis, treatment, education, training, and custodial care is woefully inadequate. The Public Health Service estimates there are some 30,000 mentally retarded persons awaiting admission to public residential facilities, not to speak of the additional thousands on similar waiting lists for private institutions.

The Subcommittee on Economic Progress of the Joint Economic Committee prepared a report in 1966 which disclosed the existence at that time of only 2,571 public facilities serving the mentally retarded throughout the United States. Obviously, a great imbalance exists and it must be corrected.

The same report estimated that capital expenditures by public institutions for the retarded totaled \$439 million, and projected a financial requirement of some \$3 billion through the year 1975. Again, such expenditures are exclusive of facilities under private ownership.

The numbers I cite represent merely one facet of the whole problem of retardation. They do not tell the story of the anguish borne by families who are unable to find satisfactory care for children they desperately love.

There are insufficient funds under the Mental Retardation Facilities and Mental Health Construction Act of 1963—which provides formula and project grants to the States and to nonprofit institutions—to facilitate construction of necessary treatment centers.

The legislation I propose would greatly ease this situation because it would provide to both private and public facilities which treat the retarded the opportunity to borrow federally insured funds and repay such loans at current interest rates.

The program would work much like

our present Federal Housing Administration loan system in which the Government provides mortgage insurance for housing funds obtained from private lending sources.

I am hopeful such a loan program will stimulate and encourage greater participation of private and public institutions in the area of mental retardation.

It should also be noted that research indicates a great majority of the mentally retarded come from disadvantaged areas and yet at the same time, most hospitals and centers which provide care are located in either more affluent areas of the cities or in the adjacent countryside.

Hopefully, the availability of federally insured funds will encourage construction or rehabilitation of retarded facilities precisely where they are needed the most.

THE POSTAL CUTBACK: EVERYONE IS HURT AND NO ONE IS HELPED

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker at the time when I voted with this Congress to pass the temporary 10-percent surtax, I was assured by administration representatives that the cutback in Federal employment would not extend to the Post Office Department. Based upon this assurance, I supported the surcharge, but now it appears that I—as well as many others—have been buffaloed. Either the administration was overly optimistic or they have misrepresented the facts; for, almost as soon as the ink was dry on the Excise Tax Extension Act of 1968, a cutback in postal employment and mail service was announced.

Forcing the postal service to reduce employment to the level of June 1966 is neither in the interest of Government economy nor the health of our Nation's business and industry. Mail volume has increased substantially since June 1968, an increase which is directly traceable to the unprecedented economic growth and prosperity the Nation has enjoyed in recent years.

About 80 percent of the country's total mail volume is generated by business activity. It is obvious that a cutback in mail delivery service will have an adverse effect on many businesses. And it is equally obvious that the Post Office cannot reduce its work force to the level of June 1966 without curtailing essential mail delivery services.

Postmaster General Watson has already ordered cutbacks in service because the people to do the work are not available. This situation will only deteriorate if the postal service is not exempted from the employment cutback—an employment cutback which will not reduce the postal budget one penny.

I strongly support Congressman DULSKY's bill to exempt the Post Office Department for the employment cuts im-

posed by the tax bill. I see absolutely no justification for the decline in postal service and the handicaps to businesses which depend on the mail that would result from this cutback.

HIGH SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY JOHN J. CARVER

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently the senior class was graduated from Watertown High School in Watertown, Mass. The speaker was my very close personal friend, John J. Carver, chairman of the Watertown School Committee.

This outstanding gentleman is an excellent choice of a speaker to address young people going out into the world, for he is an example of the fine American tradition of civic and social responsibility.

John Carver gained renown as a scholar-athlete at Exeter, Cambridge Latin School, and Harvard University where he was captain of the Harvard baseball team.

After being graduated from Harvard, Mr. Carver became more active in the civic and political life of Cambridge, Mass. He was a city councilor and was also elected to the school committee. Now, as a resident of Watertown, Mass., he devotes a great deal of his time and energy to the work of the Watertown School Committee.

John Carver is a member of the board of trustees and is general public affairs manager of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. He is a wonderful example of how a prominent businessman can and should participate in his community.

