

far in putting to rest—once and for all—the acrimony which has occurred in recent years over the question of whether or not merchant ships whose operations are to be subsidized by the public treasury—with the taxpayer's money—should be built in the United States or elsewhere. Of itself, this issue has contributed to the divisiveness about which I have already spoken, but it is to be hoped that by its referral to a group of open-minded experts, there can be agreement among all parties on basic objectives and fundamental principles.

And so I end on the same note on which I began—adding my voice to those who appeal for a unity of purpose in the accomplishment of essential national goals. There are still no assurances that the Administration will support or endorse the maritime legislation—and the program it would authorize—which will shortly come before the Congress for consideration. This uncertainty is all the more reason for a united front. If the Congress, labor and management are of a single mind, it is reasonable to anticipate that such a concordant position will not be wasted on the policy makers and the American public.

Financial Cuts

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Treasury has just released a report that shows cash withdrawals of \$44,470,480,772 for the first 7 months of fiscal 1968 by the Defense Department. This does not include \$1,346,260,494 of the Atomic Energy Commission. Such expenditures were included with defense expenditures in the President's budget message.

The Pentagon now states that it has "gross unpaid obligation incurred" of over \$38 billion. This was largely due to increased contractual obligation signed last summer and fall.

With these facts in mind and noting the increased war activity, it is obvious that defense spending may well go over \$80 billion in both fiscal 1968 and 1969 unless the administration makes drastic cutbacks.

Under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an informative article which appeared in the Boston Globe January 4, 1968, under the byline of Allen M. Smythe, a financial columnist. Similar articles appeared in other metropolitan dailies.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Feb. 4, 1968]
LETTERS DEMAND SPENDING CUTS, END TO WAR
AND NO TAX HIKE

(By Allen M. Smythe)

The flood of critical letters inundating the Capitol since the President's budget message may decide the fate of the surtax. Coupled with these complaints are protests against heavy defense spending and the ineffectiveness of the war.

Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana, who is one of a number of Democratic senators never invited to the White House, summed up the public complaint as "get out of Vietnam, cut defense spending, and no surtax."

Rep. Gerald Ford, House Republican leader, called the statement that Federal spending could not safely be cut further as absurd. It was pointed out that defense spending this year and next will exceed \$79.8 billion, the highest of World War II.

Rep. Melvin Laird, (R-Wisc.) called the estimates misleading and said defense spending was again underestimated by \$5 to \$1 billion as was the case the last several years. He refers to the estimates of \$79.8 billion for spending in fiscal 1969 and \$82.3 billion in fiscal 1969 for defense obligations. These each

include more than \$2 billion for atomic weapons for the first time.

Rep. John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.) and chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee calls the budget requests unrealistic and says defense spending may be \$40 billion over the defense costs of \$43.2 billion in 1961 when Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara took over the Pentagon and combat troops were first sent to Vietnam.

The U.S. Treasury has just reported the cash withdrawals for defense in the first seven months of fiscal 1968 at \$44.2 billion. This is \$5.4 billion more than the same period a year ago. This does not include any costs for atomic weapons or any hidden war costs of the State Department, CIA, foreign aid for emergency funds.

The Pentagon reports "gross unpaid obligations incurred" now exceed \$38 billion. This was caused by a military buying spree last Summer and Fall and then a stretchout of payments. This alone should keep defense spending at a high rate.

Emergencies can always raise costs. Rumors at the Capitol hint that the 45,000 South Korean troops may be called home and more U.S. troops will replace them.

The budget request includes an item for four FDL supply ships at \$45 million each. These are the first of 30 such floating arsenals that would hover off potential trouble spots over the world. The Navy has announced that they would be built at Pascagoula, Miss., the home state of the popular Sen. John Stennis.

More than \$500 million could be cut from the construction and reconversion of Navy vessels.

Cancellation of part or all of the expensive F111 aircraft project is a possibility. The new defense secretary, Clark Clifford, before confirmation told the senators he would study the cost and deficiencies of this weapon. A total of \$8 to \$10 billion is yet to be spent on production.

The Navy has asked five firms to bid on a substitute of their version. The bomber version for the Air Force was an afterthought by McNamara. The Air Force is also designing an inexpensive fighter that could perform some of the missions expected of the F111.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 12, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jewell M. Smoot, Court Street Methodist Church, of Flint, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, by whom we are governed, though threatened by the rule of tyranny within and without: Call up the best within us, lest the worst obtain control. Forgive our shortsightedness when we react in fear instead of responding in courage. Enable this representative body to be responsible in its dependence upon Thee and sensitive to the needs of a world which at times gropes in the darkness of bewildering confusion. Make here the statesmanship which will preserve our honor and project our integrity. We pray for all the peoples of this land. Protect the helpless, guide the perplexed, counsel those in danger. Make us worthy as a people under God, with liberty and justice for all. And may our strength be in obedient service of Almighty God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On February 10, 1968:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12603. An act to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ASKED TO REVIEW QUESTIONABLE PRACTICES—SERVICEMEN TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF BY LOAN COMPANIES—CREDIT UNIONS TO RESCUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been vitally concerned with the problems that a serviceman faces when he attempts to obtain merchandise on credit or make a loan.

The committee found that a serviceman faced a veritable jungle when he sought credit and was subjected to sharp practices that were beyond imagination. It was not uncommon for servicemen, particularly those stationed overseas, to pay interest rates of 60 to 70 percent on loans. This was especially prevalent

among lower ranking enlisted men whose credit sources were extremely limited.

One of the answers to this problem is the establishment of credit unions so that no matter where a serviceman is stationed he will have access to a credit union. Virtually every major large military installation in the United States now has a credit union but in overseas commands there is a scarcity of credit unions. On December 15, 1967, credit union service was authorized for all our troops stationed in West Germany. This is being accomplished by six U.S.-based credit unions which have opened one or more suboffices in West Germany. It is perhaps the most significant step in relieving the serviceman from the burden of high interest rates and sharp practices.

In order to aid servicemen in their search for financing, the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the various exchanges, launched a program several years ago in which finance companies would be able to operate in the exchanges as an independent contractor. While the idea may have had its merits, the execution of the idea was less than desirable. The company receiving the first contract was one of the finance companies that was under investigation by the subcommittee for a large number of questionable dealings. The exchange system did little checking on the company's background before issuing the contract and had exchange officials checked with the military legal section of the various services, they would have learned that the company was causing a great many problems for our servicemen and should not have been allowed to operate out of the PX.

The military and exchange system must be extremely careful to whom they engage as contractors, for a company privileged to operate out of the PX has, in the eyes of a serviceman, the blessing of the military. The serviceman feels that the company has been carefully screened and would do nothing to take advantage of the serviceman.

This situation was made abundantly clear on Okinawa recently where the Air Force engaged an automobile broker to accept orders on the military installation for new cars. The understanding was that the Air Force would receive 2 percent commission for each car sold. In short and concise terms, the car broker pocketed most of the money given to him and skipped the island leaving scores of servicemen not only without cars, but thousands of dollars. The servicemen dealt with the broker because they felt that since he was licensed to sell on the military installation, he had the blessing of the Air Force.

Recently, it has come to my attention that the military is considering expanding a number of finance contractors in the exchanges. I have viewed such an arrangement with alarm because of the history surrounding such arrangements and of the types of companies that are being considered as contractors.

Last week, I wrote to Mr. Alfred B. Fitt, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, seeking information on the need for new contractors and asking that this entire area be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, military credit unions have performed a valuable service for our men in uniform and I have never heard one complaint from a serviceman as to the treatment he received from a credit union. This is in contrast to the thousands of letters that are received by the military complaining about other credit extenders. The fact that six credit unions have volunteered to open offices in Germany, is a further indication of how far credit unions are willing to go to help our servicemen. It does not seem reasonable for a credit union to spend its time and money in setting up a new office in Germany if, at the same time, the military is going to allow other credit extenders to operate out of the local exchange with the full blessing of the military. The military owes a great debt to the credit unions throughout the world that are helping servicemen. But allowing other credit extenders, including some with questionable reputations, to operate under special privileges, is not the way to repay the debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of the letter I have written to Secretary Fitt which more fully describes the problems concerning the exchange-financing contractor arrangements:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1968.

HON. ALBERT B. FITT,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower),
the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Department of Defense, in connection with the various exchange services of the armed forces, is considering a plan for expanding its existing contracts with financial institutions to handle automobile financing through the military exchanges.

It should be noted that, at the present time, the exchanges have an automobile financing contract with American Mutual Services Corporation of New York, a company that was granted this contract at the time it was being investigated by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee because of a large number of complaints by servicemen that the firm engaged in sharp practices.

You may recall that a special hearing was held in Newark, New Jersey by Congressman Minish which dealt primarily with American Mutual Services Corporation.

I am informed now that the Department and the exchanges are contemplating bringing in other financial companies and financial institutions to the exchanges for the purpose of providing financing for servicemen.

One of the companies under consideration, it has been reported, is the University National Bank of College Park, Maryland. This bank sought permission from officials in your office to engage in certain practices that were contrary to military regulations. After the bank was denied permission to engage in these practices, it enlisted the services of a high-ranking Army legal officer who apparently is condoning these practices, which include the payment of fees to retired officers and semi-military groups such as wives' clubs for soliciting accounts for the bank.

Recently, the Department of Defense made a tremendous step forward in helping servicemen with their financial problems by establishing credit unions throughout the Federal Republic of Germany. And, for the past few years, the Department of Defense has taken an active role in assisting credit unions in the United States in better performing

their role in helping servicemen. It would appear that much of the work done by the Department of Defense would be negated if questionable financial institutions were allowed to operate through the exchange systems. Once the Department of Defense gives its approval to companies operating out of the exchange, the Department becomes a party to any sharp practices engaged in by these companies. Such a situation occurred in Okinawa where the Air Force allowed an automobile broker to sell cars on Air Force installations in return for 2 percent of the sales of the broker. The broker fraudulently obtained thousands of dollars from servicemen but failed to deliver the cars. The servicemen dealt with this company because they felt since the Air Force had allowed the company to operate on the post that it must have been a reliable firm. Such a situation could easily occur if additional finance companies and other financial institutions are allowed to operate out of exchanges.

It would be appreciated if your office would give careful consideration to the advisability of expanding the financing program in exchange systems and to the desirability of continuing renewal of existing contracts.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

VICE PRESIDENT CONDEMNS TRIAL OF CITIZENS OF SOUTH-WEST AFRICA BY COURTS OF SOUTH AFRICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I have obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include the full text of statements, first, by the Vice President of the United States and the permanent Ambassador to the United Nations on the trial of citizens of South-West Africa in the courts of South Africa which later resulted in their conviction and sentencing to long terms of imprisonment; second, by the court of South Africa prior to the rendering of its verdict; and, third, by one of the defendants before the Supreme Court of South Africa on February 1, 1968.

There follows excerpts from the remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on January 6, 1968:

On the third anniversary of the OAU, President Johnson set forth our position: "The foreign policy of the United States," the President said, "is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country and we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law."

Nowhere are these rights more challenged than today in Southern Africa.

The case of South West Africa is but one case in point. But it contains all the elements of tragedy which characterize this situation.

My government, through all legal and practical means, has tried—both alone and together with other members of the United Nations—to persuade South Africa to change her policies and practices with respect to South West Africa. We shall persist in these efforts.

In 1966, we joined the majority of the United Nations General Assembly in declaring that South Africa had failed to carry out the terms of the mandate over South West Africa. And that the UN henceforth assumed responsibility for the territory.

The South African government is now trying 32 citizens of South West Africa—originally 37—on charges of terrorism.

This trial is being conducted in Pretoria, over 1,000 miles from the homes of the accused. The charges—made under a South African law enacted as much as a year after the alleged crime—could lead to sentences of death.

That trial is a farce. It is based on a law that provided for the retroactive political persecution of wards of the international community. It raises fundamental questions regarding international norms of behavior.

Great legal and human issues are involved here. We believe that the rights and well-being of the 32 are the legitimate concern of all the international community.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the early days of American independence: "All eyes are opened or opening to the rights of man . . . the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God."

FULL TEXT OF AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S STATEMENT TO U.N.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the statement of Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. representative to the United Nations, in plenary, concerning South-West Africa, December 14, 1967:

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S STATEMENT TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America). Mr. President, before I begin my statement I should like to say to you how pleased I am to have this opportunity to make it while you are in the Chair.

The position of the United Nations regarding the relationship between South Africa and South West Africa is clear. It was expressed in the overwhelming approval of the General Assembly's resolution on this question more than a year ago. That resolution which the United States fully supported was, as I said at the time, intrinsically sound. South Africa's own actions in breach of its obligations, its disavowal of the mandate, and its disregard of the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice provided the basis for the General Assembly's decision that South Africa's mandate for South West Africa was terminated and that henceforth South West Africa came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. It is on the basis of this decision that the United Nations has subsequently acted. Members of the United Nations have not always agreed with unanimity on courses of action, but uppermost in our minds have always been the rights of the inhabitants of South West Africa, and the obligations of the international community not only to preserve those rights, but also to seek their full enjoyment for the inhabitants.

Now, if South Africa's own actions led to the forfeit of her rights in South West Africa and formed the basis of the United Nations decision to terminate South Africa's man-

date, what have been South Africa's subsequent actions? Unquestionably, the actions of the South African Government since 27 October 1966, reaffirm the wisdom of the General Assembly's decision and constitute the best refutation of South Africa's hollow and unconvincing contention that it administer South West Africa "in the spirit of the Mandate entrusted to it by the League of Nations, and has no intention of abdicating its responsibilities towards the people of South West Africa."

South African proposals earlier this year to impose and promote the fragmentation of the Territory under the guise of self-determination and to achieve piecemeal annexation under the guise of administrative efficiency must be opposed because of their potential long-term harmful effect. South Africa's imposition in South West Africa of its universally condemned policy of apartheid should be a matter of deep concern for all of us. Moreover, these proposals represent clear defiance of the General Assembly's wise injunction that South Africa refrain and desist from any action, constitutional, administrative, political, or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the present international status of South West Africa.

I should like to analyze in some detail the atrocious Terrorism Act, under which thirty-seven South West Africans were charged and brought to trial under conditions which are repugnant to all who believe in justice under law. This Act is significant because of its immediate implication in terms of human lives and its long-run effect in terms of an attempt to break the will of South West Africans to achieve their right of self-determination. The Act, promulgated after South Africa's lawful authority for the Territory had terminated, represents not only South African defiance of the United Nations, but also further proof of South Africa's determination to flout the spirit and terms of the League of Nations Mandate.

Three months ago, on 12 September, the Special Committee of this Assembly called upon the South African Government to release the accused immediately. That Government has ignored that call. At that time, the United States representative, noting that neither lawlessness nor the absence of a lawfully functioning independent judiciary could be contemplated, succinctly stated the reasons why the application of the Terrorism Act to South West Africa was inadmissible. It is still inadmissible. And because it is inadmissible, I have no hesitancy in commenting on this prosecution, which, under ordinary rules, since the matter would be *sub judice*, would not be an appropriate matter for discussion.

In the twenty-year discussion of apartheid in the United Nations, United States representatives frequently have had occasion to comment on legislation passed to implement apartheid. Surely the Terrorism Act rivals the worst of the legislation and, as long as it exists, constitutes a self-repudiation of South Africa's claim to a tradition of respect for the rule of law. Lest some say that this judgment is too harsh, let the terms of the Act speak for themselves:

1. It is retroactive to so-called "offences" performed five years ago.

2. It places upon the accused the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that he did not perform acts, harmless in themselves, with the intent to commit a crime.

3. It subjects persons found guilty of what South Africa calls "terroristic activities" to the penalty provided for treason—death by hanging—or, in any case, imprisonment for life or for not less than five years.

4. It authorizes any commissioned police officer to arrest without warrant persons he believes may have violated the Act or who might be useful as potential witnesses, and to detain them indefinitely, without bail,

without recourse to the courts or counsel and without the right to receive visits from family or friends.

5. It allows the Government to try jointly persons accused of separate violations, thereby permitting the guilt of the accused to be judged in a mass trial.

6. It permits a person acquitted of one charge to be tried again on other charges arising out of the same acts.

7. Finally it defines offences with such vagueness as to approach absurdity, if its consequences were not so serious. For example, any person who intentionally "embarrass(es)" the administration of the affairs of the State or who encourages "feelings of hostility between the White and other inhabitants of the Republic" is a "terrorist." Other offences which might otherwise be misdemeanours—for example, obstructing traffic—are likewise made subject to a hanging sentence.

It is the nature of this Act and its unconstitutionality in the court of human and public opinion that compels my comments today, as I have said, in a case on which normally I would not comment because it is *sub judice*.

Who are the defendants at present being tried under this Act? Why were they held without charge, incommunicado and in solitary confinement for up to 400 days? What is the significance of their trial 1,000 miles from their homes in a court guarded by stung armed policemen and police dogs? In the answers to these questions are the principal elements of the tragedy of South West Africa. They illuminate the whole range of the problem before the General Assembly today.

Those defendants are not well known like Nelson Mandela or the Nobel Peace Prize winner, the late lamented Chief Albert Luthuli. However, they too are men who have sought a future for their homeland in which they and the overwhelming majority, who are non-white, may participate in governing their own affairs, free from the restrictions and the discrimination of apartheid. In most democratic societies they would be able to pursue their goals through speeches and publications and would not be subject to hanging under the gross charge of "embarrassing" the Government or promoting a "spirit of hostility."

But to seek the goals of free men in the international Territory of South West Africa is to be subjected to increasing restrictions, culminating in this declaration of terror by the South Africa Parliament on 12 June 1967. Out of these restrictions grows desperation and in that desperation some have found no alternative to violence as an expression of the determination to be free.

The United States does not condone violence. The United States does condemn the brutality of a Government whose official policies have bred violence by closing avenues of peaceful dissent in South West Africa, thereby generating the very behaviour it seeks to punish.

Most disconcerting of all is the possibility that the full story has not been told, since international opinion stands in the way. How many South West Africans who have committed the "crime" of desiring to attain elementary human rights are being held without charge in solitary or other confinement, without knowledge of family, without access to counsel, with no hope of fair trial except under conditions of spurious legality? How many others, if finally brought to trial, will find that serious suggestions of assault during detention are ignored on the basis of a bald denial by a prosecution witness?

As a Member of this international community, however, we have a right and a responsibility, expressed in our co-sponsorship and support of the resolution before us

in document A/L.536, to call upon the South African Government to provide us with complete and straightforward answers. We have a right and a responsibility to call upon the South African Government to halt those prosecutions, to release and repatriate those South West Africans and to cease the illegal application of that Act in the Territory. This we do with all the vigour at our command.

I would not wish to conclude my statement tonight without referring to the extreme and ridiculous allegations which we have heard in the past several days with regard to the implementation by the United States of the United Nations embargo on the supply of arms and military equipment to South Africa. My country has adhered scrupulously to the terms of that embargo. Despite this unequivocal position, which I reaffirm, on the implementation of the Security Council's resolution on the shipment of arms and military material the United States has been falsely cited by two delegations during this debate for alleged violations in this field. I should like to mention those allegations and insinuations briefly and to refute them categorically.

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that the United States and certain other countries "... continue to deliver bombers to the South African racists, as well as air-to-air missiles and various types of small arms" (1628th meeting, p. 57).

It is significant that the Soviet delegation did not provide—nor could it—any details on this sweeping allegation either in the statement from which I have quoted or in its earlier statement on South West Africa. On earlier occasions when similar statements have been made my delegation has directly challenged the Soviet representative to furnish details—details which the Soviet delegation never has provided and could not provide. Those charges were fabricated out of thin air. It is obviously impossible for the Soviet Union to provide details because they do not exist. Faced with that fact, other delegations have resorted to inference and insinuation rather than direct statements such as the one I have quoted. The representative of Hungary, speaking on 11 December 1967, said that: "According to press reports in March 1967, the South African Army and Air Force were interested in an American executive aircraft" (1624th meeting, p. 46).

I cannot confirm or deny exactly what possible purchases interest South African military authorities, but I can deny categorically the suggestion, which the representative of Hungary obviously sought to get across, that the United States is furnishing such aircraft. We are not furnishing any such aircraft to South Africa.

These citations serve to illustrate the extent to which the delegation of the Soviet Union and other Communist delegations with similar intentions go in their frantic efforts to use the debate on South West Africa as one more device for launching attacks on the United States.

While the United States and other countries continue to enforce strictly an embargo on the sale of arms and military equipment to South Africa, that country continues to receive large quantities of modern and sophisticated weapons. The real sources of those weapons are not mentioned by the Soviet representative. Those who criticize the United States, which scrupulously enforces the embargo, might better direct themselves to those countries which do not do so and to ways by which the embargo might be made more effective.

The Assembly's action on South West Africa last autumn was historic, ending a long-standing mandate for just and good cause. The United States will do its utmost, as I promised from this rostrum, by all appropriate and peaceful means to help carry

through to fruition the aims which are so broadly shared and which are embodied in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). We will provide full and faithful support to the people of South West Africa in the peaceful pursuit of their goals, in their efforts to assert and to exercise fully the rights to which all men everywhere aspire and are entitled.

REMARKS OF TRIAL JUDGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, continuing in my account of the trial of South-West Africans in the courts of South Africa, I extend my remarks to include the remarks of Judge Ludorf on sentencing in the trial of the 37:

On January 26th when announcing his findings on the guilt of the 30 accused, the Trial Court Judge said, addressing Advocate Phillips (for defense):

Mr. Phillips, I am prepared to grant the remand that you seek for the purpose of leading evidence in mitigation after you have had an opportunity of considering the judgment.

I think, however, that it would simplify your task and possibly shorten the proceedings if I indicate to you now what my basic approach to the question of sentence is.

In my view it has been proved that the accused, because of the level of their civilization became the easy misguided dupes of communist indoctrination. Had it not been for the active financial and practical assistance which the accused received from the Governments of Moscow, Peking and other countries, they would never have found themselves in their present predicament. I also think that had it not been for loud-mouthed moral support and incitement by representatives of foreign countries and the persons who published SWAPO newsletters, who have absolutely no respect for the truth, the accused would never have embarked, on their futile and ill-conceived exploits.

It also weighs with me that all the crimes whereof the accused have been convicted on the main count were committed before the Act was passed by Parliament and that this is the first trial in which persons are charged with a contravention of the Act because of the retroactive effect thereof.

For these reasons I have decided not to impose the death penalty in the case of any one of the accused. I will, however, take into account the common law offences which the accused have been proved to have committed in the assessment of the appropriate sentence, although they were not so charged.

MOVING ADDRESS BY CONVICTED DEFENDANT TO COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we who are so fortunate as to live in a land where our legal rights and civil liberties are protected and cherished, sometimes need reminding of our bless-

ings. We who enjoy freedom of speech and representative government may forget that there are people elsewhere in the world less fortunate. Often they are forced to suffer in silence, but occasionally the veil is lifted a trifle and a voice is heard crying out for help for the afflicted.

This happened recently in Pretoria where 37 South-West Africans have been charged by South Africa under an act so unjust that it offends accepted civilized legal principles and grossly violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

One of the defendants, Mr. Toivo Herman Ja Toiva, after being pronounced guilty, addressed the court in mitigation of sentence. He made such an eloquent statement that I am placing it in the Record. It captures the essence of his plight, a plight which this Government has repeatedly protested. His is the plea of a people struggling to be free. Unfortunately his plea so far has had little effect on the South African Government. On February 9 the judge sentenced Mr. Toiva to 20 years in jail and 19 others to life imprisonment.

We can only hope that the censure of world opinion might yet persuade the Government of South Africa in the direction of clemency.

I am privileged to have the full text of Mr. Ja Toiva's moving address to present for reading by my colleagues and by the people of our country:

STATEMENT OF TOIVO HERMAN JA TOIVA BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA, TRANSVAAL PROVINCIAL DIVISION, ON FEBRUARY 1, 1968

My Lord, we find ourselves here in a foreign country, convicted under laws made by people whom we have always considered as foreigners. We find ourselves tried by a judge who is not our countryman and who has not shared our background.

When this case started, Counsel tried to show that this court had no jurisdiction to try us. What they had to say was of a technical and legal nature. The reasons may mean little to some of us, but it is the deep feeling of all of us that we should not be tried here in Pretoria.

You, my Lord, decided that you had the right to try us, because your Parliament gave you that right. That ruling has not and could not have changed our feelings. We are Namibians and not South Africans. We do not now, and will not in the future recognize your right to govern us; to make laws for us in which we had no say; to treat our country as if it were your property and us as if you were our masters. We have always regarded South Africa as an intruder in our country. This is how we have always felt and this is how we feel now, and it is on this basis that we have faced this trial.

I speak of "we" because I am trying to speak not only for myself, but for others as well, and especially for those of my fellow accused who have not had the benefit of any education. I think also that when I say "we" the overwhelming majority of non-white people in South West Africa would like to be included.

We are far away from our homes; not a single member of our families has come to visit us, never mind be present at our trial. The Pretoria jail, the police headquarters at Compol, where we were interrogated and where statements were extracted from us, and this court is all we have seen of Pretoria. We have been cut off from our people and the world. We all wondered whether the headmen would have repeated some of their

lies if our people had been present in court to hear them.

The South African Government has again shown its strength by detaining us for as long as it pleased; keeping some of us in solitary confinement for 300 to 400 days and bringing us to its capital to try us. It has shown its strength by passing an act especially for us and having it made retrospective. It has even chosen an ugly name to call us by. One's own are called patriots, or at least rebels; your opponents are called terrorists.

A court can only do justice in political cases if it understands the position of those that it has in front of it. The state has not only wanted to convict us, but also to justify the policy of the South African Government. We will not even try to present the other side of the picture, because we know that a court has not suffered in the same way as we have, can not understand us. This is perhaps why it is said that one should be tried by one's equals. We have felt from the very time of our arrest that we were not being tried by our equals but by our masters, and that those who have brought us to trial very often do not even do us the courtesy of calling us by our surnames. Had we been tried by our equals, it would not have been necessary to have any discussion about grievances. They would have been known to those set to judge us.

It suits the Government of South Africa to say that it is ruling South West Africa with the consent of the people. This is not true. Our organization, South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), is the largest political organization in South West Africa. We consider ourselves a political party. We know that whites do not think of blacks as politicians—only as agitators. Many of our people, through no fault of their own, have had no education at all. This does not mean that they do not know what they want. A man does not have to be formally educated to know that he wants to live with his family where he wants to live, and not where an official chooses to tell him to live; to move about freely and not require a pass; to earn a decent wage; to be free to work for the person of his choice for as long as he wants; and finally, to be ruled by the people that he wants to be ruled by, and not those who rule him because they have more guns than he has.

Our grievances are called "so-called" grievances. We do not believe South Africa is in South West Africa in order to provide facilities and work for non-whites. It is there for its own selfish reasons. For the first forty years it did practically nothing to fulfill its "sacred trust". It only concerned itself with the welfare of the whites. Since 1962 because of the pressure from inside by the non-whites and especially my organization, and because of the limelight placed on our country by the world, South Africa has been trying to do a bit more. It rushed the Bantustan Report so that it would at least have something to say at the World Court.

Only one who is not white and has suffered the way we have can say whether our grievances are real or "so-called".

Those of us who have some education, together with our uneducated brethren, have always struggled to get freedom. The idea of our freedom is not liked by South Africa. It has tried in this court to prove through the mouths of a couple of its paid chiefs and a paid official that SWAPO does not represent the people of South West Africa. If the Government of South Africa were sure that SWAPO did not represent the innermost feelings of the people in South West Africa, it would not have taken the trouble to make it impossible for SWAPO to advocate its peaceful policy.

South African officials want to believe that SWAPO is an irresponsible organization and that it is an organization that resorts to the

level of telling people not to get vaccinated. As much as white South Africans may want to believe this, this is not SWAPO. We sometimes feel that is what the Government would like SWAPO to be. It may be true that some member or even members of SWAPO somewhere refused to do this. The reason for such refusal is that some people in our part of the world have lost confidence in the governors of our country and they are not prepared to accept even the good that they are trying to do.

Your Government, my Lord, undertook a very special responsibility when it was awarded the Mandate over us after the First World War. It assumed a sacred trust to guide us towards independence and to prepare us to take our place among the nations of the world. We believe that South Africa has abused that trust because of its belief in racial supremacy (that white people have been chosen by God to rule the world) and Apartheid. We believe that for fifty years South Africa has failed to promote the development of our people. Where are our trained men? The wealth of our country has been used to train your people for leadership and the sacred duty of preparing the indigenous people to take their place among the nations of the world has been ignored.

I know of no case in the last twenty years of a parent who did not want his child to go to school if the facilities were available. But even if, as it was said, a small percentage of parents wanted their children to look after cattle, I am sure that South Africa was strong enough to impose its will on this, as it has done in so many other respects. To us it has always seemed that our rulers wanted to keep us backward for their benefit.

1963 for us was to be the year of our freedom. From 1960 it looked as if South Africa could not oppose the world forever. The world is important to us. In the same way as all laughed in court when they heard that an old man tried to bring down a helicopter with a bow and arrow, we laughed when South Africa said that it would oppose the world. We knew that the world was divided, but as time went on it at least agreed that South Africa had no right to rule us.

I do not claim that it is easy for men of different races to live at peace with one another. I myself had no experience of this in my youth, and at first it surprised me that men of different races could live together in peace. But now I know it to be true and to be something for which we must strive. The South African Government creates hostility by separating people and emphasizing their differences. We believe that by living together people will learn to lose their fear of each other. We also believe that this fear which some of the whites have of Africans is based on their desire to be superior and privileged and that when whites see themselves as part of South West Africa, sharing with us all its hopes and troubles, then that fear will disappear. Separation is said to be a natural process. But why, then, is it imposed by force, and why then is it that whites have the superiority?

Headmen are used to oppress us. This is not the first time that foreigners have tried to rule indirectly.—We know that only those who are prepared to do what their masters tell them become headmen. Most of those who had some feeling for their people and who wanted independence have been intimidated into accepting the policy from above. Their guns and sticks are used to make people say they support them.

I have come to know that our people cannot expect progress as a gift from anyone, be it the United Nations or South Africa. Progress is something we shall have to struggle and work for. And I believe that the only way in which we shall be able and fit to secure that progress is to learn from our own experience and mistakes.

Your Lordship emphasized in your judgment the fact that our arms came from Communist countries, and also that words commonly used by Communists were to be found in our documents. But My Lord, in the documents produced by the State there is another type of language. It appears even more often than the former. Many documents finish up with an appeal to the Almighty to guide us in our struggle for freedom. It is the wish of the South African Government that we should be discredited in the Western world. This is why it calls our struggle a Communist plot; but this will not be believed by the world. The world knows that we are not interested in ideologies.

We feel that the world as a whole has a special responsibility towards us. This is because the land of our fathers was handed over to South Africa by a world body. It is a divided world, but it is a matter of hope for us that it at least agrees about one thing—that we are entitled to freedom and justice.

Other mandated territories have received their freedom. The judgment of the World Court was a bitter disappointment to us. We felt betrayed and we believed that South Africa would never fulfill its trust. Some felt that we would secure our freedom only by fighting for it. We knew that the power of South Africa is overwhelming, but we also knew that our case is a just one and our situation intolerable—why should we not also receive our freedom?

We are sure that the world's efforts to help us in our plight will continue, whatever South Africans may call us.

We do not expect that independence will end our troubles, but we do believe that our people are entitled—as are all peoples—to rule themselves. It is not really a question of whether South Africa treats us well or badly, but that South West Africa is our country and we wish to be our own masters.

There are some who will say that they are sympathetic with [our cause, but unwilling to condone] violence. I would answer that I am not by nature a man of violence and I believe that violence is a sin against God and my fellow men. SWAPO itself was a non-violent organization, but the South African Government is not truly interested in whether opposition is violent or non-violent. It does not wish to hear any opposition to Apartheid. Since 1963, SWAPO meetings have been banned. It is true that it is the tribal authorities who have done so, but they worked with the South African Government, which has never lifted a finger in favor of political freedom. We have found ourselves voteless in our own country and deprived of the right to meet and state our own political opinions.

Is it surprising that in such times my countrymen have taken up arms? Violence is truly fearsome, but who would not defend his property and himself against a robber? And we believe that South Africa has robbed us of our country.

I have spent my life working in SWAPO, which is an ordinary political party like any other. Suddenly we in SWAPO found that a war situation had arisen and that our colleagues and South Africa were facing each other in the field of battle. Although I had not been responsible for organizing my people militarily and although I believed we were unwise to fight the might of South Africa while we were so weak, I could not refuse to help them when the time came.

My Lord, you found it necessary to brand me a coward. During the Second World War, when it became evident that both my country and your country were threatened by the dark clouds of Nazism, I risked my life for both of them, wearing a uniform with orange bands on it.

But some of your countrymen when called

¹ Unclear in transmission, assumed.

to battle to defend civilization resorted to sabotage against their own fatherland. I volunteered to face German bullets, and as a guard of military installations, both in South West Africa and the Republic, was prepared to be the victim of their sabotage. Today they are our masters and are considered the heroes, and I am called the coward.

When I consider my country, I am proud that my countrymen have taken up arms for their people and I believe that anyone who calls himself a man would not despise them.

In 1964 the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) in South Africa were suppressed. This convinced me that we were too weak to face South Africa's force by waging battle. When some of my country's soldiers came back I foresaw the trouble there would be for SWAPO, my people and me personally. I tried to do what I could to prevent my people from going into the bush. In my attempts I became unpopular with some of my people, but this, too, I was prepared to face. Decisions of this kind are not easy to make. My loyalty is to my country. My organization could not work properly—it could not even hold meetings. I had no answer to the question "Where has your non-violence got us?" Whilst the World Court judgment was pending, I at least had that to fall back on. When we failed, after years of waiting, I had no answer to give to my people.

Even though I did not agree that people should go into the bush, I could not refuse to help them when I knew that they were hungry.

I even passed on the request for dynamite. It was not an easy decision. Another man might have been able to say "I will have nothing to do with that sort of thing." I was not, and I could not remain a spectator in the struggle of my people for their freedom.

I am a loyal Namibian and I could not betray my people to their enemies. I admit that I decided to assist those who had taken up arms. I know that the struggle will be long and bitter. I also know that my people will wage that struggle, whatever the cost.

Only when we are granted our independence will the struggle stop. Only when our human dignity is restored to us, as equals of the whites, will there be peace between us.

We believe that South Africa has a choice—either to live at peace with us or to subdue us by force. If you choose to crush us and impose your will on us then you not only betray your trust, but you will live in security for only so long as your power is greater than ours. No South African will live at peace in South West Africa, for each will know his security is based on force and that without force he will face rejection by the people of South West Africa.

My co-accused and I have suffered. We are not looking forward to our imprisonment. We do not, however, feel that our efforts and sacrifice have been wasted. We believe that human suffering has its effect even on those who impose it. We hope that what has happened will persuade the whites of South Africa that we and the world may be right and they may be wrong. Only when white South Africans realize this and act on it, will it be possible for us to stop our struggle for freedom and justice in the land of our birth.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOMEN MARINES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I speak with pardonable pride today of the pending 25th anniversary of the women marines as we know them today. Legislation initially sponsored by our late beloved Representative from Minnesota, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, and signed into law on February 13, 1943, is a quarter-century old this month.

Contributing largely to the reputation which the women marines have rightly earned for dedicated service over the past 25 years is the leadership and inspiration provided by the women who have served as their Directors. Three of these—Col. Ruth Cheney Streeter, their first Director, Col. Julia E. Hamblet, and Col. Barbara J. Bishop, who heads them today—come from Massachusetts. Colonel Streeter was born at Brookline, Colonel Hamblet in Winchester, and Colonel Bishop in Boston.

In 1943, women joined the Marine Corps to "Free a Marine To Fight." Today's woman marine enlists to serve her country, as did the many hundreds before her; and, like them, she does her job well.

"Free a Marine To Fight" was their World War II recruiting slogan, and the women lived up to it. Within a year of activation, Women Reserves were serving at every major Marine Corps installation in the United States—in more than 200 different specialist assignments. Besides the expected clerical jobs, they were working in communications, quartermaster, post exchange, motor transport, food services, personnel, intelligence, administration, recruiting, community relations, education, legal assistance, and photography. In aviation, their skills ranged from parachute rigger to Link trainer instructor, to aerologist, to control tower operator.

Within another 4 months, women accounted for 85 percent of the enlisted strength of Marine Corps headquarters and from one-half to two-thirds of all permanent personnel at major posts and stations in the United States. When regulations limiting them to stateside duty were relaxed, the first contingent of Women Reserves arrived at Hawaii; and before the war was over, nearly a thousand women had served with the Marine Garrison Forces at Pearl Harbor and at the air station at nearby Ewa.

Exactly how many marines the Women Reserves freed to fight was often a subject for speculation. Their peak World War II strength—nearly 19,000—approximated the size of a Marine Corps division, and Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, the second wartime Commandant of the marines, once remarked that the Women Reserves could "feel responsible for putting the 6th Marine Division in the field; for without the women filling the jobs throughout the Marine Corps, there would not have been sufficient men available to form that division."

In 1946, when the war was over, the women's units were quickly demobilized; but a small nucleus of trained women was retained to set up a postwar organization through which an expanded Women's Reserve could be rapidly and efficiently activated should the need arise again.

From 1946 until passage of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of June 12, 1948, there were no more than a hundred volunteer women on active duty with the corps. Then, with authority to accept women into the regular Marine Corps, came a slow but gradual buildup of women's units until, when Korean war broke out, 13 organized Woman Reserve platoons were called up for duty when the male Reserves were mobilized in the summer of 1950. Although their numbers did not approach their World War II strength, these women marines—like their predecessors—freed marines for combat duty.

Today, with the Marine Corps heavily committed in Southeast Asia, its women continue in their traditional role—not only in stateside jobs, but in overseas assignments undreamed of by those who set the tradition of freeing marines to fight. Within the past 3 years, women marines have seen duty in England, France, Germany, Italy, Panama, and in the Dominican Republic. Hawaii, long their most distant outpost, has become a stopover for women on the way to duty in the Philippines, Japan, Okinawa, and South Vietnam.

On last November 8, when President Johnson signed into law a bill giving women in the armed services equal promotion opportunity with their male counterparts, he remarked:

Our Armed Forces literally could not operate effectively or efficiently without our women. So, both as President, and as the Commander in Chief, I am very pleased and very proud to have this measure sent to me by the Congress.

Such high tribute to their worth stands as inspiration to all women marines as they enter their silver anniversary year. But, with or without recognition—and this truth they have already proved—so long as marines must defend freedom by force of arms, women marines will stand fast in the tradition that is as old as their service, freeing marines to fight.

The country is proud of these women marines, just as they have shown by their lives their pride in their country. Fully accepted by the men whose marine green uniform they have shared with distinction for 25 years, today's women marines deserve our happiest felicitations and best wishes. A grateful nation marks the passage of time in which they have been, like the men of the corps, "Semper Fidelis."

I am indeed happy to salute the women marines and ask that my colleagues share with me the pleasure of doing them honor.

In my remarks, I include a copy of a letter I have sent to Col. Barbara J. Bishop, U.S. Marine Corps, Director of Women Marines:

COL. BARBARA J. BISHOP, USMC,
Director of Women Marines,
Headquarters Marine Corps,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLONEL BISHOP: Observing with interest the approaching Silver Anniversary of the Women Marines, I wish to take this opportunity to extend to you, and to all Women Marines past and present, my sincere best wishes for continuing success in your service to your Corps and Country.

Since the founding of the United States Marine Corps Women's Reserve on February

13, 1943, the dedication to duty shown by the women of the Marine Corps has earned the respect and admiration of all those who are aware of their splendid contribution to the spirit and traditions of the United States Marine Corps.

I am particularly proud to note that of the five women who have headed the Women Marines since 1943, three are from my own home State. Massachusetts gave the Women's Reserve its first Director in the person of Colonel Ruth Cheney Streeter, who was born in Brookline. Colonel Julia E. Hamblet, youngest director of women in the armed services, who served two terms as your Director—first as a Woman Reserve and later as a Regular—was born in Winchester, Massachusetts. And you, entering your fifth year as Director of Women Marines, claim Boston as your place of birth. Massachusetts can be just proud of three such illustrious daughters, and indeed of all its women (and they are many) who have served our Country in the uniform of the United States Marines.

I hope you will convey to your Women Marines, gathered to celebrate their Twenty-fifth Anniversary, my heartiest congratulations and a fully merited "Well Done" for their contribution to the defense of our Nation.

Most sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK.

PRESIDENT'S ANTICRIME PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues who have already praised President Johnson's omnibus anticrime message. The President's forceful and succinct statement on one of the crucial issues confronting urban America, documents without doubt the commitment he holds for improving the quality of our citizens' lives.

Of particular interest to me is the President's recommendation that the model cities program be required to include crime prevention and control plans in the proposals of those presently designated cities as well as those designated later. As a representative of East St. Louis, one of the 63 cities selected, I am pleased by the recommendation. As one of the four cities which has had its work program approved, I am happy to report that East St. Louis' 5-year master plan contains provisions for a model anticrime program, which includes a proposal for improving police-community relations, one of the keystones of any well-designed anticrime program.

I look forward to the implementation of President Johnson's program in East St. Louis.

MOVEMENT NEEDED IN MIDDLE EAST DISPUTE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since my recent attendance in England at the Ditchley House Conference on the Middle East and a subsequent trip to several countries of that area, I have a heightened sense of the dangerous nature of the Arab-Israel impasse, a new realization of the perils which its continuance holds for the United States and a strong conviction that its settlement is urgently necessary.

Not only is the resolution of this dispute desirable in itself, but its continuance has implications for the future security of U.S. interests in the area that must cause us serious concern.

The United Nations has voted a resolution which furnishes the broad basis upon which a settlement may be founded. Of course, it is somewhat general in its language, but this is necessarily so since any initial proposal for a settlement of any dispute must leave room for changes of position and changes of language. This being said, however, this British resolution—which is essentially the same as a resolution previously offered by the United States—contains all the basic points at dispute between the parties. These include establishment of boundaries, recognition of status, freedom of navigation, and settlement of the refugee problem.

It is true that some of the problems will be difficult to solve and agreement will be hard to achieve, but the point which I wish to make is that some movement of the parties toward solution is necessary and time is of the essence.