I am pleased to submit his speech to the RECORD:

Dr. Kelly, Reverend, Clergy, Graduates of the Class of 1968, my fellow Americans.

Graduation is a time for great rejoicing. Everyone—teachers, parents, friends and relatives congratulate young men and women who have reached another plateau in their educational development. Aside from celebrating this educational achievement, graduation brings classmates closer together in a common bond. You have shared confidences, exulted in victories and accepted setbacks together. Now you celebrate a glorious occasion, one that will be forever a burning memory, a sacred recollection. This graduation will generate in you a pride in your own performance, develop an esprit de corps among graduates, your teachers and your school that will be inscribed in your heart and minds for all the days of your lives.

While you students are to be congratulated for your scholastic achievements, gathered here today are others who have made your success possible. I refer to your parents who have made enormous sacrifices in time, money and effort to provide you with an education superior to their own. They have tried to give you more advantages than they themselves ever received. Now they see in each of you an image of themselves that they wish to perfect. May God bless each and

every one of them for the aspirations they have for you.

Your teachers, likewise, deserve commendation for their patience, perseverance and sincerity of purpose on your behalf. Some of you will study in schools and colleges of higher learning. Others will work with giants of industry. But I say to you now that these teachers will be the ones you'll always remember, the ones you'll turn to for advice and guidance. Their wise counsel and diligence in your behalf will always be an inspiration for you to fulfill the confidence they have in you.

For a moment I shall address myself to you graduates. Your generation is impressive if for no other reason that there are so many of you. Reflect on the only statistic I shall quote—By 1975 more than 1/2 of the people in this country will be under 25 years of age and you will be among them.

Your generation is physically superior—you're taller, heavier, stronger, healthier, better informed, better educated and generally more intelligent. You are, indeed, a generation destined for greatness.

Your generation is unique because it's uninhibited in its economic thinking. You have no knowledge of the last serious economic depression. You are unrestrained in your expectations because so much has been accomplished in so short a time. You've seen so many long standing values, traditions and prejudices rejected almost overnight. You are unimpressed by some of our technological advances—simply because you've grown up in a time where TV, jet travel, satellite communications and moon shots are as common as hot dogs and Coca Cola after a game.

You are a concerned generation—concerned by what you see in the world around you which falls far short of your high ideals. Viet Nam, race relations, adult delinquency, religious intolerance are just a few things you are concerned about.

Finally, you are an action generation. You've observed the inescapable lesson of racial demonstrations. Properly evaluated, such actions do speak louder than words.

So your generation demonstrates in a variety of ways, and it demonstrates for a variety of causes since it wants progress not promises. Your generation may be known as the "protesting generation"—protesting against our apathy and our indifference to the issues and ills that exist in modern society. You've committed yourselves intellectually, emotionally and physically to push and pull to tug and twist until you begin to fit into this ideal world you obviously belong to.

So with your motivation, your drive and your desire, it will be you rather than us who will be the men and women who will land on the moon; you will cure cancer; you will smog free our cities; you will help the underdeveloped countries, and hopefully end poverty and war. It's your battle—Here is the torch so reverently mentioned by John Fitzgerald Kennedy when he opened his inaugural address by stating "Let the word go forth from this time and place that the torch has been passed to a new generation."

COUVE DE MURVILLE FRIEND OF UNITED STATES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the new French Premier, Maurice Couve de Murville, is well known in the United States, having been Ambassador for the Fourth French Republic in 1955 and 1956. In

an address to the American Club of Paris, at the time of the appointment to the United States, he spoke of French-American friendship in these terms:

We speak the same language. Words have the same meaning for both of us when we talk of democracy, liberty, institutions—in short, the basic understandings. This is not a simple banality for, in the world of today, there are not so many nations of whom we can say the same. For the success of the work undertaken by the Western world towards securing world peace, Franco-American understanding and friendship are fundamental.

Earlier in these remarks he described the United States as "a nation of good will."

Couve de Murville served as French Foreign Minister longer than any of his predecessors save Vergennes, Louis XVI's Foreign Minister, and he is widely regarded as the most capable French Foreign Minister since Talleyrand served Napoleon. He was described by C. L. Sulzberger before the last election as the "master craftsman" of the De Gaulle cabinet. He comes to the position of De Gaulle's First Minister steeped in economic and financial matters. He served as Finance Minister in De Gaulle's provisional government and held the post of Director of External Finances for Marshal Petain before leaving Vichy to join the Free French.