The passage of time, unfortunately, has not here—as in some cases—brought a relaxation of tensions, but rather an increase. Feelings on both sides remain strong. The U.S.S.R. has spent billions of dollars rearming the Arab States and training their armies on the one side and on the other, the Israelis have destroyed United Arab Republic refineries and have fired upon Egyptian ships in the Suez Canal. Whether rightly or wrongly done, these acts demonstrate that the fires of potential combat burn close to the surface and may flame into a conflagration at any time.

Under the U.N. resolution, Gunnar Jarring is presently in the Middle East and has been there since December 12, 1967. He has talked with various parties to the war of June 5 and has sought to elicit statements of position which might form the first faint foundation for a settlement. In fact, the immediate objective is to gain some recognition for his commission since Israel questions its competence to act in the controversy, it being the position of that nation that face-to-face talks with the Arab nations must be held to provide greater assurance that any agreements reached will have sanction and permanence.

I regret to say that the Jarring mission has accomplished little in the way of achieving a start of discussions. The Arabs insist on Israel withdrawal to the boundaries of June 5, 1967. The Israelis insist on face-to-face discussions without any intermediary, meaning Mr. Jarring. It seems clear to me that these posi-

tions will not be accepted by the opposite parties to the dispute. Therefore, unless one believes in the continuation of the present impasse—and there are elements on both sides who for differing reasons advocate its continuance—it is clear that some change of position will be necessary if a resolution is ever to be achieved.

I restate my belief, then, that time is not on the side of agreement. Solutions that were possible 6 months ago are feasible no longer. Public opinion is not what it was in June or July. A return of the Jarring mission to the U.N. with a report of "no cooperation" will not enhance the standing of the recalitrants.

I believe that a negotiated settlement of this dispute is essential for the peace of the area and the world. A continuation of the present impasse holds increasing promise of renewed and more extensive hostilities as time goes by and attitudes harden and passions rise. There still is a chance to get the wheels turning but it decreases in scope every day that passes.

I feel that it would be a tragedy if Mr. Jarring were to come back to the U.N. with empty hands and report that there was no disposition to even talk about a settlement. The Arab States might then move to implement the resolution with French and Russian support. It seems to me urgently to be desired that both sides search their consciences to see whether or not some possibility exists that a beginning of discussions may be had. In private labor disputes, we say that the parties should "bargain collectively in good faith." That is a fair statement of the objective here. And just as the failure to reach agreement through collective bargaining results in strikes which are disastrous to all concerned, so here a continuation of intransigence may eventually end in a wider and more deadly conflict, that might well not be limited to the parties to last year's dispute, but might draw in the major powers, including the United States.

I suggest, too, that our Government forcibly assert its belief that negotiations are vital for world peace and that the parties should set about reexamining their positions and that Mr. Jarring should be sent back to the U.N. with evidence of material progress.

It is my belief that responsible people on both sides want a resolution of this dispute and the achievement of standards that will have some guarantee of permanency.

I am confident that great progress can be made in this direction if action is taken now. Perhaps neither side will achieve its maximum demands, but such is never the case in peaceful negotiations, and it certainly is never the case in resolution by war. On the other hand, a real attempt at negotiation under the auspices of the U.N. and with its results protected by U.N. sanction should bring a more acceptable arrangement than has previously existed and one which will have less potential for future trouble.

LET US IMPROVE OUR SPENDING AND BUDGET PRACTICES

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal crisis that presently confronts our Government emphasizes with particular clarity the need to establish priorities for the expenditure of the limited funds at the Nation's disposal and the need for a constant reevaluation of the objects and programs on which money is to be spent.

In the executive branch, personnel and programs become entrenched and annual appropriation requests, each higher than the last, are routinely made. While congressional scrutiny may from time to time focus upon particular activities, there is little sustained effort made to determine the effectiveness of, and necessity for, executive programs and the relation of their cost to the total budget. As a member of the Government Operations Committee, I am well aware of the vital role that legislative oversight can play in this area, but all too often, it is only after great waste and damage have resulted in a public outcry that any inquiry is undertaken.

We have, moreover, recently been made aware of the lack of coordination in the work of the various appropriations subcommittees. It would seem from what we have been told that there is little opportunity for each subcommittee to assess the effect of its action in the light of what its fellows have done and in terms of overall expenditures for the year.

The meat-axe approach to expenditure reduction has often been deplored, but never abandoned. Use of this method is encouraged by the relative ease and lack of discrimination with which it can be exercised.

All this suggests the need for an independent panel to develop spending priorities and to evaluate programs in a periodic, orderly, and rational manner. I am therefore introducing today, legislation aimed at creating such a body and I hope that it will receive speedy and favorable consideration from the House.

NOT MEANT TO BE POPULAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the fact that the popularity of the United States is at an all-time low throughout the world. We should have learned the lesson long ago that our checkbook diplomacy through our foreign aid program has not bought us friends. Those we have sought to help in South Vietnam and in South Korea are not happy about our recent decisions and actions. The hour has come for us to face the fact that what is important is not popularity, but that we do what

is right and what is necessary to preserve freedom and to protect ourselves.

My friend, Mr. John Hamner, the editor of one of Florida's great daily newspapers, the Bradenton Herald, has written a very timely editorial which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial "Not Meant To Be Popular," follows:

NOT MEANT TO BE POPULAR

South Koreans are obviously angered at the United States' reaction to the Pueblo capture and the attempt by North Korean infiltrators to assassinate South Korean President Chung Hee Pak.

This anger has been spelled out officially—they don't like our private negotiations with the North Koreans to get the Americans back, and they don't like what seems, to them at least, our feeling that the Pueblo is the only one of the two outrages that's important.

South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta are giving Americans the dirty look, other reports say. So many civilians were killed or injured during American counterattacks on Viet Cong units that we're blamed for the tragic death toll.

Elsewhere, reports indicate that Americans are not the most popular people in South Vietnam in general. The war is so much more widespread and ferocious now than it was a few years back. And it appears, the Cong attacks considered, nearer an end only by nearing exhaustion of Vietnamese targets to shoot at, or rice paddies to bomb.

These are but a couple of incidents, of course. World-wide, the picture is pretty much the same.

Asians, in short, are members of the same human race as are the French, and in that human race it's a toss-up as to who dislikes America the more, the Communist nations or our friends. "Neutral" nations don't count in the contest. They're too far ahead.

But the U.S. can't shrink from the tasks of world leadership and the attempt to keep freedom as widespread as possible just because nobody likes us either very much or very long. We ought to grow up a little and stop trying to buy friendship and allies. But we ought also to grow up and realize that gold stars on the chart of world opinion aren't what counts.

Popularity isn't the national goal. Survival is. So the U.S. must learn to do what's right, when it's right, to serve that goal. And never mind who likes us or likes the decisions. The most highly regarded person at every funeral can't hear a word of the praise.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, efforts are being made at home and abroad—and this includes the Communist press—to discredit General Westmoreland.

In my opinion, these efforts are against the best interests of the United States. General Westmoreland has been given what is probably the most difficult military task that has ever been assigned to a commander of U.S. forces. He has performed well. The men he commands have performed well.

As in any war, of course, there have been pluses and minuses. To expect nothing but success against as determined a foe as we face in Vietnam under circumstances which greatly favor clandestine attack, is to expect the impossible.

We need to support our men in Vietnam, and we do. We need to support General Westmoreland under whom they serve.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has just made and to be associated with him in the sentiments expressed regarding General Westmoreland.

I think General Westmoreland has done a superb job under the most difficult circumstances imaginable.

I think that anyone who has had the opportunity to meet with him and to discuss the war in Vietnam has come away impressed by his great knowledge and his great spirit. General Westmoreland not only has a tremendous knowledge of the military, political, and economic challenges confronting us in Vietnam, but also demonstrates an inspiring spirit of determination to overcome all of the obstacles to victory in that embattled land. There may be some significance in the fact that many of the voices being heard today in criticism of General Westmoreland are voices that have led a chorus of despair and defeatism for a long time in our country. Surely these are not the voices entitled to weigh in the critical decisions on leadership for victory in Vietnam.

General Westmoreland has demonstrated his ability to rally the forces of freedom in the face of a treacherous truce-breaking attack by Communist forces, and he has remained a calm and forceful pillar of strength throughout his service in Vietnam. The Nation and free men everywhere owe him their appreciation and highest honors.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is well that we pause today to pay tribute to one of the great figures of history, and one of the great Americans of

all time, whose birthday anniversary is celebrated today—President Abraham Lincoln.

The life and history of Lincoln is one that will always live in the minds of human beings as long as mankind and history exist.

Lincoln looked to the future. Lincoln served as President under the most trying conditions, at a time when there were honest differences between our people, intense differences, and when the very Nation which is ours today was threatened with disunity and threatened with separation. But Lincoln persevered. He had faith and he had confidence.

It is unnecessary to recount the dark days of Lincoln's administrations, particularly his second administration. But they point up the loneliness of Presidents. They are the ones who must make the final decisions concerning the national interests of our country. They receive advice from countless sources, and properly so; but in the final analysis, the President of the United States, who is also the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, must make the ultimate decision.

When the decision involves extreme tension one way or the other, when it involves calculated risks, and when a decision for action or for inaction is made, the President of the United States is all the more lonely.

So projecting my mind into the minds of Presidents who have had these trying questions confronting them during the history of our country, I have said to myself, What would I do if I were in the President's position? I think I might have a little more appreciation of that than most Americans. I say this in no way lowering their appreciation. But I think I might have a little more appreciation because for 14 months after the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy I was next in line for succession to the Presidency of the United States. While the questions directly confront us in Congress, I am frank in stating that many of the problems of that period more directly confronted me because I would ask myself the question, What would I do if I were President of the United States?

So in times of tension, in times of strong emotionalism, it is time for the people to be tolerant and to withhold the statements that might, while our boys are fighting in different parts of the world, constitute shooting them in the back, so to speak. It might be well to develop an understanding mind instead of the cold, critical mind, as if war is being waged on the President of the United States, when our country is engaged in conflict elsewhere and our boys are fighting to preserve liberty in other parts of the world and for ourselves. I make that statement because if anyone thinks that if we would withdraw from South Vietnam, arrogant aggression would not take the next step, the next step, and the next step, just as Hitler did in the 1930's, they are living in a dream world of hope.

So I think it is well to pause today to pay tribute to one of our great Presidents and one of the great figures of history, not because of the political party of which he was a member, but as President

of the United States, Chief Executive of our country, who came across the pages of history at a most trying period in our Nation's history, and who—misunderstood, condemned, villified—maintained his faith and his courage, and finally he emerged with that calm, reflective, but firm leadership of his, maintaining unity in our country and making it one Nation.

So we pause today as Americans to pay tribute to the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 256)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Two weeks ago, on January 18, this agency reported to me, and to the world, that agreement had at last been reached with the Soviet Union on a complete draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty, which has been submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva for consideration by other nations, is the most significant achievement of the Agency since its establishment seven years ago.

On January 23, I forwarded to the Congress a request that the life of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency be extended for an additional three years. At that time I noted the role of the Agency in bringing us close to the final conclusion of a nonproliferation treaty, and pointed out that the treaty "is not a creation of the United States. It is not a creation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the creation of all nations, large and small. . . ."

While the United States and the Soviet Union, as Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, have had the responsibility for preparing the draft treaty, a reading of this Report will make plain the extent to which the draft has been responsive to interests and views of the nations which do not now have nuclear weapons.

In the course of a long and arduous negotiation, we have learned much of the concerns and desires of these nations. We have learned that it is not nuclear weapons they want, but security; not the destructiveness of the atom, but its benefits. We have been made aware of the depth of worldwide concern about the nuclear arms race.

The non-nuclear states have wanted their renunciation of nuclear weapons to be matched with a binding pledge by the nuclear powers to negotiate a halt in the arms race. They have not asked that the treaty require us to stop making nuclear weapons, or to divest ourselves of those now in our arsenals.

But they have asked us to pledge ourselves to move towards that ultimate goal. They feel the restraints they will voluntarily accept give them the right to such a pledge.

In drafting the non-proliferation treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union have acknowledged that right.

Under Article VI of the draft now before the Disarmament Committee, the nuclear nations will assume a solemn treaty obligation "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures regarding cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament. . . ." It is an obligation the United States will undertake with the utmost seriousness—for it continues a policy begun in 1946, when this nation offered to place its nuclear weapons under international control. We reaffirmed that obligation at Geneva when the Disarmament Conference convened there six years ago.

A reading of this Report shows clearly that the United States is pursuing a broad program of research and negotiation in fulfillment of its commitment to disarmament. The non-proliferation treaty now under consideration is another step in that direction, as the hot line and the limited test ban treaty and the outer space agreement were before it.

No nation is more aware of the perils in the increasingly expert destructiveness of our time than the United States. I believe the Soviet Union shares this awareness.

This is why we have jointly pledged our nations to negotiate towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race.

This is why the United States urgently desires to begin discussions with the Soviet Union about the buildup of offensive and defensive missiles on both sides. Such discussions—and it is important to note that the Soviet Union has agreed to them, in principle at least—will aim at finding ways to avoid another costly and futile escalation of the arms race.

Our hopes that talks will soon begin reside in our conviction that the same mutual interest reflected in earlier agreements is present here—a mutual interest in stopping the rapid accumulation and refinement of these munitions.

The obligations of the non-proliferation treaty will reinforce our will to bring an end to the nuclear arms race. The world will judge us by our performance.

The report I am forwarding today is testimony to the skill and determination with which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the leadership of Mr. William C. Foster, is supporting this nation's effort to keep the somber and grim elements of the nuclear present from obliterating the promise of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 1968.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the transportation problems of northern Virginia have been of concern to the citizens of my district for a long period of years, as I am sure comparable problems in all of Metropolitan Washington have been of concern to various Members of the House. I would hope that all of the persons interested in a coordinated system of transportation will work together to eliminate the traffic bottlenecks we have. It may be of interest to the membership to see a letter recently received by me from the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce and enclosing a resolution passed by that body on September 26, 1963. Both of these are set forth below. The problem was pressing then, it is very acute now.

VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Richmond, Va., January 31, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: I am sending you a copy of a resolution passed by our Board of Directors on September 26, 1963. We feel that this resolution is as pertinent today as it was then.

The resolution refers to the proposed Three Sisters Bridge. As you know, the Virginia Department of Highways is very much concerned with this project. Also, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, through the work of its Better Roads Committee is concerned with the development of our highway systems in Northern Virginia. The Chamber has also taken a strong stand on the development of Dulles International Airport which certainly would benefit from the Three Sisters Bridge and Interstate 66 construction in Northern Virginia.

In light of the recent developments concerning the Three Sisters Bridge, we simply want to renew our support of this project and to join with other Virginia organizations and the Virginia Department of Highways in seeking some solution to this problem.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

W. H. BOWDITCH,
President.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF
HIGHWAY FACILITIES IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA
BY THE VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas, the construction of certain vital links of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the Washington Metropolitan Area has been deferred by a Presidential Executive Order, and

Whereas, the proposed Three Sisters Bridge over the Potomac River, planned jointly by the District of Columbia and the Virginia Department of Highways, a part of Interstate Route 266 and also an essential part of the road network of Metropolitan Washington—is so affected; and

Whereas, Interstate Route 66 is being designated in Virginia to carry eight lanes of traffic from its intersection with the Dulles Access Highway in Fairfax County, to a point near the Potomac River, where two lanes are proposed to enter the District of Columbia over the Three Sisters Bridge and six lanes over the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, now under construction and restricted by law to six lanes; and

Whereas, the denial of access to the District over the Three Sisters Bridge would cause a serious traffic bottleneck in this heavily populated section of Arlington County, Virginia, already suffering from congested streets and highways; and

Whereas, the further congestion of vehicular traffic by denial of the planned outlet to

and through the District of Columbia would adversely affect the business, industrial and social life of our thriving Northern Virginia area; now, therefore,

Be it resolved that the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce strongly endorses and urges the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and all its connecting links on the Interstate System, by revoking the ordered deferment at the earliest possible date; and

Be it further resolved that the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce has no objections generally to the proposals for mass transit, but does not agree that such proposed facilities would reduce the need for highways to the extent indicated; believing on the other hand, that all of the long-planned highway system in the Northern Virginia area will be needed even if all of the proposed transit facilities are constructed; and

Be it finally resolved that copies of this resolution be submitted to President John F. Kennedy; Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges; Governor Albert S. Harrison, Jr.; Members of Congress from Virginia; the Virginia General Assembly; and the Virginia Highway Commission.

Respectfully submitted.

VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE,
By J. T. MATHEWS, President.

PROTEST RALLY IN WASHINGTON
THIS SUMMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, many years ago Adolf Hitler wrote "Mein Kampf." In it he told the world what he planned to do. He then proceeded to do what he planned. The world paid no attention to what he said until it was too late and he had plunged the world into a holocaust.

A number of years ago Frederic Engels and Karl Marx set forth the principles and objectives that the Communists were seeking worldwide. They and their successors since have proceeded to do just what Marx and Engels had said they were going to do. The world paid little attention until it was too late and we are now reaping the results of our apathy.

Last week in Washington, the Reverend Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael met for the purpose of making plans for a huge protest rally in Washington this summer. As is his usual policy, the Reverend King piously pontificates that this is going to be a non-violent demonstration; he also states that there will be civil disobedience. As is usually the case wherever one of these so-called nonviolent demonstrations is organized, it will result in violence. When this happens, King will sanctimoniously retreat to his ivory tower, after having ignited the fires that cause violence, and say he could not help it; it got out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, we have been forewarned and if the people in Washington and in the Congress do not do something to protect the civil rights of the hundreds of thousands of citizens who have the right to walk the streets in peace—who have the right to go to and from their places of business without being interfered with by these demonstrators, then we are asking for any trouble that comes.

What is it in the makeup of some people that gives them the idea that civil disobedience of the law is permissible even when, engaging in these so-called acts of civil disobedience, they are interfering with the civil rights of the great majority of our people? Mr. Speaker, no one is entitled to the right to say which of our laws he will obey and which he will disobey. Civil disobedience should be, and I submit is, in the same category as criminal disobedience. The first proponent of civil disobedience was probably Henry David Thoreau, but even Thoreau did not try to interfere with the operation of government.

One of the principal purposes of this so-called nonviolent demonstration, as stated by the Reverend Dr. King, is that these people want jobs. The figures released last week show that unemployment is at the lowest level it has been in 14 years and that employment is at the highest level it has been in that period of time. In fact, some commentators have stated that employment is at such a high rate that every person who really wants a job can get a job. Of course, everyone cannot be a bank president, but the great majority of our people of all races are today employed in jobs up to, and in many cases in excess, of their capabilities. There are too many people in this country who prefer to demonstrate rather than work, even when good paying jobs are available to all who will give an honest day's work.

Mr. Speaker, we have been warned before and suffered the consequences because we failed to heed those warnings. Is history going to repeat itself in Washington this summer? I hope and pray not.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished colleague from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. HERLONG. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it is about time that we in this Nation, and especially here in the Nation's Capital, back up our law-enforcement officers when we call upon them to protect people who walk the streets of our cities. Certainly, we should back up the law-enforcement officers of the District of Columbia and of our Federal Government when they try to protect the people of this great Capital City of ours.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in regard to people who are out of employment, if the gentleman from Florida had picked up the Washington Post of yesterday morning and had read the "help wanted ads," the gentleman would have noted that those ads covered 16 pages of that great newspaper.

So, in my opinion, if people really want to work, really want to have a job and not look to the Federal Government to train them and to pay them while they are being trained, if they really want to work, in my opinion they can find some type of employment in this city.

Mr. HERLONG. I think the distin-

guished gentleman from Florida for his contribution to this discussion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield to me?

Mr. HERLONG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with what both of my distinguished colleagues from Florida have had to say with reference to this situation. Also, I would like to say that in my opinion the metropolitan police of the District of Columbia will do a good job, more particularly, if they have the support of the President of the United States, and the Department of Justice, and of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we shall be anxiously awaiting the kind of support that will be coming from these quarters.

Mr. HERLONG. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] has seen in his State and I have seen in my great State, the State of Georgia, the results of civil disobedience, the substance of which is the breaking of laws and infringing upon the rights of others.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Florida, and I certainly hope and request that his warning be heeded.

ROBIN HOOD GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in reading the comments of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], which I suppose is the definitive defense of the actions of Mr. Eugene Foley, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in granting a certificate of competency to the Universal Fiberglass Corp., of Two Harbors, Minn. I disagree with the views of my colleague, but I must admit that he has come up with some novel theories on how government should operate. As I understand it, this is the essence of the Minnesota-oriented Robin Hood theory of government.

If there are economic problems in a district, the mere fact of their existence justifies raids on the Federal Treasury that may cost the taxpayers millions of dollars.

My Minnesota colleague also seems to argue that since he says he had a leading role in delivering a \$13,300,000 con-

tract to the Universal Fiberglass Corp. that this exonerates Mr. Neal Peterson, now a special assistant to the Vice President, of any conflict of interest because he had only a minor role as a contact man for the then Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's office.

It seems to me that my colleague is saying that since he was the major figure in this raid on the Treasury that somehow I should not point a finger of criticism at Mr. Neal D. Peterson who was only a lookout on the job for the Vice President.