After the war he became Director of Political Affairs for the Quai d'Orsay, the French Foreign Ministry, and served as French Ambassador to Egypt—1950-54—the United Nations—1947, 1949, 1950—NATO—1954—and the Federal Republic of Germany—1956-58. In 1958 he became French Foreign Minister and held that position until earlier this year when he became Finance Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the July 8 editorial page of the Des Moines Register described Atlantic Union as "a good idea worth working toward." Here is the text:

ATLANTIC FEDERATION

A federal union of the North Atlantic democracies was one of the glowing ideas much discussed in the late 1940s and largely shelved or postponed since. But in every session of Congress since 1949 a resolution has been introduced urging American initiative to call a conference of such NATO member governments as are interested to explore the possibility of working toward such a federal union. In each session there has been a list of distinguished backers of this resolution, though it has never yet passed or even got out of committee.

On July 2, 1968, though, the current Atlantic Union resolution was recommended for passage by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. According to Representative Paul Findley (Rep., Ill.), one-fourth of the membership of both House and Senate has publicly endorsed the resolution, including 61 Democrats and 48 Republicans in the House, and 17 Democrats and 9 Republicans in the Senate.

On May 7 this year, Vice-President Hubert Humphrey endorsed the resolution, pointing out that he had backed all its predecessors while he was a senator.

On Apr. 8, not long before his tragic death, Senator Robert F. Kennedy urged the resolution's adoption.

Senator Eugene McCarthy was a cosponsor of the companion resolution in the Senate, and Richard Nixon and Nelson Rockefeller have been on record for similar resolutions since 1966.

That makes all presidential candidates

backers or sponsors of exploring the possibilities of Atlantic federal union, and consequently the next president of the United States, whoever he may be.

If so internationalist an idea doesn't sound like Nixon, here is part of what he said to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Sept. 1, 1966, about a similar resolution:

"It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations. . . . It would be foolish for us to ignore the fact that science and history are even now fatefully combining to accomplish the same goal.

"The Atlantic Union resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption."

The idea may be "far out" and even "a long way off." But it's still a good idea, and a large number of highly practical, experienced statesmen believe it is worth working toward.

On the same day Kingsbury Smith, chief foreign writer of Hearst newspapers, writing from London in the News American of Baltimore, said creation of Atlantic Union envisaged in legislation approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee would be "the greatest thing for Britain." His article, outlining Britain's multitude of ills, follows:

ECONOMIC ILLS PLAGUE BRITAIN IN AFTERMATH OF FRENCH UNREST

(By Kingsbury Smith)

LONDON, July 8.—Britain is experiencing a summer of economic discontent, discouragement and despondency.

Strikes, slowdowns, inflationary wage demands and disappointing trade figures have combined to obstruct the progress towards economic recovery that Prime Minister Harold Wilson's Labor Government hoped would be well underway by now as a result of a wage-price freeze policy, higher taxes and devaluation of the pound.

With selling pressure keeping the sterling near the pegged floor level of \$2.3825, British gold and foreign exchange reserves dropped by \$62.4 million in June to \$2.68 billion.

There is speculation in trade circles that unless the situation improves soon, the government may be forced to take further restrictive measures, possibly following France's action in imposing import quotas.

The aftermath of the French crisis has caused serious concern in England on two counts.

One is the danger that a continued weakening of the franc might lead to devaluation of that currency, which could precipitate general devaluation of Western European currencies and thus wipe out the beneficial effects of the British devaluation.

The other is that Britain's hopes of joining the European Common Market have been dealt a further setback by President Charles De Gaulle's landslide election victory.

While the British did not, of course, wish to see the Communists take over in France, they were hoping that the strengthening of center groups and the non-Communist Confederation of the Left, both of which favor English entry, would help to remove the roadblock De Gaulle has placed in Britain's participation in the European economic community.

Faced with continued French opposition, the British are now groping for other ways of improving their foreign trade position.