I cannot accept his reasoning in this matter. Neal Peterson was the Humphrey staffer on this Universal Fiberglass Corp. case and had a responsibility to avoid any circumstances that might give the appearance that he would be anything but objective. It makes no difference whether his role was large or small, he was the Humphrey man handling this case and dealing with Congressman BLATNIK.

At the same time, Universal Fiberglass was represented by Mr. Roger A. Peterson, a brother of Neal Peterson.

I do not believe that Neal Peterson should have been handling any aspect of this case at a time when Roger Peterson was serving as a lawyer for Universal Fiberglass. This was a controversial case, and certainly it would be difficult for Neal Peterson to deal with this case in an objective manner. It would be difficult to imagine his warning either a Minnesota Senator or a Minnesota Congressman of any doubts about the prudence of a certificate of competency for a firm represented by his brother.

Does the Congressman from Minnesota believe that it is proper for Neal Peterson to handle this matter for the Humphrey office while his brother was the attorney for Universal Fiberglass? I would hope not. If he does, then I would have to say that we have vastly different opinions on the standards of ethics that should apply to Members of Congress and their staffs.

Only a few years ago, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, as Senator from Minnesota, had a great deal to say about what he considered the shocking conflicts of interest of Mr. Adolphe Wenzel in the Dixon-Yates case in the Eisenhower administration. There was no allegation that Mr. Wenzel received any money or thing of value, but he was in a dual role in advising the Government while holding a relationship with a firm that was advising the Dixon-Yates group. It was an improper relationship. I did not defend the Dixon-Yates case under a Republican administration, and I do not defend it now. I do contend that Mr. HUMPHREY, the arch critic of Dixon-Yates, should not permit Mr. Peterson to handle a matter for his office when Mr. Peterson's brother is serving as lawyer for the Universal Fiberglass Corp.

It seems to me that the Humphrey office and my colleague from Minnesota are supporting a double standard—one for the Dixon-Yates case under Republicans and another for Neal Peterson, a Minnesota Democrat.

I contend that the same standard should apply to men in both political parties.

While my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] apparently embraces the theory that the end justifies any means that must be used to attain it—no matter how brazen—he is moved to wonder about the lack of documented justification for awarding this contract.

It will be remembered that another protege of HUMPHREY—Eugene P. Foley—was responsible for issuing Universal a certificate of competency after his own experts in the Small Business Administration, as well as those of the General Services Administration, had concluded with prophetic foresight that Universal could not perform the contract.

Let me quote my colleague on this point. He said last week, here in the House, that:

The point is raised that the certificate of competency should have been backed up with papers and I agree that it should have been. Frankly, with all the detailed correspondence, negotiations, and discussions that went on over a period of months, there must be records—somebody must have documents supporting these facts.

The fact is that if there ever was a shred of proof that Universal had the technical or financial competence to perform this contract, it has been so well hidden that the able and thorough auditors of the General Accounting Office could not find it.

All they were able to find, I remind my colleague, is one brief unsigned paragraph by a phantom author reaching the conclusion, based on thin air, that Universal was competent.

I submit that this type of procedure is certainly not good Government, and I am delighted that my colleague agrees with me on this point.

I am totally opposed to this Robin Hood theory of government—this attitude that anything goes to deliver Government money or Government contracts if it can be demonstrated that there is economic hardship in a district.

Under this Robin Hood theory any questionable actions or pressures become virtuous if it can be argued that it was all done to relieve some local hardship. Under this theory the reports and recommendations of the financial experts and technicians at the GSA and the Small Business Administration are totally meaningless, and can be overturned on the basis of a one-paragraph, unsigned file memorandum.

The Robin Hood theory of government would mean an end to any pretense that Government decisions should be made on the basis of staff work by career Government employees and objective judgment of the merits. It would mean that no holds are barred and political influence would be the entire standard.

We know that political influence peddling and other questionable factors have become involved in many Government decisions, and there is no doubt in my mind that ethical standards have slipped all over the Government in recent years. However, I am not yet ready to accept the judgment that bad decisions should become precedents for more bad decisions, more influence peddling, and more waste of tax money. I am not ready to throw away the keys to the U.S. Treasury.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 45 minutes, Thursday, February 15.

Mr. HERLONG, for today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, on February 21; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in five instances. (The following members (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. QUILLLEN in four instances.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. CONYERS in three instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. FOLEY in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 9, 1968, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 15, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1507. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed budgetary revision involving the transfer of obligatory authority among Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 255); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1508. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1509. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of revisions and reprogramming necessary with respect to certain projects, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and to authority delegated to me by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1510. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-577; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1511. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, transmitting the annual report of the Council; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1512. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program for the year ending December 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the act of October 3, 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1513. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report of two typographical corrections to be made in the schedule of expiring licenses for non-Federal hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1514. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on civilian positions allocated or placed in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 in the Department of Defense during the calendar year 1967, as required by statute; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1516. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 12, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Chipola River at Dead Lake, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954, no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvements are being accomplished by other interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 7, 1968, the following bill was reported on February 12, 1968:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14743. A bill to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890; with amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted February 12, 1968]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2792. A bill to amend sections 281 and

344 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the statutory prescription of fees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10135. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of the surviving spouse of a U.S. citizen who dies while serving in an active duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15300. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 15301. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 15302. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Jackson, Miss., as the Medgar Evers Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 15303. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 15304. A bill to appropriate funds for the study of a deep-draft ship channel extension, Wilmington Harbor, Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15305. A bill to appropriate funds for the hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion project at Wrightsville Beach, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15306. A bill to appropriate funds for continuing construction of the New Hope Dam and Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15307. A bill to appropriate funds for the upper part of Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15308. A bill to appropriate funds for the navigation project at Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15309. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Cape Fear River, above Wilmington, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15310. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate preconstruction planning for the Brunswick County beaches from the Cape Fear to North Carolina-South Carolina State line; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15311. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Carolina Beach and vicinity project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15312. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15313. A bill to provide for the elimination of all grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washington and New York City; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15314. A bill to provide for improved

employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 15315. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate within the Department of the Interior an officer to establish, coordinate, and administer programs authorized by this act, for the reclamation, acquisition, and conservation of lands and water adversely affected by coal mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15316. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.J. Res. 1084. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.J. Res. 1085. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

305. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the proposal to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide for additional revenues to accrue to the fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

306. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the Federal Meat Inspection Act and its adverse effect on independent slaughterhouses and meatpacking plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 15317. A bill for the relief of Renzo Grassini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 15318. A bill for the relief of Miss Apollonia Redy Vettore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 15319. A bill for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 15320. A bill for the relief of Chuck

Hong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15321. A bill for the relief of Maria Bonavolonta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15322. A bill for the relief of Silvio De Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 15323. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 15324. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tuttolomondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 15325. A bill for the relief of Claudia Schurenberg; 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:

241. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to placing statues of certain U.S. judges in the U.S. Capitol, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE—Monday, February 12, 1968

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HAYDEN).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under

the previous order of Thursday, February 8, the Senate will stand in adjournment until Wednesday next.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 5 sec-

onds a.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 14, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Parents Proud of Marine Who Hoisted Flag

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, over the past several days, newspapers throughout the country have been besieged with reports of the latest Vietcong offensive against a number of urban centers across South Vietnam. One of the bloodiest engagements occurred in the city of Hue, capital of Thua Thien Province, where at one point the enemy forces controlled the major portion of the city.

With the determination and spirit that are the mark of our American fighting men, the Vietcong were forced to relinquish the provincial capitol building over which they had flown the North Vietnam flag. In the heat of battle and the ensuing exuberance of victory, three valiant marines raised the Stars and Stripes in its place. I was proud to learn that one of my constituents, Marine Sgt. Frank A. Thomas, Jr., was among those three men. Despite the matter of protocol and custom, which says that the South Vietnamese flag should have been raised, it is a mute point when we consider the inspiration that these men must have felt to see Old Glory fly over the battle-scarred city.

It is a fitting tribute that I include ex-

cerpts from articles which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Camden Courier-Post:

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Feb. 6, 1968]

MOTHER IS PROUD, BUT CALM

(By Ken Earl)

"Well, mom, I have to do my duty like everybody else . . ."

With a grim smile Marine Gunnery Sgt. Frank A. Thomas was breaking the news to his mother as gently as he could.

He was soon to be headed for Vietnam.

The 34-year-old Leatherneck made the disclosure while home for Thanksgiving with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Thomas Sr. of 341 N. 37th Street.

PROUD OF UNIFORM

"He was proud to wear the uniform," said his mother, "and tried to make us understand that it was his duty to go to Vietnam."

On Dec. 6 he arrived in the war-torn country.

Mrs. Thomas wasn't surprised when she heard from the Courier-Post today that her son and two other Marines—keeping a vow they had made—tore down the North Vietnamese flag and raised the Stars and Stripes at Hue after recapturing the Thua Thien Province headquarters from Communist forces.

SAIGON BATTLE RAGES ON

(By Eugene V. Risher)

SAIGON.—Enraged U.S. Marines including a Camden, N.J. father of four ripped down a North Vietnamese flag in the still-embattled city of Hue today and ran up the Stars and Stripes. But fighting spread in the Saigon streets and the air war blazed with new fury.

U.S. spokesmen said about 900 Viet Cong moved from the flaming Cholon sector of Saigon back into the center of the city where street fighting broke out anew. There were battles in the suburbs and at the gates of the Tan Son Nhut Airport.

U.S. Marines fought large scale engagements around the coastal city of Quang Tri just below the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) and outside Da Nang as spokesmen warned the Communists appeared to be trying to isolate the big cities of Saigon, Hue and Da Nang.

RUNS UP FLAG

UPI correspondent Alvin B. Webb Jr. reported that Marine Capt. Ron Christmas' H Company swore at the sight of the North Vietnam flag atop the provincial Capitol. They smashed through Communist fire, seized the building and Christmas radioed his chief: "We have the building, sir! We're going to run up the American flag."

He turned to his men and said, "Let's go!" and at 4:03 p.m. three Leathernecks yanked down the red flag from the Capitol of Thua Thien province and ran up the U.S. flag—despite custom that says the South Vietnamese flags must fly from South Vietnamese buildings.

The three men were Pfc. Walter Kaczmarek of Port Reading, N.J., Pfc. Allen McDonald of Jacksonville, Fla., and gunnery Sgt. Frank T. Thomas Jr., of Camden, N.J. As they saluted their work machine gun fire splattered in the streets before and wisps of tear gas floated up to them.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 7, 1968]

PARENTS PROUD OF MARINE WHO HOISTED FLAG

Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Thomas, of 341 N. 37th st., Camden, were not surprised when

they received word Tuesday that their son, Marine Gunnery Sgt. Frank, Jr., had pulled down a Communist flag in the embattled South Vietnam imperial city of Hue and raised in its place the American flag.

Mrs. Thomas voiced the thoughts of her husband, a retired 22-year chief boatswain in the United States Navy, when she acknowledged, "We are very, very proud of what Frank has done."

CLIMBS BUILDING

The sergeant was fighting through the streets of Hue in the drive to clear out Vietcong guerrillas who had infested the area for the past week when he saw the Red flag atop the Administration Building of the South Vietnam military headquarters.

He halted his group and led Pfc. Alan McDonald, 19, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Pfc. Walter Kaczmarek, Jr., of Port Reading, N.J., in climbing to the top of the headquarters, tearing down the enemy bunting and replacing it with the Stars and Stripes.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 7, 1968]

HEADQUARTERS AT HUE RETAKEN BY MARINE UNITS

HUE, VIETNAM, February 6.—U. S. Marines, heirs of the Iwo Jima tradition, recaptured the Thua Thien Province headquarters from Communist troops here Tuesday and hoisted the Stars and Stripes above its battered walls.

Across the Perfume River, their South Vietnamese allies narrowed Red holdings within bomb-churned precincts of the walled Citadel, the once ornate home of Vietnam's emperors, which forms most of the northern part of Hue.

U.S. FLAG HOISTED

A Marine battalion commander had told his men the South Vietnamese government's flag should replace the Vietcong banner when they took over the yellow, two-story headquarters, a government landmark.

But the American flag was run up in the exuberance of victory after about 24 Leathernecks stormed over the walls and cleared out the place in room-to-room combat.

Gunnery Sgt. Frank Thomas, 34, of Camden, N. J., ran up the colors with help from Pfc. Alan McDonald, 19, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Pfc. Walter Kaczmarek, Jr., 19, of Port Reading, N. J.

There were lusty cheers from other Marines, many unborn when the Stars and Stripes was raised over Iwo Jima 23 years ago in a dramatic moment of the Second World War.

Under slight sniper fire, the Marines moved on from the building to house-to-house fighting along the palm-ringed plaza wall.

The "Untouchable" Parade

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, just as the Red Vietcong were able to infiltrate South Vietnam and on New Year's Day rise to the surface in a suicidal battle against the citizens, we can better appreciate the constant threat from the American Vietcong, the "Untouchables" who are planted in our country—in our Government.

Mr. Capell's "Untouchables, Part VII" should be revolting enough to awaken every patriotic American—liberal, moderate, or conservative—to demand ac-

tion for removal of these undesirable untouchables.

The President of the United States must appreciate the danger from Madam Jerzy Michalowski, wife of the current Polish Ambassador to the United States and stationed here in Washington, D.C. the nerve center of our Republic.

Her removal needs only that President Johnson declare her husband, Ambassador Michalowski, persona non grata. Why doesn't he do it?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I follow my remarks with "Untouchables, Part VII" from the Herald of Freedom and a clipping from the Government Employees Exchange here in the District of Columbia dated February 7:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Feb. 9, 1968]

THE UNTOUCHABLES—VII

Now emerging as possibility more than an innocent and duped bystander in the Warsaw Spy and Sex Scandals is the American Ambassador to Poland at that time, Jacob D. Beam. The Government Employees' EXCHANGE, a liberal bi-weekly dedicated to civil service reform, owned and edited by Mr. Sidney Goldberg, carried a story concerning Beam's involvement in its January 10, 1968 issue. Under the red headline, "Sex Scandals Involve Beam," the story stated that Madam Jerzy Michalowski a Communist agent, "has been positively identified as 'one of the chief architects of the 'Warsaw Sex and Spy Scandals'" which disrupted the American Embassy in Warsaw during the incumbency of Ambassador Jacob Beam. . . . In addition, the informant stated the woman has also been identified 'without any question of doubt' as having maintained an 'intimate personal relationship' with Mr. Beam from 1957 to 1961. . . ."

Jacob Dyneley Beam, now U.S. Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, was born in Princeton, N.J. on March 24, 1908, the son of Jacob Newman Beam (a Princeton professor) and the former Mary Prince. He graduated from Kent School and Princeton with an A.B. degree in 1929. During 1930 Beam studied at Cambridge University in England and in 1931 he began his career with the U.S. State Department as a clerk in the U.S. Consulate in Geneva, Switzerland. He was promoted to vice-counsel and remained in Geneva until 1934, his work there being mainly the observing and reporting of the activities of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office.

On November 24, 1934 Beam was made third secretary at the American Embassy in Berlin where he remained until August 1, 1940. In Berlin he was on the staff of Ambassador William E. Dodd, the last U.S. ambassador to Nazi Germany. The Ambassador's daughter, Martha, occupied her time in Berlin as a Soviet agent and even made a try at seducing Hitler. She failed but Unity Mitford, sister of U.S. Communist Jessica Mitford (author of "The American Way of Death"), succeeded in becoming Hitler's mistress. Also in Germany during this period was Howard Trivers who later became involved in the intricate web of the Warsaw Spy and Sex Scandals.

Martha Dodd, also known as Martha Eccles Dodd, Mrs. George Bassett Roberts and finally Mrs. Alfred K. Stern, was finally indicted on two counts of espionage conspiracy in September 1957 along with her husband, Stern. The Sterns have never been tried as they were in Mexico at the time of the indictment and clandestinely fled behind the Iron Curtain to Czechoslovakia. The Dec. 13, 1967 issue of The Government Employees' Exchange had this to say about Martha Dodd's relationship with Howard Trivers: "The career of Foreign Service Officer-1 Howard Trivers, at present American Coun-

sul-General in Zurich, Switzerland has been included in a 'probe and scrutiny' by a 'top-secret' British Security Survey Team operating in the United States for the past seven months. . . ."

"The interest of the Survey Team in Howard Trivers originated in information the British received concerning HARD Trivers' contacts during the years 1932-38 when he was attending the Universities of Heidelberg and Freiburg, Germany, the source stated. Part of this information indicated Howard Trivers had been a member of a private courier service organized by Martha Dodd, the daughter of U.S. Ambassador to Germany. . . ."

Other sources report that Trivers was recommended to Martha Dodd by his Princeton classmate, Jacob Beam. Trivers will be remembered as the man to whom Foreign Service Officer Stephen Koczak reported some subversive activities of his superior, Thomas A. Donovan, thereby setting into action the events which brought an end to Koczak's State Department career, through the conniving of the "insiders."

A description of Martha Dodd Stern is found on pages 4885 and 6 of the Senate Internal Security Hearings on "Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States." The information is from a series of articles which appeared in the N.Y. Journal-American Nov. 10-20, 1957 written by Jack Soble (Soviet spy indicted with Martha Dodd) with Jack Lotto.

"When the door opened, the beautiful stranger threw her arms around me in tight embrace and gave me a long, passionate kiss.

"This was my introduction to Martha Dodd Stern, daughter of the late United States Ambassador to Germany, William E. Dodd. "All I had said was 'I am Sam.'"

"This was the code name given me by my Soviet secret police superior to use in contacting her husband, multimillionaire Alfred K. Stern.

"The Sterns, who became my close friends after that first meeting in their swank New York apartment in the winter of 1944, were exact personality opposites. But they were as one in their ardent espousal of Communist causes.

"The slightly built, ever-dapper Stern chased after the Russians to be allowed to do their bidding. Perhaps it was because he was completely over-shadowed, thoroughly dominated by his wife.

"All this quiet, cultured and highly educated businessman had to offer was money. And he was free with it to back Soviet-approved activities. He financed the Boris Morros music company as a business front for Soviet espionage. Likewise, his money helped create pro-Communist propaganda organizations like the Institute of Pacific Relations.

"Gay, vivacious Martha, 11 years younger than her second husband, was always seeking new adventures, and liked to talk about them over martinis.

"And it was over a round of drinks that Martha told me a strange story of her twisted loyalty to the Soviet Union.

"Apparently to impress me, she bragged how she had spied on her own father for the Russians. She said that during her father's term as Ambassador in Berlin in the early 1930's she had had a love affair with an official of the Soviet Embassy, who actually was an NKVD agent.

"At his behest, Martha related, she stole information from the secret files of the United States Embassy—to which she had easy access—and turned it over to the agent.

"This exciting woman, who was seldom without a cocktail in easy reach, had once even trusted with Hitler and later described the Fuehrer as a 'frigid celibate.'"

Martha's impression of the six-foot-two Dyneley Beam has not been recorded for posterity, although she had plenty of time to form an impression as Beam was at the

Berlin Embassy for six years until August 1940. In April 1941 he was sent to the American Embassy in London as vice-consul and third secretary, remaining until the fall of 1944. From early 1945 to August 1947 he was back in Germany, acting as political adviser on German affairs at Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, under General Eisenhower. It was during this period that German and Nazi documents were captured which contained information concerning Howard Trivers, among others, and then mysteriously "disappeared," according to The Government Employees' Exchange.

Beam now returned to Washington, D.C. becoming chief of the division of Central European affairs in October 1947 (Howard Trivers was his Assistant Chief) and acting special assistant in the office of German and Austrian affairs in March 1949. Outlining Beam's career, Current Biography 1959 states at this point:

"For the next few years Beam's attention was centered on problems of the Far East. Having gone to Batavia, Java as consul general in October 1949, he served as the United States representative when the sovereignty of that area was transferred in 1950 from the Netherlands to the new government of Indonesia. As soon as a diplomatic mission was established at Indonesia's capital city, Jakarta (formerly Batavia), he assumed the duties of counselor of the American Embassy, and from October 1950 to April 1951 he had the additional responsibilities of the acting United States representative on the United Nations Commission for Indonesia."

The breaking up of colonial empires was an important part of the Communist plan implemented at the close of World War II. Communist spokesmen in the U.N. and elsewhere were bleating for the "national aspirations" of the colonies to be recognized and the granting of "independence" to them. Communist agents had been active in supplying information upon which these demands for "independence" were based. One such agent was a personal recruit of Martha Dodd Stern. She was Jane Foster, a San Francisco aristocrat, described by Jack Soble, (Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States, p. 4882, on):

"Jane Foster Zlatovski spelled sex appeal. "This slim, trim modernist artist, who had been born and raised on aristocratic Nob Hill in San Francisco, willingly turned her assets into a Soviet spy weapon.

"Coldly, methodically, this attractive woman worked on American military and intelligence agents to shed their inhibitions and secrets.

"If anybody could be described as a modern-day Mata Hari, that would be the hard-drinking, intensely jealous Jane. For nearly 10 years she turned in her reports, with photographs, on American intelligence and counterintelligence agents. . . .

"When I first met this dedicated Communist Party member she had just finished a 3-year job with the supersecret Office of Strategic Services.