Still clinging to the hope that Britain will eventually be accepted in the Common Market, Prime Minister Harold Wilson is advocating the creation of a separate European technological community in which the British would be able to participate.

The British are confident they could make an important contribution to Europe's technological development in atomic, space, aeronautical and computer fields.

Strengthening DeGaulle's rule in France has also revived the debate in England between those who favor the Common Market and those who feel Britain should seek its future prosperity in closer economic cooperation with the United States through a North Atlantic free trade area.

Douglas Jay, former president of the Board of Trade and an outspoken critic in Parliament of the Common Market, told a world trade conference in London last week. "The brightest prospect for Britain" was to help create an industrial trade group with North America and Scandinavia.

Thus, he said, would impose on Britain "no rise in our import prices, cost of living, export costs or loss of markets anywhere." He said that of all the alternatives facing Britain, the Common Market, with its agricultural trade barriers and high-cost policies, would be worse.

Common Market advocates, however, are convinced Britain could develop a much greater volume trade with Europe than it could with the North Atlantic group, and they furthermore see little hope of anything in the nature of a free trade arrangement with America because of the strong opposition of American labor unions to competition with British goods.

The greatest thing for Britain would be the creation of an Atlantic union envisaged in legislation approved by the United States House of Representatives' Foreign Affairs Committee last week.

This legislation would authorize an 18-member U.S. delegation to meet with similar groups from other NATO countries to explore the possibility of transforming the military alliance into an Atlantic federal union in which member countries would control their own internal affairs, but enjoy free trade within the community and follow common military and foreign policies.

Since the plan would involve the United States and other NATO countries, including France, it is too utopian for mankind's present international immaturity.

BUSHEL AND PECK: A KISS OF DEATH?

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, since the House has approved a study on the pros and cons of the U.S. switch to the metric system, I thought the editorial which appeared in the Bristol, Virginia-Tennessee on Tuesday, July 9, 1968, would be of interest to Members of the House and to readers of the RECORD.

"Bushel and Peck: A Kiss of Death?" presents some salient points and faces the fact that a change is coming about. The editorial follows:

BUSHEL AND PECK: A KISS OF DEATH?

Congress is looking into the problem of the gap.

Not between generations or in the balance of payments but in measurements, an area where the United States finds itself increasingly isolated.

The House has approved and the Senate is considering a study on the pros and cons of a U.S. switch to the metric system, a by-product of the French Revolution which, unlike Napoleon, never met its Waterloo.

Metric has gone on to triumph in most of the world with the major exceptions of Eng-

lish-speaking countries, which have stubbornly clung to the familiar but cumbersome old Anglo-Saxon system based on pounds, feet and quarts.

Now, metric has even accomplished something Napoleon never came close to achieving—the conquest of England. The British are involved in the enormously complicated and expensive process of shifting all official measurements and measuring instruments—cash registers, adding machines, dials and scales—to metric's neat decimal arrangement of grams, meters and liters.

With Britain's capitulation, 90 per cent of the world's population is in the metric camp. The United States is the only major nation still on the outside.

Even we long ago gave in part way. The greater accuracy and efficiency of metric has long been recognized in scientific and technical fields. Every high school math and science student has had a brush with it. But in daily American life, the pound and its like have prevailed.

Proponents of a change admit the cost would be great, but contend that in the long run savings would be much greater—an estimated \$705 million annually in education costs alone through more efficient instruction in mathematics.

Congress may now be moving us ever so slowly down the road to a liter of milk, a kilogram of potatoes and 10 kilometers to the next filling station.

It probably would be all for the best.

But somehow, we're going to miss pounds, feet and quarts—not to mention grains, bushels, rods, furlongs and pecks.

WHAT'S OUTLOOK FOR YOUTH WHO WANT TO STAY ON FARM?

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years now, we have been hearing and reading a great deal about the so-called farm problem. We have also been concerned about the future of farming as an occupation for our young people who want to stay on the farm.

One of the finest articles that I have ever read on this subject recently appeared in the Atkinson-Annawan (Ill.) News. The title of the article is "What's Outlook for Youth Who Want To Stay on Farm?"

Mr. Speaker, I insert a copy of this article in the RECORD:

WHAT'S OUTLOOK FOR YOUTH WHO WANT TO STAY ON FARM?