"She was in New York on a vacation before moving into another sensitive spot with the United States Army in Vienna and Salzburg, Austria. . . .

"Like her German spy prototype, Jane was married to a ne'er-do-well Army Officer, George Zlatovski, of Duluth, Minn. (born in Russia-Ed.), at the time a lieutenant in the United States Army Intelligence.

"He also became a Soviet agent under my command. His work was to bring terror and fear to many refugees who had fled to the safety of the United States from behind the Iron Curtain.

"The first time I met Jane, I was impressed with her strong dedication to the 'cause.'

"Her first report, apparently, also made a big impact in the Kremlin.

"I received verification of this fact in February 1946, when I picked up a newspaper less than 2 months after Jane had turned

over a report on Indonesia she obtained while in the employ of the OSS. . . .

"As I read his (Manuilsky—a Stalin collaborator) speech, which accused the British of suppressing the nationalist ambitions of the Indonesians, I thought I recognized statements I had seen before.

"Then it hit me. Manuilsky was fortifying his attack with quotations taken word for word from the report Jane had handed to me.

"Her document was given to me around Christmas of 1945 at the home of Alfred and Martha Stern, wealthy 'angels' of Communist causes and financiers of business fronts for Soviet spy activities. . . .

"Jane was recruited for our ring by her old friend and drinking companion, Martha. . . .

"Over rounds of martinis, which she devoured like water, Jane outlined her philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, and how she and her husband, George, were prepared to go to any lengths to be useful to the Soviet Union.

"She told me how she had worked for the OSS in Indonesia while married to a Netherlands envoy. . . .

"For Jane Foster Zlatovski soft light, music, and wine were strictly necessary business atmosphere.

"Between stolen kisses, she collected for her Soviet bosses many of the secrets, confidences, and itemized human frailties of American intelligence agencies in Austria and France.

"On weekend affairs, when whisky glasses were seldom empty, and her targets sufficiently relaxed and off guard, her camera clicked during lighthearted frolicking.

"In this manner, this attractive, dedicated Soviet agent obtained compromising details on the sexual, drinking, and gambling habits of men whose identities were closely shielded.

"Her husband, George, an Army intelligence officer, showered his attention on women secretaries in sensitive United States agencies. . . .

This is the modus operandi of a typical Soviet agent successfully used to compromise United States employees and force them to work for the Communists. The exact same plan was used during the Warsaw Spy and Sex Scandals. Jane and George Zlatovski were indicted on July 8, 1957 on two counts of espionage conspiracy but have never been tried as they fled to France.

Looking to the future, Jacob Beam prepared himself by taking courses in the Russian language and history at his own expense. Thus prepared he began a career of U.S. representative behind the Iron Curtain. He went to Belgrade, Yugoslavia in April 1952. It was here that he met and started dating Miss Margaret Glassford, an officer employed by the U.S. Information Service in Belgrade. They were married in November 1952 and have a son Jacob Alexander Beam. It was in Belgrade also that Beam became friendly with Daroslav Vlahovich, a Foreign Service Officer.

In November 1952 he went to Moscow and was there at the time of Stalin's death and the subsequent power struggle. In June 1953 Beam began a tour of duty in Washington but was still occupied with affairs in Communist countries. Current Biography states: "As deputy director of the policy planning board, he helped to outline long-range diplomatic strategy for the State Department." Then in June 1957 he was nominated by President Eisenhower as United States Ambassador to Poland and arrived in Warsaw in August 1957. He also had another important job—holding meetings with the Chinese Communists. These were terribly important and strictly secret. Realizing this, the Soviets proceeded to bug the new Embassy building and compromise practically the complete staff, including the Marine guards.

In the Warsaw Embassy was Edward Sy-

mans, the long-time Soviet agent whom Beam had first met in Berlin. Also on the staff was Daroslav Vlahovich who had been transferred to Warsaw at Beam's personal request. When the State Department in Washington wanted to quickly transfer Symans and Vlahovich, the prime espionage suspects, out of Warsaw it was Ambassador Beam who insisted they be allowed to complete their tour of duty. It was during this period from 1952 to 1961 that Beam reportedly was involved in "an intimate personal relationship" with Mme. Jerzy Michalowski, the wife of the present Ambassador to the U.S. from Poland who was at that time Director General of the Polish Foreign Ministry. Born Myra Zandel on November 23, 1914, Mme. Michalowski might be described as a thoroughly modern Mata Hari.

Her first husband was Dr. Ignace Zlotowski, head of a special Soviet-Polish espionage unit attempting to acquire atomic information in the United States. Zlotowski, whose real name was reportedly Goldman or Goldberg, worked under the cover of being a professor at the University of Minnesota 1941 to 1942, at Vassar 1942 to 1944 and Ohio State University 1944 to 1946. In the early 1940's Myra Zlotowski obtained a position with the Office of War Information and, when her husband left the East Coast for Ohio State University, became known as the wife of Stefan Arski, another OWI employee who worked on the "Polish desk." Arski's real name was Arthur Salman and he assisted the OWI in its efforts to suppress the story of the Soviet massacre of 15,000 Polish officers and soldiers in the Katyn Forest Massacre. The Communists tried to put the blame on the Nazis but subsequent investigations proved that it was the work of the Communists themselves. After Arski returned to Poland he became editor of the Communist paper Robotnik (The Worker), an outspoken anti-American organ.

The present Mme. Michalowski has reportedly been an agent of the Soviet and later Polish Communist Party Central Committee since 1936. As wife of the important Michalowski, who had been in London at the same time Beam was stationed there, she leads a very busy life and is now being glamorized as a Washington hostess. Her life in Warsaw was described in the book "Poland Little Known" as follows:

". . . Roving everywhere is Maria Zientarowa known also as Stefan Wilcosz or Michalina Wilkoszowa or Tadeusz Makowski or Jan Michalski or Stefan Welczar, former friend of comrade Kliszko, former wife of Arski, the Editor-in-Chief of 'Swiat' when he was an employee of OWI, and at present the wife of the Director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Jerz Michalowski. . . .

Myra, through her "friendship" with Ambassador Beam, was able to get information which she fed back to her Soviet bosses. It is now presumed that the high ranking Polish intelligence officer who was supplying the United States with valuable security information from Warsaw was forced to seek refuge in the United States because of her. She is also credited with arranging the Scarbeck Case to take the heat off the important real agents, with Beam himself supplying the information to Dikeos who reportedly broke the case.

Edith Kermit Roosevelt in her column, Between the Lines, discusses Mme. Michalowski and states:

"The various marriages of a Warsaw charmer may provide the incentive that could force the issue of Communist espionage and policy manipulation into the limelight. . . . White House and State Department circles have remained silent. They have confided that they fear the revelations could spark a new wave of McCarthyism in the United States."

Although "McCarthyism" has been made a dirty word by the liberal press, it is exactly what we need today. It has been estimated

that the activities of Sen. Joe McCarthy set the Communist timetable back ten years. Ed Hunter, originator of the term "brainwashing," states in his publication, *Tactics*:

"The present, pervasive anti-anticommunist propaganda climate was created out of the debris of the McCarthy era. Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy contributed mightily to the cleansing of our Augean stables, but was shot down and killed, in the psychological warfare manner, in the middle of the battle. If the communist infiltration of the White House, the State Department, our military, and other agencies of government had not been frontally attacked, inflicting great damage to the red forces, and forcing them to fall back at many points, it is difficult to see how we could have survived."

We have now reached the stage again where it is difficult to see how we can survive if another cleaning job is not done. How many more Mata Haris are roaming the cocktail circuit and the diplomatic dinners, charming their way into government secrets? More important, what use is being made of these secrets and the roster of "human frailties" of government personnel? Strangely enough the State Department does not seem worried about this angle. The angle they are interested in is: Who is exposing the fact that these things are going on and what can we get on them to make them stop?

The Government Employees' Exchange of January 10, 1968 states:

"In other developments, a different source said that the top secret British 'Security Survey Team,' . . . has extended its operations to Canada and Mexico. In Canada its inquiries have encompassed liaison with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, especially in connection with the trips of State Department officials to Canada to obtain information on 'payola' payments allegedly made by Dictator Rafael Trujillo to Congressmen and Senators. The State Department officials were especially interested in establishing whether payments were made to Senators on the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigating State Department security and the Otto F. Otepka case.

"The British 'Security Survey Team' operating in Canada and Mexico is especially interested in the activities of Charles Lyons. . . ."

The State Department action is a two-pronged cover up of the subversive activities of its employees and attempt to "get" those exposing them. The State Department officials involved in this conspiracy, which ties them in with varying degrees of espionage, Communism, subversive activities and involvement with female Soviet agents, are endangering the security of our country. The fact that nothing is done to remove the security risks and prosecute those guilty of various security offenses proves the existence of a powerful clique of "Untouchables."

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Feb. 7, 1968]

SECRET AGENT'S ROLE IN WARSAW SCANDALS CLARIFIED

In its January 10 issue, *The Exchange* reported that Madam Jerzy Michalowski, the "wife" of the current Polish Ambassador to the United States, had been positively identified as "one of the chief architects of the 'Warsaw Sex and Spy Scandals' which disrupted the American Embassy in Warsaw during the incumbency of Ambassador Jacob Beam. Mrs. Michalowski was also identified as having maintained an "intimate personal relationship" with Mr. Beam from 1957 to 1961.

The Exchange also reported that date that on the basis of her "intimate personal relationship" with Ambassador Beam, Madam Michalowski, in 1960, obtained from Ambassador Beam details about the dispatches being sent the Central Intelligence Agency

by a "Lt Col Michael Goleniewski," an American "agent in place" who had first revealed to United States authorities the existence of the sex and spy scandals in Warsaw. Further, *The Exchange* reported that "as a result of her discoveries from Ambassador Beam, Madam Michalowski, her husband Jerzy Michalowski (then Director of the Polish Foreign Ministry) and Soviet Intelligence agencies uncovered the identity" of "Lt Col Goleniewski" who had to flee to West Berlin.

The Exchange report of January 10 intentionally did not indicate how or where "Lt Col Goleniewski" was communicating with American officials or how or where Ambassador Beam learned of his existence or of his reports. However, because of certain wrong interpretations or distortions being placed on the January 10 report, a "witting source" has consented to the publication by *The Exchange* of the fact that Ambassador Beam, who had never met "Lt Col Goleniewski," first learned of the existence of the "American agent in place" while the Ambassador was on "consultation" in the State Department in Washington.

Ambassador Beam's own sources in the State Department "consultation" were Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy Henderson and Assistant Secretary of State for Security William Boswell, the source further indicated to *The Exchange*. Under Secretary Henderson and Ambassador Beam, together with Ambassador E. Allen Lightner Jr. and Consul General Howard Trivers, the latter two involved in the so-called "Stephen A. Koczak selection out case," are all members of the so-called Henderson-Princeton Pact group of Ivy League "old school tie" Foreign Service Officers, the source indicated.

Under Secretary Henderson told Ambassador Beam, the source stated, that the State Department had received its information personally from Richard M. Bissell, Jr., the CIA's Deputy Director for Operations who, as readers of *The Exchange* will recall, later coordinated the disastrous "Bay of Pigs" action in Cuba which resulted in his own resignation as well as the departure from CIA of its Director, Allen Dulles.

When informing Under Secretary Henderson of the details of the dispatches of "Lt Col Goleniewski" regarding American members of the American Embassy in Warsaw identified as Soviet agents, or otherwise "compromised," Mr. Bissell has requested that none of the suspected American officials in Warsaw be "alerted" by any personnel actions or transfers without prior approval of such action by CIA, the source revealed. To prevent any "inadvertent" personnel actions in Warsaw itself, Mr. Bissell and Under Secretary Henderson had agreed to recall Ambassador Beam for "consultations" and to have him personally informed about the situation in his Embassy, the source stated.

The reason Ambassador Beam had been "totally unaware previously" of the existence and activities of "Lt. Col. Goleniewski," the source explained, was that "Lt Col Goleniewski" was careful to avoid the American Embassy in Warsaw and has sent all his messages to American officials, addressed to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, through his own couriers who dispatched the material from Switzerland or other Western European countries. Thus, Ambassador Beam had never met "Lt Col Goleniewski," the source revealed.

In his meetings with Under Secretary Henderson and Assistant Secretary Boswell, Ambassador Beam did not learn the name of "Lt Col Goleniewski," the source stated, because Mr. Bissell had not communicated it to the State Department. However, the information he did receive was sufficiently detailed so that, when Madam Jerzy Michalowski obtained it subsequently in Warsaw from Ambassador Beam, the Soviet intelligence organization was able to identify "Lt Col Goleniewski" as the American "agent in place," the source stated. This required "Lt

Col Goleniewski" to flee for his life to West Berlin and ended his activities as an American agent in the Soviet camp, the source concluded.

President's Message on Crime

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposal for increased security measures for banks and savings and loan institutions, as outlined in his message on crime control, deserves our immediate attention and bipartisan support.

The alarming increase in the number of bank robberies requires immediate action. The FBI Crime Index of statistics submitted by local and state police agencies discloses that bank robbery continued a sharp upward trend with a 60-percent increase during the first 9 months of 1967, over the same months in 1966.

Other statistics made available by the FBI indicate that violation of the Federal bank robbery statute increased approximately 30 percent in 1967. The total number of robberies, burglaries, and larcenies during the calendar year reached 2,551, as compared with a previous alltime high of 1,871 for 1966.

The dollar losses resulting from these crimes are in the millions. But of immeasurably greater concern, is the expanding threat to the lives of customers, bank employes, and police officers which is inherent in these crimes of violence.

The FBI reports that the arsenal of weapons available to robbers and burglars has steadily grown. The newest, a burning tool which came into use in bank burglaries in 1967, is capable of burning through a 6-inch thickness of tempered steel in approximately 15 seconds. It can cut an opening in a 3-foot wall of concrete in a matter of minutes.

Modern technology has placed sophisticated counterweapons at the disposal of banks and other financial institutions at relatively modest costs. An FBI publication which has recently been circulated to banking institutions indicates that reasonably effective alarm systems may be installed and operated for \$100, plus a nominal monthly charge. Microphones which may be connected to speakers installed in a local police station cost about the same. Special protective cameras are available for approximately \$1,000.

However, despite the success the FBI has reported in tracking criminals with the aid of protective devices, and efforts on the part of the Bureau to encourage voluntary use of safety measures, security and protective measures in many institutions remain grossly inadequate.

The situation can be remedied by Federal legislation placing responsibility for overseeing the installation, maintenance and operation of minimum security devices and procedures in the Federal agencies who perform other supervisory functions in relation to federally insured financial institutions. We should give our law enforcement officers charged with

responsibility for protecting our financial institutions the benefits that can be expected from the use of modern methods to make banks and other financial institutions secure from criminal assaults.

Nation's Governors and Boy Scouting

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to conduct surveys of Members of the 89th and 90th Congresses to determine what the Boy Scouts had done for Congress a half century after Congress did something for the Boy Scouts by chartering it as a national organization.

Because of my abiding interest in Scouting, I was contacted by Mr. Keith Douglass of Dover, Del., who conducted a similar survey of our Nation's Governors. I was not surprised to learn that well over half of our Governors have participated in the Scouting program, either as Scouts or as Scout leaders.

It is grand testimony to the free world's greatest youth movement that it has played a part in developing the leadership capabilities of so many of our Nation's outstanding citizens.

There is no better time than during Boy Scout Week to recognize the Governors who have, at some time during their lives, come under the influence of the Scout Oath:

On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my Country.

Only 21 Governors have had no Scouting experience. Of the 29 Governors who have been associated with the movement, 26 were Scouts, 12 have served as adult Scouters, and nine have been registered in both capacities.

The following Governors have participated in the Scouting program:

Alaska Governor Walter J. Hickel, Scout; Arizona Gov. John R. Williams, Scout; Colorado Gov. John A. Love, Scout; Connecticut Gov. John N. Dempsey, Scouter; Delaware Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr.; Florida Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Life Scout; Idaho Gov. Don W. Samuelson, Scout and Scouter; Illinois Gov. Otto J. Kerner, Scouter; Indiana Gov. Roger D. Branigin, Scout and Scouter; Iowa Gov. Harold E. Hughes, Scout; Kansas Gov. Robert Docking, Scout.

Also, Michigan Gov. George W. Romney, Scout and Scouter; Missouri Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, Scout; Montana Gov. Tim M. Babcock, Scouter; Nevada Gov. Paul Laxalt, Scout; New Mexico Gov. David F. Cargo, Scout; North Carolina Gov. Daniel K. Moore, Scout; North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy, Life Scout; Oklahoma Gov. Dewey Bartlett, Scout; Pennsylvania Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, Eagle Scout; Rhode Island Gov. John H. Chaffee, Life Scout and Scouter; South Carolina Gov. Robert E. McNair, Scout and Scouter; Tennessee Gov. Buford Ellington, Scout and Scouter; Texas Gov. John B. Connally, Jr., Scout; Utah Gov. Calvin L. Ramp-ton, Scout and Scouter; Vermont Gov. Philip H. Hoff, Life Scout; Washington Gov. Daniel J. Evans, Eagle Scout and Scouter; West Virginia Gov. Hulett C. Smith, Star Scout and Scouter; Wisconsin Gov. Warren P. Knowles, Life Scout.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Gov. John N. Dempsey of Connecticut has been awarded the Silver Beaver Award from the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. His father was a personal aide to Lord Baden-Powell, the founder of the Boy Scout movement.

Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois is a vice president of the Boy Scouts of America and has been awarded the Silver Buffalo Award.

Gov. Branigin of Indiana was President of the Harrison Trails Council of the Boy Scouts.

Gov. John J. McKeithen of Louisiana has been awarded the Most Outstanding Service Award from the Alpha Phi Omega College Scout Fraternity.

Gov. Tim Babcock of Montana is an honorary member of the national council and a member at large of the Executive Board of Region Ten.

Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee is a Mid-Tennessee Executive Council member and an honorary member in the national council. He has been awarded the Silver Beaver Award.

Gov. Evans of Washington is a member of the Chief Seattle Executive Council Board.

Gov. Hulett Smith of West Virginia is a member of the Buckskin Executive Council.

Encouraging Action

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, out of riot-torn Detroit, Mich., last summer rose a citizen's committee to mobilize the public and private resources of that community in a future effort to discover and/or devise solutions to build a better life for all citizens. This group was appropriately called the New Detroit Committee.

Recently, I had the pleasure to visit extensively with an individual who serves on that committee, Mr. Robert W. Fezzey, of Detroit. I was most impressed by Mr. Fezzey's comments and the successful efforts of the committee.

During our conversation, I learned that Mr. Fezzey, only a few weeks ago, thoroughly discussed the workings of the New Detroit Committee in an address before the 1967 annual meeting of the Southeast Michigan Tourist Association.

I feel that this address contains information which is of interest to all Members. I urge you to read it and see how one city and one committee is facing up to responsibilities of leadership. His speech follows:

REMARKS BY MR. ROBERT W. FEZZEY BEFORE THE SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN TOURIST ASSOCIATION 1967 ANNUAL MEETING

Thank you,

It's an honor and a privilege for me to be here today. However, I'll admit that I'm here with some trepidation.

When I received Sid Baker's letter indicating that I was to speak on the subject "Building a New Community Through Tourism", I had some severe reservations. I didn't feel qualified to talk on this subject and so I immediately called him, suggesting that there must have been some mistake. I wasn't competent to discuss the topic at hand.

I told Sid that what I might attempt to cover would be my impressions of the last five months of 1967, during which I was

loaned full-time to the New Detroit Committee chaired by Mr. J. L. Hudson, Jr. I would be glad to briefly recap some points about the committee and its work, and make some observations about what the experience of working with the committee has meant to me personally.

To my surprise (maybe to my chagrin) Sid responded that he felt this would be fine. I suppose there would not have been any "hang up" in my mind if Sid had chosen for a title, "Building a New Community—That Will Allow Tourism to Expand"—because that's really what I'll be talking about.

I read with considerable interest your industry's report for 1967—and was indeed impressed. Tourism in Michigan is certainly everybody's business as the report indicates. I'm sure everyone in this room is interested—as we are in my business—in creating a social climate within our State and particularly our urban areas that will allow continuing expansion of an industry that contributes so significantly to our economic well being. But we have a great challenge facing us and, therefore, we must all be involved in attempting to find solutions.

In Michael Harrington's book, *The Other America*, there's reference made to the suburbanite who drives to work each morning, along the expressway to the central city. He works all day in his air-conditioned office, gets into his car, and heads back to suburbia each evening, completely oblivious to the dimensions of the problems of the people who live by the side of his road. Unconcerned, he's one who's grown accustomed to the face of poverty—bleak, monotonous, soon almost invisible, as it whizzes past his car windows. Does that touch a nerve? Mr. Harrington, I have come to realize, was drawing a picture of me. I fitted the pattern. Hopefully somewhat more sensitive than the majority of suburbanites, but still pretty unsophisticated, and uninvolved in any meaningful effort to relieve the stark and tragic condition of too much of the city. After all, I wasn't being bothered. So why not just leave well enough alone?

Then came July 23rd. And the bleak and impersonal face I'd passed so complacently took on a form and got itself recognized. It was an angry face, and it was a threatening face. A face in which hopelessness had turned to despair and despair had turned to blind rage. And I and many others decided right then and there that we never wanted to see that face again.