A few years ago, research studies showed that for each 10 farm boys reaching age 20, there would be only one good opportunity to go into farming and make a good living. At the same time, some farmers were saying that good farmland would be left idle, because not enough boys were going into farming.

We have seen a lot of young men leave the farm in order to earn a living. Some older farmers also have left to take places in business and industry. A few young men have started farming, and some are doing quite well.

There are many empty feedlots, barns, and hog and poultry houses on farms today, though the total livestock industry is larger than ever before. But there is no good idle land—except that being kept out of production by Uncle Sam.

So, what's ahead now? For farm youth? For agriculture? The best answers to these questions are obtained by carefully observing what's happening today.

To a large extent, poultry and egg production are no longer a part of the ordinary farm; these have become large-scale, semi-industrial enterprises. The men who feed the birds and gather the eggs often work for wages, a commission, or some other arrangement with a business firm.

Cattle feeding is also being concentrated in fewer and larger units. It is disappearing as a sideline enterprise on Corn Belt farms, becoming concentrated in a relatively few large scale businesses. Dairying, too is slowly but surely becoming a big-scale industry.

The hog industry is also concentrating on fewer and larger production units. Although health and sanitation problems are slowing down this trend, they will not stop it.

The beef cow-calf business still remains widely scattered, using grass and other roughage. But some ranches have been big business since the pioneer days, and others are combining to become larger.

Crop production is a different story. Farmland area is pretty well fixed. You can't "build" a 1,000- or 10,000-acre farm, in the sense of creating a new "facility." It is difficult to buy or rent land in large blocks. Even so, many Corn Belt farmers now operate 500 and more acres, mostly with little or no hired labor. There will be fewer and larger grain farms next year—even fewer 10 years from now.

We believe that there will be good opportunities in farming—for top thinkers and hard workers. But most of the teen-agers of today will be working and living in the suburbs of 1978.

They can get fair to good jobs with a high school education. But most of the best jobs will require graduation from college; many, advanced degrees as well.

Average starting salaries for agricultural graduates from the University of Illinois and similar institutions in 1967 were over \$7,000. Those with one more year (M.S. degrees) averaged over \$9,000. (Ph.D. degrees) the average starting salaries were over \$11,000. Graduates from other colleges—engineering, business, etc.—have done just as well or better.

So, we urge young men and their parents to think about the future. Not just next year, or 1970. But about 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010. What will today's high school students be doing during the next 40 years? Will they be glad they went to college? Or sorry that they did not?

ADDITIONAL GUN LEGISLATION

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, according to the program, we face additional gun legislation this week in the House of Representatives.

I have heard many Members indicate that they have received more mail on this subject than any other subject that they have been confronted with during their tenure in Congress. I have responded to a total of 3,412 constituents on this subject since the assassination of the distinguished Senator from New York. Of this total, 623 favor additional gun legislation and 2,789 oppose additional legislation—and this does not include the hundreds who have expressed themselves personally to me on this subject. Of all those who write, there is an atmosphere of urgency concerning the whole question.

Many in their letters—and I have noticed in the press—frequently mention the "gun lobby", the National Rifle Association. Mr. Speaker, I have been in contact with no gun lobby, nor with any pressure group. I know from the newspaper advertisements that have appeared in the newspapers at home that there has been an equal effort by both the pros and the cons, with large newspaper ads, to create mail to the Congress indicating the views of those who write.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's body, and we need to know the views of the people that we attempt to represent—and we should vote here to reflect those views.

So long as those who are espousing a particular view on this or any other subject do so by engendering mail from home, I think it is good for those of us who are trying to do our best to reflect the opinions of our people. Large ads have appeared in the papers in my district by the John Glenn committee in favor of additional firearms legislation and by sportsmen's organizations and others in opposition to additional legislation.

PRESENT LAWS

There are already many gun laws on the books. There is a wide variation from State to State as to their context. As I understand it, 49 States and the District of Columbia now have laws affecting the carrying, purchasing, or owning of handguns. Four States require gun registration, and it appears that nearly all of the States are currently examining their laws and regulations in light of the pressures of the day.