You all know the story of the riots—"civil disturbances"—if that goes down better. It's a tale of something that couldn't happen in our community, but it did. And maybe that's the key to it all. Too many of us had failed to realize that the price of good human relations, of a wholesome, advancing community, is dear indeed. Perhaps we thought we'd learned our lesson a quarter century earlier in 1943. And it's true Detroit had had a long period of peace and prosperity. And on the surface at least it appeared that we'd learned our lesson well.

But then it all broke loose. Social analysts will be asking why for a long time to come. I suppose. Max Ways, in his editorial in the recent issue of *Fortune Magazine*, calls our problems "A crisis within a crisis—He says 95% of what is wrong in our cities had developed before the crisis in race relations erupted". I certainly don't want to try to explain it but the shock of riot coursed through the area and we felt its reverberations everywhere, even out in suburbia. No part of the metropolis was left untouched by the tragedy of it all.

Let me remind you that in our city more than 500 fires were set, and many others attempted, in an area spanning 10 square miles. Forty-four people died, and a large number were injured. Thousands were charged with serious crimes. Property losses were in the 100s of millions of dollars. Some very brave men lost their lives in efforts to

protect people and property and to restore order to a city that was being torn apart. Nothing quite like it had ever happened in this Country. But the chances are all too great that it could happen again. It could happen in Detroit next summer, or sooner. It could happen in any major city of the United States, at any time. For this reason, I think all of us must view the causes of rioting with a sense of great urgency.

But the greater the time interval from the event, the more difficult it seems for us as people to sustain a sense of urgency. There are many who'd like to close their eyes and have the whole problem go away. There are many who actually have shut the problem out of their minds. But, it's not going to go away.

I'm reminded of the parallel offered by the Flint tornado of a few years ago. That's all we talked about at the time, but we soon forgot it.

Oh, we think of tornados now from time to time—but only when the weatherman warns us that atmospheric conditions are building up that could cause one. We don't have any control over those kinds of conditions.

But there is something we can do about the conditions that collided last July and resulted in the devastating social tornado that crashed down on 12th Street. And let me warn you that too many of those conditions are still in the air—and that the same kind of fearsome social tornado could strike again—and almost anytime.

The riots themselves were clearly and thoroughly wrong. But behind them lie such fundamental causes as the high rate of unemployment among Negroes, alleged mistreatment by some policemen, profiteering by some stores and landlords, sub-standard housing, and the frustration of so many Negroes who see others enjoying so many of the benefits of American life which they don't have, but perhaps most basic—A cry, a demand for dignity!

I think the message to be drawn from the rioting that occurred in Detroit and in other cities last summer is that if we are to look ahead with any degree of confidence, or even hope, for a unified and constructive society, this nation must face up to the need for social and economic innovations in our cities—and we must do it NOW. Business leaders, labor and government, community organizations and researchers, all are going to have to struggle to discover or devise better answers.

It has become evident that the problems which demand immediate solution are primarily in the areas of jobs, housing, schools and public order—all underscored by a basic demand for human dignity.

Business has a critical role to play—in providing jobs, in helping to prepare Negroes for those jobs, in helping to rebuild the cities, and in providing leadership to the community.

And along with this, Negroes must be encouraged to play a larger role in determining how their own problems are to be solved, and in responding with a sense of participation and responsibility within the framework of an orderly and dynamic society.

It was just at the close of the riot period that Governor Romney and Mayor Cavanagh asked J. L. Hudson to organize a citizen's committee to mobilize the public and private resources of our community. As Chairman, he was able to recruit the chief executives of a dozen companies, as well as representatives from education, unions, government and community organizations. This was not the typical "blue ribbon" committee appointed to solve community problems, because the kind of human troubles that Detroit had experienced just could not be met by applying that traditional formula.

"Militant" members of the Negro community were included from the very beginning, in order to be sure that the commit-

tee would be tuned in to their viewpoints and to their frustrations. This representation of the "militant" Negro element, as well as more moderate members of the Negro community, has served the Committee well.

The Committee includes seven men who are elected governmental officials, ranging from members of the State Legislature in Lansing to the chairmen of the boards of supervisors in three counties and the president of the Detroit Common Council. There are fourteen businessmen, including the chief executive officers of the "Big Three" automobile companies, the heads of our three utilities, three retailers, two bankers, an advertising agency president, my friend, John Pingel who is on your program this afternoon, and a financier. There are four educators. Three labor unions are represented. Nine members of the Committee represent community organizations, including the League of Women Voters and the NAACP. An eminent lawyer who is the president-elect of the American Bar Association and a Federal Judge also are Committee members.

And let me add this. In my business experience I've observed many committees. But never have I seen the dedication, the sense of commitment, and the devotion to a common cause that the members of this 39-member New Detroit Committee as well as the task force serving it have demonstrated from the start. The Committee members have set a high record for regular attendance at committee meetings which are held about every two weeks. And you have to understand that in addition to the committee meetings which take a full half day out of the schedules of these very busy people there are normally two or three subcommittee meetings in between each full committee meeting which requires further participation and commitment of their time.

The task force serving the committee and the subcommittees is composed of about 30 men recruited from corporations, labor, universities, and other community institutions. As staff members we were to formulate background information, and generate original and studied recommendations for committee action. Many of the staff people like myself have returned to their jobs after serving five months and are being replaced by new task force men. Let me tell you that those of us returning to our jobs are going back as *different* people—and maybe this will be the greatest contribution made by the New Detroit Committee—the increased understanding of our urban problems by the committee members and the task force personnel that perhaps can be helpful in the future direction of their organizations in this critical area.

The committee has been giving primary attention to nine broad fields for immediate consideration and action:

The improvement of community inter-communication among grass roots organizations and existing community power structure, and at the person-to-person level; community services, both private and public, including health, welfare, public order and recreation; economic development; education; employment; youth and recreation; legal; finance; and, housing.

The New Detroit Committee has developed some interesting principles of operation. One is that everything should be done to make full use of existing agencies for the implementation of New Detroit plans and proposals before any thought is given to recommending that a new agency be set up.

Another principle is that pronouncements be minimized and action be maximized. Broadside promises too often lead to disappointment and frustration.

A *third* principle is that everyone in the community—especially the committee members—need to develop better listening practices.

Something the committee's become aware

of so far is how hard it is to get existing private and public institutions, as well as governmental units, to be sensitive to the real, underlying problems. Too many organizations provide goods or services as through a human machine to non-feeling machines.

Customers and constituents too seldom get thought of as people with human problems. I think many of us have learned that we can no longer decide what we feel should be done is necessarily what the community feels its needs are.

My guess would be that those of you that have followed the New Detroit Committee activities with any interest at all if asked what action you associate with the committee the answers might be—the Fair Housing legislation which failed to pass in the Special Session—the request for 5.3 million dollars for emergency educational needs which failed to be acted on—the proposed police study that has failed to materialize—and the proposal for funding indigenous community organizations. This would be a completely unfair assessment of New Detroit—these matters are the headlines—the news makers.

The Committee is hopeful for favorable consideration of Fair Housing in this session of the Legislature. It is working diligently to get the other problems resolved but more importantly the items I mentioned are just a small part of the total picture.

Let me enumerate some of the things the committee has been able to do to date which are particularly significant.

"New Detroit" has stepped into a major area of concern—employment. It is succeeding in a massive effort to obtain jobs for unemployed inner city residents. Through the end of the year, 43,000 people have been placed in jobs by the major employers in the Detroit area, with approximately half of those jobs going to Negroes.

The Ford Motor Company has established employment centers in the inner city areas and has hired directly in the inner city neighborhoods nearly 2,000 from the ranks of the "hard-core" unemployed. In this effort they have felt it worthwhile to provide bus money and luncheon money to these new employees prior to receipt of their first pay checks.

Chrysler Corporation, in cooperation with the YMCA, has worked out a "buddy" system to make sure that previously unemployable young men stay on the job once they are hired.

My own company, Michigan Bell Telephone has "adopted" Northern High School for the purpose of helping train students for jobs, to teach them how to seek jobs, and in many other ways to increase and improve employment opportunities for the young people in the inner city.

General Motors has adopted a "buddy" system in an inner city factory with encouraging results.

The J. L. Hudson Company, has developed two interesting programs, directed at the employment of 250 inner city high school dropouts or potential dropouts, and the hiring of 250 inner city residents on referral from inner city ministers.

The New Detroit Committee is looking into the dilemma of the underemployed and it has developed an imaginative, new approach to this longstanding problem. In effect, employers are being asked to look carefully at all their employees, pinpoint those with hidden or untapped qualifications, and upgrade them on a merit basis at the earliest possible date. A sincere review, we believe, will support the overwhelming evidence that advancement opportunities have not been given equally to Negroes, once hired into an existing organization, as they have to whites.

The committee also is currently studying the community college program, particularly in the Wayne County area.

It is investigating ways and means of providing management counselling and equity financing for new or small businesses,

with emphasis on indigenous businesses and inner city needs. The committee has drawn up a legislative package to assure adequate insurance for inner city properties of all types.

The committee has worked closely with the Virginia Park Rehabilitation Citizens' Committee, a committee working in a neighborhood very close to the heart of last summer's riots, in developing what appears to be a successful program of direct neighborhood participation in the planning and rehabilitation of their own community, as Housing Director, Robert Knox indicated just this week when announcing long range plans for the 12th Street area.

It is reviewing the community's public and private recreation needs, problems and opportunities.

The committee is trying to identify the weaknesses and strengths of the public and private social services in our community so as to suggest a more effective use of manpower, greater responsiveness to immediate needs, and more effective use of the potential for volunteer assistance in the metropolitan area.

It is developing a youth program through a special task force for youth involvement, and assisted a program called "Homes by Christmas," which launched a successful campaign that raised \$180,000 to house 120 families burned out during last summer's riots.

I think this list shows that the committee has made a start toward getting an extremely complex and difficult job done.

It became very clear to all of us that were or still are involved in New Detroit that the community-at-large must develop better listening mechanisms. The grass roots people must not only be listened to, but they must be actively and directly involved in the full planning process as well as all implementation efforts. Only insofar as every citizen has reason to consider himself a significant part of this society, can he be expected to work and live to protect and improve it. While this seems fundamental, we find serious lack of understanding or personal concern on this point in many sectors of the white community.

The whole spirit and intent of the New Detroit Committee is summed up in Chairman Hudson's words as he reported on its work to the people of the area:

"We must recognize and identify the sources of the frustrations that led to the riots last summer, and then work diligently with all of the resources available in our communities to develop programs of self-help and progress. This is not only for the Negroes in our slums, but also for the whites who live in poverty. They all seek, deserve, and now demand, a better future.

"Community improvement must begin with human rehabilitation. This complex task will require the best efforts of all of us for many years to come."

Earlier I mentioned a few examples of what business is doing.

All of us as businessmen can do much more. For instance, we must review our employment practices. Do we truly hire people purely on the basis of qualification? Do we promote those we have on the basis of merit alone? Do we send our recruiters out to all neighborhoods, all sections? Are we willing to take a chance in our hiring now and then? Or do we just sit back and wait for the exactly right person to come along?

This is a hard but necessary thing, to be fair across the board in employment practices. It's something that demands more than lip service from the top. It requires a well-structured program that reaches all the way down to the basic levels of the company. And there needs to be provision made for effective follow-ups, and a cold look needs to be taken periodically to see whether the statistics show any real progress. If you'll

pardon another reference to my own company, we've had for years a program of equal opportunity going. It's part of the Plans for Progress program. It takes constant reminders and follow-up. Definite improvement has come as a result, but there is still more to be done.

Now, of course, I cannot predict the future. What it may bring is anybody's guess. But I do know this, the New Detroit Committee, many, many area businessmen, and I personally, are determined to do everything possible to make it a better future for everyone and that we're all going to get there together.

You know, I once heard a story that illustrates the situation we're in. Among the papers that the novelist, F. Scott Fitzgerald left behind at his death was the plot for a novel he apparently wanted to write. The substance of it was roughly this. A group of heirs were gathered in a huge manor house located on a very valuable estate to hear the reading of a will. The substance of the will was simplicity itself. All the rich land around the house, and the magnificent house itself was to pass to the heirs—provided they could learn to live in it together peacefully.

That's something of what we're facing today. It's a wonderful world. Certainly there's enough for everyone, but we can only all share in it if we succeed in learning to live together peacefully.

Thank you.

Italy's Spy Agency Kept Sex Dossiers

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, I have been opposing the establishment of a national data bank on the grounds that it holds a genuine threat for abuse of information. Many people in the statistically oriented professions have reassured me and said that it would be impossible for such a generalized aggregate producer to be turned into an intelligence system of personal dossiers. While I have the utmost respect for their unimpeachable academic credentials and their devotion to civil liberties, it seems to me that such an always expanding collection of computerized information may eventually operate far differently than its noble purposes would suggest. We cannot be sure that benevolent men will always use this highly personal information for benevolent purposes.

This was brought home very forcibly by a news item in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 4. While no one is now suggesting that the proposed national data bank will bear the slightest resemblance to the Italian counterespionage service—SIFAR—it is conceivable that a similar escalation of function and effect may very well occur. I would like to call particular attention to the following line in the news story:

Its dossiers were limited at first to spy suspects but later grew to include government officials, deputies, senators, industrialists, bishops, priests and artists.

The greater the opportunity to collect and analyze confidential information,

the greater the opportunity for abuse. This fundamental fact of human nature seems to me to suggest that we must be very careful before we entrust our personal histories to the tender sensibilities of bureaucrats at any level. It is especially dangerous, in my opinion, when these men are shielded behind the forbidding facade of the Federal Government. I think it would be very wise for all of us to ponder the significance of this highly unfortunate Italian example of dossier-type information being used for purposes that the originators of SIFAR never dreamed.

ITALY'S SPY AGENCY KEPT SEX DOSSIERS

ROME.—The Italian counterespionage service, SIFAR, turned itself into an autonomous power group by digging out the private secrets and sex habits of prominent citizens, including 4500 priests, a Rome court was told yesterday.

Parts of a secret report on SIFAR were read during a libel case. Former army chief of staff Gen. Giovanni de Lorenzo, who led SIFAR from 1956 to 1962, is suing the magazine L'Espresso for alleging that he masterminded a 1964 coup plot.

The report, compiled by an inquiry commission last year, said SIFAR began its "odious and illegal espionage" in 1956. Its dossiers were limited at first to spy suspects but later grew to include government officials, deputies, senators, industrialists, bishops, priests and artists. SIFAR agents were ordered to make detailed inquiries into their sex habits, illegitimate children and frivolous conduct, the report said.

Lt. C. E. Richards, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, Awarded Bronze Star

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the sacrifices being made by our servicemen in Vietnam to protect the interests of this Nation and all mankind deserve the respect and commendation of every American citizen. For this reason, I take personal pleasure in paying special tribute to Lt. C. E. Richards, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps. Lieutenant Richards, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Richards of my district, Nashville, Tenn., received a citation from the President and was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroic achievement while serving in Vietnam. The United States should indeed be proud of Lieutenant Richards' act of patriotism and sense of duty.

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

U.S. MARINE CORPS, HEADQUARTERS,
FLEET MARINE FORCE, PACIFIC,
San Francisco.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to Second Lieutenant Clarence E. Richards, Jr., United States Marine Corps for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroic achievement in connection with operations against the enemy in the Republic of Vietnam while serving as a Platoon Commander with Company M, Third Battalion, Fifth Marines, First Marine Division, On 13 May 1967, during Operation Union,

Company M was assigned the mission of relieving Company K which was heavily engaged with a numerically superior North Vietnamese Army force and had sustained heavy casualties. Displaying exemplary leadership, Second Lieutenant Richards aggressively led his platoon and Company M through dense undergrowth to the right flank of the besieged company. Disregarding his own safety and fearlessly exposing himself to intense enemy fire, he quickly positioned his men and directed their fire against the North Vietnamese forces. After relieving the pressure on the beleaguered unit, he supervised the evacuation of casualties and, moving from one position to another, encouraged his men and maneuvered them to positions from which they could more effectively bring fire to bear on the enemy. Constantly exposing himself to heavy small arms and automatic weapons fire, he subsequently sustained a serious leg wound from enemy machine gun fire. By his daring and aggressive actions in leading his platoon, Second Lieutenant Richards contributed materially to the success of his company which, in the ensuing fourteen hour battle, inflicted over 120 enemy killed and confiscated a large quantity of abandoned weapons, ammunition and equipment. Second Lieutenant Richards' courage, exceptional professionalism and selfless devotion to duty in the face of extreme personal danger were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and of the United States Naval Service."

Second Lieutenant Richards is authorized to wear the Combat "V".

For the President,

V. H. KRULAK,

Lieutenant General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commanding General, Fleet Marine
Force, Pacific.

pared while doing graduate work at Georgetown University.

COMPILED BOOK

During his studies he learned that an aunt by marriage, Mrs. Sarah Key Patten, the daughter of Sen. D. M. Key, had in the basement of her Chattanooga home a collection of unpublished letters and other materials about her father.

He became so interested in the material and the new information it provided on an important era which had particular relevance to the events of today, that he decided to turn the dissertation into a book.

Mr. Abshire, now executive secretary of Georgetown's Center for Strategic Studies, attended Baylor School, the University of Chattanooga and was graduated from West Point. Between UC and West Point, he joined the Army and rose to sergeant before entering the academy. After graduation he served for a year and a half in Korea as captain for a frontline company. He coauthored "National Security" with Richard Allen and is working on a third book on Portuguese Africa.

His short, historical study of Sen. Key; published by Frederick A. Praeger, 224 pages with notes and indexes, selling for \$5.95, officially published today; is a craftsman-like compilation of meticulous research. The facts alone contain the drama of epoch in the making and the tragedy of seeing the visions of a prophet destroyed in his lifetime—plus the deeper tragedy of knowing that today's turmoil need not have been.

The book spent a third of its length describing Key's unremarkable record as a Confederate officer, after he had rejected the guidance of his old friend and mentor Andrew Johnson. He obtained a pardon from President Johnson, who had succeeded the assassinated Abraham Lincoln, after the war and returned to the "carpetbagger" city of Chattanooga to resume his law practice.

NAMED SENATOR

For 10 years Key struggled to rebuild his life, often reflecting on the rashness that had allowed him to answer an emotional call to rally around a futile, erring cause. When Johnson, who had survived an attempted impeachment and returned to Tennessee to become a senator, died in 1875, the young Chattanooga chancellor was appointed to fill the seat until the legislature could meet again to elect a successor.

Before he got outside the city limits, the new senator alienated the political machine of Isham Harris, the secessionist governor, and much of his constituency by supporting national banks and opposing the sentiment that Southern states should repudiate their war debts.

He wasted little time in Washington stirring controversy by raising a voice of moderation and conciliation between North and South; at the same time decrying the injustices being heaped upon the defeated section.

Tammany Democrats thought they had a Southern trained seal and Southern racists thought they had a viper on their hands—neither was correct.

POLITICAL FLAW

Key preached unionism over sectionalism (and though a white supremacist, Negro suffrage over segregation and Southern involvement in the economic growth of the nation. He had the politically fatal flaw of honesty—his tenure in the Senate ended after a year when the Tennessee Legislature elected a Harris dupe.

When factions threatened a new civil war over the disputed Hayes-Tilden presidential election in 1876 the only man who could avert catastrophe was the candid, recently defeated back-woodsman from Chattanooga.

CABINET POST

As a moderate Southerner, he was in position to influence enough votes to swing the election from Democrat Tilden to Repub-

lican Hayes. An independent position on the Cabinet as postmaster general was arranged by Memphis publisher Col. Andrew J. Kellar, the schism was healed and the cries of "Tilden or blood" faded.

But neither Key nor Kellar could stir the hesitant Hayes into withdrawing federal troops from the Southern states still occupied and, as Key had feared, this bred the hatred and distrust which was exploited by Southern radicals and Northern Tammany Hall politicians to set the stage for formation of a one-party, solid South.

The new postmaster used his politically powerful office to save the presidency when Tilden forces tried to resurrect charges of fraud in the electoral vote decision. The act made him well known and popular at the grassroots level, but drew more hatred from his political enemies.

TO FEDERAL BENCH

Had he run for governor of Tennessee when he resigned from his post in 1880, the author believes, instead of accepting a federal circuit court bench in Chattanooga; he might well have brought about the renaissance which would have led Southern politics away from racism and sectionalism to enlightenment and a broader national outlook.

The forgotten element, the small farmers, had become a dynamic new force and were ripe for exploitation because they had looked hopefully to the Hayes administration for relief from their burden of unrewarding drudgery.

Tennessee Republicans would have given him solid support, industrialists were ready to swing to him, and some agrarians might have followed him because of his association with their hero, the Great Commoner, Andrew Johnson. He did not choose to run.

The South slid back into a morass of color-line politics which kept the radical elements in power, but cost the South a half century of stunted economic and social justice development.

Thomas Alva Edison: Humanity's Friend

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished citizens of the State of New Jersey is Mr. George E. Stringfellow, retired senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries of West Orange, N.J.

Mr. Stringfellow was a close personal friend of Thomas Alva Edison and thus his reminiscences about this great man are of particular interest to all Americans young and old, who are fascinated by the career of the man who gave light to the millions.

Just this week, the Kiwanis Club of Kearny, N.J., were honored by the presence of Mr. Stringfellow, whose speech, "Thomas Alva Edison: Humanity's Friend" is worthy of the attention of all Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Stringfellow's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON: HUMANITY'S FRIEND

(An address by George E. Stringfellow, business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, and Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., delivered before the Kiwanis Club of Kearny, N.J., February 7, 1968)

Thomas Alva Edison, father of the electric light and power industry, produced more in-

A Southern Leader's Timely Biography

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading "The South Rejects a Prophet" by Dr. David M. Abshire. This fascinating political-historical biography was the subject of an article by Jere Sellars in the December 27 issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press. Because of its interest to this body, I place the article in the RECORD:

TODAY'S TROUBLES MIGHT HAVE BEEN AVERTED IF SENATOR KEY'S ADVICE HEEDED—ABSHIRE'S BOOK RELEASED HERE

(By Jere Sellars)

If David M. Abshire interpreted the evidence of century-old letters and clippings with accuracy, then it is less than extravagant to say that the bloodshed and horror of the "long, hot summer" of 1967 might not have happened had the South not rejected the genius of a Chattanooga.

If his conclusions are correct, the South spent its blood, its fortune and over a half century of its future to purchase the illusion that the dead past could be resurrected.

David McKendree Key—lawyer, senator, cabinet member, soldier, judge, statesman and prophet; twice the pivotal point for swinging the United States away from the brink of a second Civil War—is the subject of "The South Rejects a Prophet."

Mr. Abshire, a native Chattanooga, was in Miller's today for the first of two autograph parties here to launch the publication of his new book. The book grew out of research for his doctrinal dissertation pre-

ventions than any other many in the history of the world and was one of mankind's greatest benefactors. He was born in Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847—121 years ago. He died in West Orange, New Jersey, on October 18, 1931.

It was my high honor to have been selected by Mr. Edison to assume the management of one of his largest and most lucrative businesses. Any success I may have had in commerce or civic affairs, is largely the result of my daily association with this great American during the last decade of his long and productive life.

Embellishment can not fittingly pay tribute to one so humble, so plain and retiring.

He was passionately fond of work.

He was a genius in applying organized knowledge.

He was infinitely patient and undaunted in failures.

He brought forth inventions which broadened the lives of mankind.

He brought amusement, joy and romance to man, woman and child. He lessened their labors. He widened their education for a fuller enjoyment of their daily lives. Great industries with employment of many millions followed in the wake of his discoveries. We can truthfully say there came from his laboratory, a supreme gift—a higher standard of life and higher living standards for the world.

At the time of Edison's death it was suggested that as a tribute to him, the electric power of the nation be turned off for one minute. It was felt this token of respect would cause the people to realize Edison's magnificent contribution.

Upon further consideration it was realized that somewhere in the bowels of the earth, men digging in tunnels and mining ore are dependent on electrically-driven pumps for air. Without it they would soon perish. In hospitals surgeons in the midst of operations with life hanging in the balance, are dependent on electricity to complete their work. The telephone and the police and fire alarms are dependent on electric power. And in hundreds of other situations there would be great danger to life and property if the power of the nation was turned off at the source, just for a minute, as a tribute to its creator.

And so, in our very inability to pay as complete a tribute to Edison as we wished, we found a new and higher tribute to him. Life depends on the light and energy he gave us.

Civilization has been built around his work.

At twenty minutes past three o'clock, the morning of Sunday, October 18, 1931, Thomas Alva Edison closed a long life of unparalleled usefulness.

Mr. Edison's approach to death was a wonderful example of unperturbed courage. Its inevitableness was thoroughly understood and on no occasion did he manifest any apprehension of spirit. He dealt with his falling health as impersonally as he did with any research problem. Before he entered the drowsiness which turned into the final coma, Mr. Edison compared himself with an old machine past repair.

The entire world followed the illness and passing of Mr. Edison with interest and sympathy reserved only for its beloved great, which he was. Throughout the eleven weeks of his illness, his home in Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., was a focal point of unusual solitude. Many thousands of inquiries on Mr. Edison's condition came to the inventor's home and to members of his family.

After the word of his passing had been flashed around the world, messages of condolence and tributes to his genius flowed into Llewellyn Park in unprecedented numbers.

Mrs. Edison, who had been his close companion over a period of 45 years, was constantly in attendance at her illustrious hus-

band's bedside. She contributed everything possible to his comfort and peace of mind. She exhibited extraordinary courage and fortitude throughout the ordeal.

On October 19 and 20 Mr. Edison's body lay in state in the library of his West Orange laboratory. Except for the casket and the simple floral decoration, this room was left almost as he knew it, with its galleries lined with reference mementoes of his amazing life.

After Mr. Edison's employees and co-workers had taken their last look at all that remained of their "old chief", the gates obstructing the way to the laboratory were thrown open and the public allowed to pass through the library. Four abreast they waited in line and moved sadly through the room. Old men and women, shabbily dressed, and school children were in line. Limousines with liveried chauffeurs discharged passengers who took their places in line.

During the two days and nights that the body lay in state, it is estimated that more than 50,000 persons filed through to render a last act of reverence.

On Wednesday morning, October 21, Mr. Edison's body was carried to his home in preparation for the funeral rites and burial. The funeral service was extremely simple, in keeping with the taste and character of Mr. Edison. While the ceremony was private, more than 400 close friends were in attendance.

After the ceremony the body was carried to Rosedale Cemetery in Orange, N.J. which overlooks the hills and valleys among which he had spent the most productive years of his life. It was dusk when the last rites were being said, and autumn leaves drifted softly to the ground from the distant fringe of trees. President Hoover's wreath of magnolia leaves lay at the head of the grave. Electric lights flashed on in the distance while Mrs. Edison stood in silent contemplation before the flower-banked grave.

Only members of the family and a few intimate friends, including his old cronies, Harvey Firestone and Henry Ford, and their wives, attended the interment.

In commenting on Edison's passing, the New York Times said:

"Edison, the light bearer, has gone into darkness. The master of the waves of sound is silent. Around him had gathered an atmosphere of respect, admiration and affection such as surrounded no other American of our time. . . . He might have wrought all these marvels and remained apart, solitarily in his laboratory. His companionable and social nature, his fine simplicity and boyishness, endeared the man, set up his essential human image in millions of minds. He was not only honored, but loved."

Three years before Edison passed on to his reward, a special Congressional Gold Medal of Honor was given him for "development and application of inventions that revolutionized civilization in the last century."

Few men have received, or receiving, deserved such a compliment from the United States Congress.

The manner of his life became the manner of his death. Slowly, calmly, peacefully, he faced death. It found him as unafraid to meet the mysteries beyond as he had been unafraid to explore the mysteries here.

On his deathbed he said, "It is very beautiful over there." How true that must have been with his coming, and equally true it is that he made it very beautiful over here.

He ended his long life, not with a sudden stroke, but with a slow folding-up that seemed perfectly to suit it. No one can yet entirely estimate his place in history, but it can at least be said of Edison, as it was said of Lincoln, and can be said of very few other: "Now he belongs to the ages."

The Washington Post said of him:

"Few men will have the privilege of influencing the life and civilization of their fel-

low-beings after they have crossed the bridge of death, so much as this great American."

There are those who feel that Edison's greatest contribution to civilization is not listed in his more than 1,000 inventions and is not a material product of his laboratory. It is his inspiration to youth, his example to those who would dare to dream of new worlds, his challenge to accomplishment that will always spur onward those who fight the past with the future.

President Hoover said:

"It is given to few men of any age, nation or calling, to become the benefactor of all humanity. That distinction came abundantly to Thomas Alva Edison, whose death in his 85th year has ended a life of courage and achievement.

"By his own genius and effort he rose from a newsboy and telegrapher to the position of leadership among men. His life has been a constant stimulant to confidence that our institutions hold open the door of opportunity to those who would enter. He possessed a modesty, kindness, a staunchness of character rare among men."

Among the lessons from the life of Edison are his uniformly courageous and optimistic outlook, his triumph over his handicap of deafness and his consistent exemplification of the doctrine of self-help. In his achievements he reared for himself an enduring memorial.

Edison's last public utterance remains the best advice given to a perturbed world. It was:

"Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. Always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Thomas Alva Edison was humanity's friend!

President's Message on Education

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson points out in his education message that 1½ million young men and women will leave high school and enter the labor force this year.

But as the President correctly observes, they will be leaving at a time of high employment in this country, a time when job skills are at a premium.

The President predicts:

Too many of them will find that they have no job skills—or only marginal skills, or skills which are not really needed in their communities.

Yet even in a time of high employment, jobs are continuing to open up. It is estimated that there should be two technicians to every engineer or professional physical scientist; there should be 6 to 10 technicians for every medical doctor or researcher in the health fields.

Obviously, broader training must be offered to high school students in vocational education. Students must be encouraged to stay in school and to undertake technical training.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I welcome the President's request for favorable action by the House on the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968.

We already have made much progress under the Vocational Education Act of

1963. In the past 4 years, the number of vocational students in our high schools has increased by more than 1½ million.

Of these young men and women, about 1¼ million have been trained in a business occupation. The remaining ¼ million have been trained in trades and industrial occupations.

In that same period, the number of postsecondary vocational students has increased by more than 900,000. Of these, nearly 800,000 have taken training in business education, and 70,000 have been trained in trades and industrial occupations.

Mr. Speaker, the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act would help the States concentrate their funds where they find the greatest needs in vocational education. It would encourage the States to make long-range plans for better vocational education. I hope the House will act promptly to enact the President's bill.

Fair Pay System for Federal Government Wage Board Workers

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service commenced public hearings relative to the pay of our Government's 800,000 wage board employees, which incidentally is more than in all of the Post Office Department or the combined total employment of any two of our Nation's largest private corporations.

Wage board employees are those in recognized trades or crafts, other skilled mechanical crafts, and in unskilled or semi-skilled manual labor occupations. Examples of wage board employees are: laborers, carpenters, painters, and aircraft mechanics. These are frequently referred to as blue-collar employees to distinguish them from the classified or white-collar employees of the professional, administrative, and clerical classes.

Under various laws, especially the Classification Act of 1949, the annual salaries of the white-collar employees are established, from time to time, by the Congress. On the other hand, the heads of the departments concerned establish the hourly wages to be paid the wage board employees. The wages of the blue-collar employees are required to be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

In our continuing study of the salaries and wages of Federal employees, we found a number of inequities and inconsistencies involved in establishing the pay of the blue-collar workers. Principal among these was the significantly different hourly rate for the same work in the same city or area paid by the various Government departments. These inequities were brought to the attention of the Congress and the President. He directed the heads of departments and agencies under the leadership of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to simplify

and to coordinate the procedures for establishing pay rates for blue-collar employees.

On December 1, 1967, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission announced a new coordinated Federal wage system for the departments and agencies. In the meanwhile, the Senate passed a bill, S. 2303, in October 1967, to provide for a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of wage board employees.

In 1967, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, spent many months reviewing the pay of our professional, administrative, and clerical personnel. As a result, Congress passed the most comprehensive pay bill in history for those employees. It now appears most appropriate and timely that we give proper and adequate consideration to the pay of our 800,000 blue-collar workers, about 80 percent of whom are in the Department of Defense.

All interested departments and employee organizations will be given an opportunity to express their views on the different proposals to revise the wage board pay system.

On February 6, 1968, in testimony before the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee, Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission reviewed, in depth, the coordinated Federal wage system, and stated that it would be put into effect on an area by area basis beginning July 1, 1968. The principal features of the new system are the same rate of pay for the same type of work in the same area by all departments, standard job classification, and greater employee participation in the reviews leading to establishment of pay rates.

Any comprehensive overhaul of the blue-collar pay system should result in a single wage board pay system in the Department of Defense, which up until now has had two.

The next witnesses to be heard, the week of February 26, will be officials from the Defense Department who will discuss their views.

We certainly want to hear from all employee organizations and others who have an interest in this management area. The blue-collar workers, from laborer to top-level supervisors, must have a fair pay system—one that is truly representative and comparable with the hourly rates of pay of our private economy.

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing now pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service more important to the American taxpayers than the undertaking of the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee to insure that the best and fairest wage pay system we can devise is established and implemented as soon as possible.

Fayette County, Ga.

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, at my request, the Department of Health, Educa-

tion, and Welfare informs me that there is more to the story of its dealings with the Fayette County School District than has been indicated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] today. I have long been impressed by the Department's good faith in the administration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I am confident that the Department will disclose its reasons for deferring Federal funds as soon as possible.

Interoceanic Links—Release by Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the January 1964 Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone served to dramatize the interoceanic canal problem to a greater degree than any event since the famous dash in 1898 of the U.S.S. *Oregon* from the Pacific coast to join the U.S. fleet off Santiago, Cuba. One consequence has been the encouragement of the thoughtful authors and outstanding authorities to write on various aspects of the canal question.

Among such writers is Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff of Tulsa, Okla., a distinguished geologist formerly head of the department of geology of the University of Pennsylvania, who is well versed on interoceanic canal problems.

In a recent release on "Interoceanic Links," Dr. Meyerhoff presents some Suez and Panama canals and their relation to world commerce.

I quote the indicated release as part of my remarks:

INTEROCEANIC LINKS

TULSA, OKLA., January 21, 1968.—To an air-minded generation, oceans are for cruises. This is the season for Caribbean jaunts, and the Mediterranean may lure the more leisurely and affluent, even tho Athens, Nicosia, and Cairo have lost some of their charm. But the 'round-the-world traveler really has to have time and money, for the only way around is the long way—via Cape Town. Suez is closed to traffic. At least, he doesn't have to round Cape Horn—yet.

The Cock-eyed World.—Geographically the world is cock-eyed. Most of the land is in the Northern Hemisphere, and most of the water is in the Southern. The world's population is even more unbalanced, for a disproportionate amount of it is crowded into the great expanses of habitable land in the Northern Hemisphere. Theoretically concentration is good for business, but practically it's bad for trade. The world's bulk commodities move by water.

In the Eastern Hemisphere the completion of the Suez Canal in 1869 changed the entire pattern of international trade, and especially trade in the British Empire. Britain's navy and bases assured safe passage. Gibraltar—"The Rock"—controlled the entrance to the Mediterranean. Malta guarded the narrows between Sicily and Tunisia. A pact with Egypt and bases at Aden and Soltra took care of the Canal, Red Sea and Gulf of Aden. The final control point on the route to the Indies and Hongkong was Singapore on the Strait of Malacca.

And now? Gibraltar, British since 1704, is under threat from Spain. Malta, Aden and Singapore are independent. And Nasser has

bitten off his nose to save face, to the tune of \$4 million or more a week in tolls. Oil for Western Europe may have been the most critical bulk commodity to pass thru the Canal, but the 100,000 and 200,000-ton tankers in service or abuilding offer scant comfort to the lesser nations dependent upon low-cost ocean freight for their bulk exports and imports. The added shipping and insurance costs for oil and other raw materials may well have been the final shove that pushed the British pound over the brink.

Lest We Forget.—Nasser has given the maritime nations a timely lesson in the freedom of the seaways, if not of the seas. Perhaps it is one reason why we haven't heard more of the Panama treaty which, only a few months ago, the Administration was prepared to push thru the Senate. Helpfully, Panamanians demonstrated against it and demanded bigger and better concessions at the crucial moment. But what is going on now between the two governments, even the Senators seem unable to discover.

Before the Panama Canal was opened in 1914, shipping between the East and West coasts of the U.S. was severely restricted, and so was West Coast development. It faced the Orient, and trans-Pacific trade was easier—and more lucrative—than trans-continental trade around the Horn. The voyages of the Clipper ships or the forced-draft run of the USS Oregon made dramatic reading, but the trans-continental railroad made more sense. The truth is, it still does.

Movement of mineral raw materials thru the Panama Canal illustrates the point. In an average year 13 million tons of iron ore, copper, nitrate and other minerals pass thru the locks to get from one ocean to the other. Of this amount less than 200,000 tons is internal U.S. trade, and approximately 8.3 million tons, U.S. foreign trade. The remaining 4.5 million tons has a foreign origin and a foreign destination. Over 9 million tons are iron ore, copper concentrate or matte, tin, lead and zinc concentrates, and nitrates from Chile, Bolivia, and Peru, whose economic development dates in large part from the opening of the canal. Other Latin American countries join the list of beneficiaries when agricultural products are totted up.

Administration of this vital interoceanic link is a responsibility that cannot be shared with a country that has nothing to offer but the accident of geography. The U.S. with a feeble assist from the U.N., took Suez out of responsible hands, at a cost the Eastern Hemisphere is now paying. Can it afford to compromise its responsibility to the world in the administration of the Panama Canal?

President Acts To Bring Boating Safety to America's Waterways

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we have acted to achieve safer motor vehicles and highway programs, President Johnson proposed in his consumer message to improve boating safety.

It has become dangerous to launch a pleasure boat on our lakes and waterways.

Last year's figures point out the seriousness of the problem. Some 7,000 persons were seriously injured and more than 1,400 were killed in boating accidents.

In Michigan alone, in 1966, there were 325 boating accidents, in which 90 people were killed, 123 were injured, and prop-

erty damage totaled nearly a quarter of a million dollars.

These statistics only record those deaths and injuries which were reported—not the many accidents which may have gone unreported.

Boating safety is a necessity for the total enjoyment of our waterways. All levels of government must cooperate in this venture if we are to have a true measure of success. Thus, the President's Recreational Boat Safety Act will provide Federal assistance to help States establish and improve their own boat safety programs—while authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to act and enforce safety standards for boat design and equipment.

Boating should be enjoyable—not hazardous; relaxing—not a risk. President Johnson's program can help eliminate the needless tragedy in our waterways. We must act promptly on the President's proposals.

Motor Vehicle Master Keys

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that in his message on crime in America, President Johnson indicated that the administration will sponsor legislation to control the traffic in so-called motor vehicle master keys in interstate commerce.

Many bills to accomplish this laudable goal have been introduced in this Congress. The senior Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL, and I have co-sponsored one of these measures. Our bill differs from some of the others, however, in that it would prohibit the interstate shipment of master keys to persons barred by State law from possessing or receiving them.

It is my belief that by relating the Federal law to State statutes, we would both strengthen existing State regulations and encourage those States that have not already done so to enact laws of their own for curbing master keys.

Although we may disagree on the exact form this legislation should take, I think we can all agree that the auto theft problem cries for solutions.

Already much is being done. A campaign undertaken by the Justice Department, law enforcement associations, and automobile clubs has helped educate the general public on steps to reduce auto theft. Many auto owners have been alerted to take such precautions as they can, by leaving car ignitions and doors locked when their cars are unattended. And manufacturers are responding with devices which will make it difficult for a motorist to inadvertently leave his car with the key in the ignition.

Although carelessness by automobile owners still continues to contribute to auto theft—particularly by juveniles who are prone to "joyriding"—even locked cars can be stolen by the use of "master keys" which are readily available to the public through mail-order sales.

For a minimal price, any person can obtain a set of keys which, although advertised as "master keys" are really "manipulation keys," designed to fit the ignition of numbers of cars of designated models. These keys are not of the type used in the locksmith trade, which are specifically designed to open combinations of locks in a planned sequence, but are intended to take advantage of un-planned construction similarities in a series or group of locks.

The "manipulation" or "tryout" key, as it is sometimes called, has little legitimate use. The manufacture and dissemination of such keys must be controlled, so as to prevent them from being available to irresponsible persons who can easily use them for illegal purposes.

I hope that legislation to accomplish this can be enacted this year.

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, February 12, marks the day on which we honor one of the greatest heroes of our American Revolution, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of the most valiant and brilliant soldiers of his day. He was also a great soldier of freedom.

Born the son of a well-to-do Polish peasant, Kosciuszko seemed destined to be a fighter for freedom and justice. He was born on February 12, 1746, and at the age of 13 lost his father. This did not deter his resolve, however, for he continued his education with success and in 1765 entered the Royal Military School at Warsaw. He graduated in 1769 with the rank of captain and won a scholarship for study in France where he entered the famous military school at Meseieres, specializing in artillery and engineering.

In 1776, in Paris, Kosciuszko heard of America's fight for independence. Our Revolution stirred his restless, fighting spirit and his desire to act in a righteous cause. With borrowed money he sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August of that year.

In the United States, Kosciuszko applied at once for military service. He was admitted and first employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware. In 3 months he completed this assignment and earned a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of 1777 Kosciuszko joined the northern army at Ticonderoga. Unfortunately, his plans for fortification there were not followed and Ticonderoga was lost to the enemy. Soon, however, his sound judgment was given due credit at Saratoga. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of construction of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he saw action at Charleston, S.C., and was one of the first Conti-

mentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his outstanding services for the cause of our Revolution, Congress made Kosciuszko a brigadier general in October of 1783. Concerned for his own people, he returned to Poland hoping to serve in Poland's struggle for freedom. In 1789 he was made a major general in Poland's Army and for many years continued to lead the Poles in their valiant but hopeless fight for freedom. He ended his career in Switzerland, dying there on October 15, 1817.

It is most fitting that we pay homage to the memory of this gallant son of Poland who was also one of the great patriots of our American Revolution.

A Crumbling Policy

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Vietnam draws on and on, we are led to wonder about the wisdom of a military policy in this area.