PRESENT FEDERAL LAWS

Title IV of the omnibus crime bill, enacted prior to the current "push" for additional gun legislation, bans mail-order and nonresident sales of handguns. It forbids sales to minors and requires Federal licensing of all dealers. This is a solid approach in the prevention of illicit traffic of guns in interstate commerce. I supported this bill.

The National Firearms Act of 1934 applies to sawed-off shotguns and rifles and all other weapons from which a shot can be fired—except long rifles and shotguns and except handguns. This includes machineguns, bazookas, mufflers, silencers, et cetera. Under this law no transfer of such guns can take place except on application approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This provides for gun registration with the District Collector of Internal Revenue of all such guns. Penalty for violation—fine up to \$2,000 or 5 years in jail, or both.

The Federal Firearms Act of 1938 applies to all guns by whatever name known. It provides for all dealers to be licensed. This law requires all dealers to maintain permanent records of the disposal of all guns as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe by regulations—and directs that the Secretary make rules and regulations to comply with the act. This law prohibits the sale to anyone under indictment or who has ever been convicted of a crime of violence or who is a fugitive from justice. In effect, this law provides for "original sale registration" of all guns if the Secretary of the Treasury and the Justice Department en-

force it. Possession of a firearm acquired in violation of these acts is an offense.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation which we will be voting upon this week, would reenact the gun title of the crime bill and add the same provisions for long guns. The general purpose of this measure is to establish a complex of prohibitions whereby the ordinary citizen would be required to purchase his firearms from a dealer in his own State under the laws of that State. This bill does not provide for firearms registration or licensing of owners, but I understand that amendments will be offered from the floor to include these provisions.

CONCLUSION

In my opinion, this bill should be revised to accommodate the sportsman who may need to purchase a shotgun or rifle in a State other than his own. I question what reason there can be as to why a sportsman living in what we refer to as "northern Kentucky" should be prohibited from purchasing a sporting gun from nearby Cincinnati—or why should some sportsman living in Jeffersonville or New Albany, Ind., be prohibited from purchasing his sporting gun in Louisville, Ky. Why should the sportsman's gun auctions now held in several localities in the United States be outlawed for non-residents of that State?

In looking over the most recent crime report issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it appears that the percentage of murders committed with the hands and feet is identical with that committed with long guns.

According to experts, the availability of a gun does not affect crime rates. Dr. Marion Wolfgang, professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, says "few homicides due to shootings could be avoided merely if firearms were not present—the offender would select some other weapon to achieve the same destructive goal."

The President in his second message requesting Federal registration of all firearms and licensing of gun owners made reference to the licensing and registration of other items. As far as I am concerned, the items which the President compared gun registration to: that is, automobiles, marriage licenses, professional licenses, and the like, are handled by the States. And if there is to be registration of firearms, it seems to me that this should be comparably compared. Enactment of a Federal registration law would necessitate the creation of a super Federal police force to enforce it. This could be the beginning of the end of the whole concept of this Republic.

Registration of automobiles has not prevented their theft or their use in crime. It would be wishful thinking to believe the registration of firearms would prevent the criminal from stealing them or using them in the pursuit of crime or violence. The main thrust of our effort to reduce unlawful shooting must be aimed at the criminal, and not at the weapon.

I believe that continued failure of the courts to match the crime with adequate punishment will result in a growing misuse of firearms. A new gun law designed to silence the public cry for congressional action could, in itself, create a false sense

of security. More important than gun legislation, police must have the authority to arrest. The carrying of concealed weapons or handguns by criminals, by drug addicts, by felons, or by juveniles must be treated with the seriousness it deserves.

In our impatient desire to achieve a better deal for the impoverished and those in our society imprisoned by despair, let us not become placidly tolerant of the behavior of the criminal. Crime is not a product of poverty, but rather the poor are victims of it. Guns are not a reason for crime, murder, or assassination, but rather a tool which the criminal will find as long as they exist.

Over half of the 18,000 convicts released from prison in 1963 were arrested again for new offenses before the end of 1966. Where is the public outcry to overhaul our penal system so a term in prison is not merely a recess period in the career of the criminal? Where is the cry in our States and communities for adequate law enforcement which will bring to justice the 87 percent of those who commit crimes and now escape detection, apprehension, or conviction? Under the present attitudes in our society, crime in America does pay.

In light of this shocking fact, it seems to me the challenge is clear. Let us wake up to the stark reality of what we have to face in bringing this country to a higher plateau of law and order. The bridge we must build to freedom from fear will require far more from us than an in-haste gun bill, born out of a storm cloud of violent tragedy. As people, we must find the courage to face head on the task of enforcement.

A SALUTE TO DALY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Alameda, Calif., Times-Star carried an editorial on Monday, July 8, entitled "A Salute to Daly."

Mr. Ed Daly, president of World Airways which is one of the largest supplemental carriers in the world, is a public-spirited and generous man as evidenced by the content of the editorial. His rise in the business world has been phenomenal but in ascending he has never forgotten the underprivileged. His generosity in donating money to build a swimming pool is a commendable act. Also mentioned in the editorial is Stolte, Inc., one of the foremost building contractors in the bay area who will construct the pool without cost.

The editorial follows:

A SALUTE TO DALY

Boys and girls at the Alameda County Juvenile Facility complex in San Leandro will have a healthy outlet for their energies in the near future, thanks to Edward Daly, president of World Airways.

Daly has donated money for the building of a swimming pool, which will be constructed on the 150 Ave. site.

Stolte Inc. contractors also should be credited for doing the construction work without cost.

The pool will serve young people at the Boys Camp, Girls' Home and Chabot Ranch—boys and girls with whom authorities are working to steer back onto the right track in their relationship with society—as well as the young people at Snedigar Cottage, who are there as victims of circumstance and through no fault of their own.

Through Daly's initiative and generosity, the county will be able to allow these young people the opportunity to learn that recreational and competitive swimming is fun—more fun than breaking the law—as well as an ideal way to burn-off some of that excess energy.

Daly has, over the years, done a great deal in the interest of youth. This is another outstanding example, and he is to be commended for it.

FLORIDA'S FINEST CITIZEN

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Florida is honored to have Representative ROBERT SIKES as its dean of the Florida delegation. Recently, we had the pleasure in the House to pay tribute to him for serving longer here than anyone in Florida's long history. Today, I ask permission to have made a part of the RECORD an outstanding editorial from the Panama City News-Herald, and, as laudatory as the editorial is, it does not go halfway in the fine things we know about our beloved colleague.

The editorial reads as follows:

FLORIDA'S FINEST CITIZEN

Writing an editorial on a person who has made just about every contribution there is to make in the way of public service to his community, his state, his country and his fellow man is an extremely difficult task.

Such a man is U.S. Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes, the distinguished and highly respected dean of the Florida legislative delegation in Washington.

Northwest is fortunate, indeed, to have such an outstanding leader as its representative in the United States Congress.

Bob Sikes set a memorable new record on July 5 when he achieved the distinction of having served longer in Congress than any other Floridian. He broke the House longevity record in 1963 and surpassed the length of service record previously held by the late Sen. Duncan U. Fletcher in the Senate on July 5.

Mr. Sikes has served the First District of Florida for some 28 years, or longer than any other person from the Sunshine State in the 123 years of its history.

He has served the people of this area so ably and long that many of us take him for granted—and this is unfortunate. There are large numbers of us who also are selfish when it comes to the great "He-Coon" of the tall pine country of the Florida Panhandle.

There was a time—not too many years ago that Bob Sikes could have had the highest political office of this great state, the governorship. This was before the shift of political power to South Florida—when a small band of political giants from rural Northwest Florida ruled supreme in Tallahassee. They were called "Pork Choppers" and Bob Sikes was their idol. He started many of them on their political careers and they were his proteges, for Bob Sikes served two terms in the Florida House before going to Washington.

And Bob Sikes wanted to be governor—to end his great career of public service by holding the highest office in the state he adopted as his own and holds in such high esteem and loves so much.

But we, his constituents, and most particularly his close friends, were selfish. "We need you too badly in Washington, Bob," the mighty He-Coon was told from every quarter. "Northwest Florida will suffer if you leave Congress. You have too much seniority and too much power in Washington."

As he so often does, the big man from Crestview put service to his beloved Northwest Florida above self and forgot about the governorship.

Well, Bob Sikes, if you want to know the truth, we, your loyal friends and constituents, still are selfish—and we're not ashamed of it. On the contrary, we're proud; proud of you, your record of achievement, your tireless record of service to your nation in seeing to it that this country is prepared at all times to meet any aggressor.

We're proudest of all that you remained in Congress to represent the finest district in the land. We think that you made a wise decision—and that you are more important to this state and nation, and are making a greater contribution to both, than you possibly could have as governor.

Being a newspaperman ourselves, we're also proud that Bob Sikes is a member of the Fourth Estate. He did a creditable job of editing his Okaloosa News-Journal, which he founded at Crestview, until being elected to Congress. As proof of the esteem in which he was held by his peers in the journalistic profession, Sikes was elected president of the Florida Press Association in 1937.

For the benefit of newcomers, Congressman Sikes is affectionately called the "He-Coon" because of his outstanding leadership qualities. Cracker folks in this part of the country call the leader of a raccoon pack the "He-Coon."

As to the record of Mr. Sikes, he has made so many invaluable contributions to his district, his state and his nation that it would take an entire newspaper to list them. He

ranks 17th in seniority in the entire House of Representatives and serves on several very important committees.

His powerful voice has been heard for over a quarter of a century for the cause of a strong national defense, improvements of our waterways and forests and the conservation of America's natural resources. He is a great conservationist and patriot.

Mr. Sikes' greatest contributions have been in the field of national defense and military preparedness. He is a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, which means he must pass judgment on every cent spent by his nation on military construction.

In the words of a colleague, Congressman Andrews of Alabama, "there is not a better qualified military expert in this Congress than Bob Sikes."

Mr. Sikes acquired his military knowledge the hard way, starting as an ROTC cadet at the University of Georgia and rising to the rank of major general in the Army of the United States. He, incidentally, is a native Georgian who came to the Sunshine State to study at the University of Florida, where he acquired a masters degree, and remained.

He retired from the Army Reserve a few months ago after serving his country over a span of more than 40 years which included active duty stints in two world wars. A grateful Army presented him the Legion of Merit upon his retirement.

Perhaps few of Congressman Sikes' constituents realize the awesome power he wields in Washington or the exceptionally high esteem in which he is held by his colleagues in the Congress.

In honor of his having set a longevity record for service in Congress from Florida, members of the House of Representatives by unanimous vote granted five days for which to pay tribute to Robert L. F. Sikes.

Members of that august body, including leaders of both parties, heaped thousands of words of lavish praise on Mr. Sikes and his outstanding record of public service.

The long list of tributes and remarks were led off by none other than Congressman Don Fuqua of Altha, a protege of Sikes' who was but a boy of seven when the He-Coon first was elected to Congress in 1940. He spoke for a solid hour on the merits of Congressman Sikes before relinquishing the floor to other House members.

Mr. Sikes is known and recognized as one of the truly great statesmen of all time to serve in the hallowed halls of Congress. He is universally respected by all who know him and very well liked by most of them.

His popularity is attested to by the some 3,000 friends who showed up at a reception in the Rayburn House Office Building on the night of July 8 honoring him and Mrs. Sikes.

In addition to the countless other honors bestowed upon Congressman Robert L. F. (Bob-He-Coon) Sikes, we would like to add another: Florida's finest citizen and most outstanding public official.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 16, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russell D. Burns, of the Presbyterian Church of the Rock, Key West, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we Your children need individual help now. Pressures and demands have come from everywhere. At times we must live with Epicureans and we ourselves even possess the pride of Narcissus.

At this moment we acknowledge You as the King of kings and we know we are frail and mortal.

Our Father God, we remember Your

promise of the Holy Comforter, the Holy Spirit himself. May He enable the Members of this body to have courage, faith, and wisdom to deal with today's business.

We adore You, the God and Lord of life. Today may our lives express gratefulness for Your self-giving love and patience. These things we ask because we believe in You. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7481. An act to amend section 620, title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of a higher proportion of hospital costs in establishing amounts payable for nursing home care of certain veterans;

H.R. 14954. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to improve vocational rehabilitation training for service-connected