Is there a need for a reassessment of the U.S. military posture, with some deep thought being given to a modified approach to this problem?

Walter Lippmann makes some penetrating observations on this subject in an article appearing in the February 12 issue of Newsweek. I insert this article in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A CRUMBLING POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The seizure of the Pueblo has brought home to us that in the coastal waters of Asia lie the outer limits of our conventional military power. It has been a humiliating affair. But it is only an incident in a chain of events which teaches the same lesson, that the Johnson-Rusk Asian policy is a miscalculation of our own power in relation to the power that can be arrayed against us.

The Pueblo affair has made all but the most irresponsible realize that we cannot afford to have a second land war in Asia. This realization has come to us a few weeks after Great Britain, our only important and independent ally in the world, has announced that she will abandon her role as a military power in South Asia—from Suez to Singapore. This leaves us without the support of a single large power anywhere in the world. The withdrawal of Britain from Asia confirms the total isolation of the United States.

The financial crisis which caused the British decision to withdraw left the dollar exposed and vulnerable. By various devices at home and abroad a crisis has been averted. But if the war in Asia spreads and intensifies, there can be little doubt that these financial devices and palliatives will break down. This may well cause a worldwide financial crisis.

Our international financial troubles have now been capped by the domestic budget. Because it is impossible to foresee the course of the war, it is a mystifying budget. The only certain thing about it is that it marks the end of the great "war" on poverty and the promises of a "Great Society."

Amidst all these troubles we are facing the biggest battle of the war in Vietnam. In this battle, General Westmoreland does not have the initiative.

Attempting the Impossible. The series of

setbacks would seem to indicate that the Johnson-Rusk policy in Asia is crumbling. What is crumbling is the notion that the United States can by military force determine the order of things on the continent of Asia.

We have had plenty of warning from American soldiers and American experts not to attempt the impossible in Asia. They have told us that we cannot invade and conquer, that we cannot "contain" by surrounding, the masses of Asian peasants.

It is not necessary to read Chinese and Sanskrit in order to understand the essential facts of the strategic and military relationship between America and Asia. It is necessary only to look at a map and to study the statistics. The Johnson-Rusk policy in Asia is based on the assumption that 200 million Americans, because they have a superior technology, can lead and direct the two-thirds of the human race which inhabits the continent of Asia. It cannot be done.

The size of Asia is too great. The distance from America is too great. The distrust of the Western white man's rule is too great. The reluctance of the Western white man to go bankrupt and die is too great. The foundations of the policy are rotten, and they were bound to crumble.

The Pueblo reminds us that in making the strategic mistake of engaging the bulk of our military power at one point, like Vietnam, the response can and will break out at other points. The war is already spreading into Laos, Thailand, Cambodia and Korea. Perhaps it will spread to Quemoy and Matsu, perhaps to the Middle East. The Johnson-Rusk policy of "containment" is like trying to squeeze a gallon of water into a pint-size bottle.

No Victory in Asia. The cardinal mistake in Washington has, however, been the failure to realize that the Soviet Union could not and would not allow us to win the war in Asia. This quite self-evident truth has now been reaffirmed by Chairman Kosygin in his interview with Life magazine: "The United States cannot defeat Vietnam. And we, for our part, will do all we can so that the United States does not defeat Vietnam."

Despite the Communist habit of making big threats, this is a very serious statement. For in this case the Soviet Union not only has real reasons for helping Vietnam but it has the practical ability to do what it says it will do. We cannot prevent the Soviet Union from supplying North Vietnam, and we may be sure that China will not interfere.

But besides supplying Hanoi, the Soviet Union can unleash or foment outbreaks at a dozen places from Korea to the Mediterranean. Even the blindest among us can see that the United States, which has no effective ally in the world, cannot have military superiority all over the globe.

Until the miscalculations of our present policy are understood, the formation of a constructive policy in the emerging and awakened Asian continent will not be possible. We are witnessing the frustration of a military policy. Until we have learned the lesson of the mistake which has caused it, we shall have little political influence in Asian affairs.

Parity Prices

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the farm parity percentages on farm products for the month ending January 15, 1968.

The average price that farmers received this past month is less than three-fourths of the fair price that farmers should be receiving. It is important to point out that not only are farmers being plagued with depression level prices, their costs have been and are continuing to establish new monthly all-time highs. While farm prices are 2½ times higher than they were in 1910-14, their farm production and living costs are 3½ times higher. This past year alone, production costs increased seven points over a year ago. The interest that a farmer pays now, based on a per acre average, is 4.6 times as high as the 1910-14 base; his taxes are nine times as high per acre as the base period, and his wage costs are 8½ times as high as the base period. Parity for the year of 1967 averaged 74 percent, which is 6 percentage points lower than last year, and the lowest of any year since 1933. In the great depression year of 1934 farm parity was at 75 percent.

I call this shocking condition to the attention of my colleagues because continuance of such low returns will finally lead to the reality of painful consequences by the public who today receive the greatest food bargain in the world at the expense of one of the lowest paid segments of our society. In effect, the farmer is subsidizing the food consumer and has been for nearly 20 years.

Parity prices for January 1968

	Percent
January	74
Cotton	51
Wheat	54
Corn	65
Peanuts	75
Butterfat	78
Milk	84
Wool	45
Barley	74
Flax	73
Oats	76
Sorghum	68
Soybeans	76
Beef	75
Chickens	64
Eggs	62
Hogs	73
Lambs	79
Turkeys	59

President's Message on Education

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on education gives us an ample agenda for building upon past educational accomplishments and for meeting the educational needs of the young men and women in this country.

We sorely need such an agenda. The changing trends of our national economy and the growing demands upon young men and women to present modern job skills have created a serious gap in our educational system.

New occupations are emerging; old ones are dying out. Broader training must be offered to students in vocational education. Students must be motivated to stay in school and to go on to more advanced training after high school.

It is to these purposes that the President's partnership for learning and earning is addressed. Title I of the proposed legislation would provide grants for model projects in vocational education. The broader training needed would begin here with improved curriculums.

The President's bill also would consolidate next year the existing authority for vocational education programs under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts.

I think this is most important because the present requirement for separate matching, purpose by purpose and project by project, would be removed. States then would match Federal funds with a statewide total. This would give more flexibility; Federal funds would be directed to the greatest needs.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, it was estimated that the number of jobs for professional and technical workers would increase by 40 percent by the 1970's. Those jobs are continuing to open up. I believe the Congress should comply with the President's request and get on with the task of improving vocational education in this country.

Two State GI's Die in War

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp5c. Harold R. Stafford and Sp4. Russell M. Amoss, two infantrymen from Maryland, were recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN WAR—H. R. STAFFORD, R. M. AMOSS BOTH KILLED JANUARY 31

Two Army infantrymen from Maryland were killed January 31 in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The latest casualties from Maryland were identified as Spec. 5 Harold R. Stafford, 25, of 2812 Oak Grove Avenue, Baltimore Highlands, and Spec. 4 Russell M. Amoss, of Route 3, Mount Airy.

SERVING SECOND HITCH

Specialist Stafford, a tankman turned infantryman, was killed by gunfire, according to his wife, Mrs. Opal Stafford. He had been in Vietnam since September.

Specialist Stafford, a native of Balleysville, W. Va., was serving his second hitch in the Army. He was assigned to the 25th Infantry Division.

He first enlisted about 1959 and was discharged in 1963. Mrs. Stafford said her husband reenlisted in June, 1966.

"He just felt he was needed," Mrs. Stafford said.

ATTENDED SCHOOL IN WEST VIRGINIA

At one point Specialist Stafford was a tank commander in an armored unit in Germany. He was considering making a career of the Army but had not yet decided to do so, Mrs. Stafford said.

"He never bothered me about the situation over there," Mrs. Stafford said. "He knew I'd just worry."

Specialist Stafford attended high school and plumbing trade school in Balleysville.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a son, Richard T. Stafford; a daughter, Tammy R.

Stafford; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Stafford, of Holcomb, W. Va.; two brothers and five sisters.

Specialist Amoss, an infantry squad leader, was killed by metal fragments from an explosion, according to the Department of the Army.

IN VIETNAM SINCE MAY

He was 20 years old and had been in Vietnam since May, 1967.

Specialist Amoss lived in rural Howard county, not far from the Carroll county community of Mount Airy. He was a 1965 graduate of Glenelg High School and a pitcher on the school's baseball team.

After graduation, and until he was drafted on November 18, 1966, he was employed by the Fawcett-Haynes Printing Corporation, in Rockville.

In his letters home from Vietnam, his mother recalled last night, "He let me know he was okay, but he wouldn't tell us about anything over there."

SURVIVORS LISTED

Specialist Amoss is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley M. Amoss, of Route 3, Mount Airy, nine brothers, Stanley M. Amoss, Jr., of Baltimore; Earl Amoss, of Frederick; Howard Amoss, of Reddington, Pa.; Robert Amoss, of Mount Airy; Richard Amoss, of Detour, Md.; Kenneth Amoss, of Damascus, Md.; Norman Amoss, of the United States Air Force and Roy and Lloyd Amoss, both of the home; and four sisters, Mrs. Grace Shaw, of Riverdale, Md.; Mrs. Doris Gasaway, of Clarksburg, Md.; Mrs. Mary Gayer, of Sykesville, Md., and Miss Gall Amoss, of the home.

In addition, the deaths of a Navy hospitalman who once lived in Baltimore and an Army Specialist who was born here were reported.

KILLED BY SNIPER

The Navy man was Hospitalman Ralph D. Wheeler 3d, 20, who was killed January 27 by a sniper while he was serving with the 3d Battalion, 4th Marine Brigade, 3d Marine Division.

He was the son of Army Sgt. 1st Class and Mrs. Ralph D. Wheeler, of 315B Forbes road, Trafford, Pa., and as a small child he lived with his parents in Baltimore until his father's assignments as a career soldier led elsewhere.

Hospitalman Wheeler was a 1966 graduate of Trafford (Pa.) high school. He had been in Vietnam since Thanksgiving Day, 1967.

He is survived by his parents; a brother, Mark Wheeler, of Trafford, and a sister, Mrs. Carole Mallory, of Pittsburgh.

The soldier was Spec. 4 David W. Leatherbury, 21, son of the Rev. and Mrs. John R. Leatherbury, of Fort Worth, Texas, who was killed in Vietnam January 12. His parents are both former Baltimoreans.

Foreign Travel Tax Is Unwise

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating editorial appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Wednesday, February 2, in opposition to the proposed tax to be levied upon Americans traveling abroad. This persuasive and timely editorial is reproduced here for the benefit of my colleagues as well as for the edification of those in the executive department who are advocating this unwise measure:

AN ABOMINABLE TAX

It would be hard to devise a scheme more intricate, more difficult to enforce, and more

contrary to American traditions of liberty than the proposed travel tax which the administration has dumped in the lap of Congress. Or, for that matter, one less likely to make a significant dent in the balance-of-payments deficit, which Secretary Fowler described as "intolerable."

Not even the administration expects the proposed tax to cut tourist spending overseas by more than 200 or 250 million dollars a year. This is almost trivial when compared with the dollar deficit of about 3.6 billion dollars, or with total tourist spending of about 4 billion dollars, or with the government's own spending abroad on foreign aid, which has been estimated at about 8 billion dollars a year.

In order to bring about this modest saving, American travelers are threatened with a ridiculous amount of red tape and bureaucratic snooping. Anyone planning to leave the western hemisphere would have to file a tax return stating how long he expected to be overseas and how much he expected to spend there. If he expected to spend more than \$7 a day, he would have to pay in advance a tax on the excess: 15 per cent up to \$15 a day, and 30 per cent over that.

Upon leaving the country, he would have to file a declaration stating how much he was taking with him in cash and travelers checks, "subject to verification by customs officials or other treasury officials" [meaning they could search him]. He would have to pay a 5 per cent tax on his air line or other transportation. Upon his return he would have to declare how much money he had left [and perhaps display it], and within 60 days he would have to file a final return listing his expenses, reporting any money he received abroad beyond what he took with him, and paying any remaining tax due.

Rules like these have been tried by other countries but have never worked. For those who want to evade them, there are at least two ways around every rule. Even with complete public cooperation, they would be difficult to enforce. The purpose of the proposal is to discourage travel, but, to the extent that it does, it would infringe upon what the Supreme Court has declared to be an inalienable right, "a constitutional liberty closely related to rights of free speech and association." In the words of Justice Douglas, an inveterate globe-trotter himself, "Free movement by the citizen . . . is the very essence of our free society."

True, the court was talking about the right of Communists and others to travel abroad against the wishes of the state department. But this makes the proposed restrictions all the more offensive. The administration is not only asking us, as tourists, to atone for its own fiscal sins, but it also wants to impose on a right which the Supreme Court has guaranteed even to Communists in our midst. And all in the dubious hope of trimming at most one-twelfth from the "intolerable" deficit.

Foreign Assistance: A Priority Program

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President for pressing the offensive in the war on hunger he declared last year and for reaffirming the importance of aid programs in health, education, and agriculture.

The programs he proposes are constructive. They offer immediate and long-range solutions to the problems most visibly afflicting the less-developed world. He asks our support in exploiting spec-

tacular breakthroughs in agriculture, in meeting the growing response to our offer of help in family planning.

The health, education, and agriculture programs proposed by the President are the best available guarantee of a healthy and intelligent leadership to carry on with the task of development wherever this leadership is most needed.

The urgency should be apparent to all of us. Population growth today is projected in multiples of billions compressed in steadily diminishing periods of time.

What we are asked to do involves no great sacrifice. We are called on to use our great resources of wealth and technology to help preserve the precarious balance between food and mouths, to eradicate disease and ignorance.

If we are not moved to support this program by a sense of compassion, let us obey our instincts for self-preservation.

If anything offers hope for peace and stability, surely these programs do. They satisfy today's needs in the developing world and keep pace with tomorrow's.

Our experience since the President first emphasized these programs 3 years ago encourages optimism. In cost the program is modest. But modest or not, we cannot afford to give anything less than our full support for these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of the President's message sent today to the Congress in support of his proposed foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1969, plus some additional supplementary information on that program:

TO BUILD THE PEACE

Peace will never be secure so long as:

Seven out of ten people on earth cannot read or write:

Tens of millions of people each day—most of them children—are maimed and stunted by malnutrition.

Diseases long conquered by science still ravage cities and villages around the world.

If most men can look forward to nothing more than a lifetime of backbreaking toil which only preserves their misery, violence will always beckon, freedom will ever be under seige.

It is only when peace offers hope for a better life that it attracts the hundreds of millions around the world who live in the shadow of despair.

Twenty years ago America resolved to lead the world against the destructive power of man's oldest enemies. We declared war on the hunger, the ignorance, the disease, and the hopelessness which breed violence in human affairs.

We knew then that the job would take many years. We knew then that many trials and many disappointments would test our will.

But we also knew that, in the long run, a single ray of hope—a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—can do more to build the peace and guard America from harm than guns and bombs.

This is the great truth upon which all our foreign aid programs are founded. It was valid in 1948 when we helped Greece and Turkey maintain their independence. It was valid in the early fifties when the Marshall Plan helped rebuild a ruined Western Europe into a showcase of freedom. It was valid in the sixties when we helped Taiwan and Iran and Israel take their places in the ranks of free nations able to defend their own independence, and moving toward prosperity on their own.

The programs I propose today are as im-

portant and as essential to the security of this nation as our military defenses. Victory on the battlefield must be matched by victory in the peaceful struggles which shape men's minds.

In these fateful years, we must not falter. In these decisive times, we dare not fail.

NO RETREAT, NO WASTE

The foreign aid program for fiscal 1969 is designed to foster our fundamental American purpose: To help root out the causes of conflict and thus ensure our own security in a peaceful community of nations.

For fiscal 1969, I propose:

An economic aid appropriation of \$2.5 billion.

A military grant aid appropriation of \$420 million.

New and separate legislation for foreign military sales.

A five-year program to develop and manufacture low-cost protein additives from fish, to help avoid the tragic brain damage now inflicted on millions of children because of malnutrition in their early years.

That the United States join with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development-lending affiliate of the World Bank. For every two dollars the United States contributes, other nations will contribute three dollars.

That the Congress authorize a contribution to new Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

Prompt appropriation of the annual contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

A further authorization and appropriation of callable funds for the Inter-American Development Bank to stand behind the Bank's borrowing in private money markets.

COMMON EFFORT FOR COMMON GOOD

I pledge to the Congress and to the people of America that these programs will be carried out with strict attention to the six basic principles of foreign aid administration we announced last year.

1. Self-help

Self-Help is the fundamental condition for all American aid. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment. We will help those—and only those—who help themselves. We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement.

2. Multilateralism

This year, 90 percent of our AID loans will be made as part of international arrangements in which donors and recipients alike carry their fair shares of the common burden.

America now ranks fifth among donor countries in terms of the share of its national product devoted to official foreign aid. Japan increased her aid by nearly 50 percent last year. Germany has increased her aid budget despite fiscal restraints which have curtailed domestic welfare programs. Great Britain is maintaining aid levels despite severe financial problems. With the signing of the International Grains Agreement, other wealthy nations will for the first time be obligated to contribute food and money to the world-wide war on hunger.

This year we must take another important step to sustain those international institutions which build the peace.

The International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending affiliate is almost without funds. Discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now underway. We hope that these talks will soon result in agreements among the wealthy nations of the world to continue the critical work of the Association in the developing countries. The Administration will transmit specific legislation promptly upon completion of these discussions. I urge the Congress to give it full support.

3. Regionalism

Last year I joined with the Latin American Presidents to renew, reaffirm and redirect the Alliance for Progress.

The nations of free Asia began a general survey of their joint transportation and education needs, while work proceeded on projects to bring power, water and the other tools of progress to all.

The African Development Bank, financed entirely by Africans, opened its doors and made its first loan.

The coming year will present three major opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts:

A. The Inter-American Development Bank.

This Bank stands at the center of the Alliance for Progress. Last year, the Congress authorized three annual contributions of \$300 million each to the Bank's Fund for Special Operations. The second of these contributions should be appropriated this year.

The Ordinary Capital of the Bank, which comes mainly from sales of its bonds in the private market, must now be expanded. Since 1960, we have appropriated \$612 million which is kept in the U.S. Treasury to guarantee these bonds. Not one dollar of this money has ever been spent, but this guarantee has enabled the bank to raise \$612 million from private sources for worthy projects. We must extend this proud record. I urge the Congress to authorize \$412 million in callable funds, of which \$206 million will be needed this year.

B. The Asian Development Bank

This Bank has asked the United States, Japan, and other donors to help establish Special Funds for projects of regional significance—in agriculture, education, transportation and other fields. Last October I requested that the Congress authorize a United States contribution of up to \$200 million. This would be paid over a four-year period—only if it were a minority share of the total fund, and if it did not adversely affect our balance of payments. I urge Congress take prompt and favorable action on this request.

C. The African Development Bank

This Bank has also asked for our help to establish a small Special Fund for projects which cannot or should not be financed through the Bank's Ordinary Capital. We must stand ready to provide our fair share, with full safeguards for our balance of payments.

4. Priority for agriculture and population planning

Victory in the war on hunger is as important to every human being as any achievement in the history of mankind.

The report of 100 experts assembled last year by the President's Science Advisory Committee on the World Food Supply rings with grim clarity. Their message is clear: The world has entered a food-population crisis. Unless the rich and the poor nations join in a long-range, innovative effort unprecedented in human affairs, this crisis will reach disastrous proportions by the mid-1980's.

That Report also reminded us that more food production is not enough. People must have the money to buy food. They must have jobs and homes and schools and rising incomes. Agricultural development must go hand-in-hand with general economic growth.

AID programs are designed both to stimulate general economic growth and to give first priority to agriculture. In India, for instance, about half of all AID-financed imports this year will consist of fertilizer and other agricultural supplies.

We have made a good start:

India is harvesting the largest grain crop in her history. Fertilizer use has doubled in the past two years. Last year five million acres were planted with new high yield wheat seeds. By 1970 this will increase to 32 million acres.

Brazil, with AID help, has developed a new

grass which has already added 400,000 acres of new pastureland and increased her annual output of beef by 20,000 metric tons.

The Philippines is expecting a record rice crop this year which will eliminate the need to import rice.

In the year ahead, AID will increase its investment in agriculture to about \$800 million—50 percent of its total development aid. In addition, I will shortly propose an extension of the Food for Freedom program to provide emergency food assistance to stave off disaster while hungry countries build their own food production.

We must also tap the vast storehouse of food in the oceans which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface. I have directed the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Secretary of the Interior to launch a five-year program to:

Perfect low-cost commercial processes for the production of Fish Protein Concentrate.

Develop new protein-rich products that will fit in a variety of local diets.

Encourage private investment in Fish Protein Concentrate production and marketing, as well as better fishing methods.

Use this new product in our Food for Freedom program to fortify the diets of children and nursing mothers.

But food is only one side of the equation. If populations continue to grow at the present rate, we are only postponing disaster not preventing it.

In 1961 only two developing countries had programs to reduce birth rates. In 1967 there were 26.

As late as 1963, this government was spending less than \$2 million to help family planning efforts abroad. In 1968, we will commit \$35 million and additional amounts of local currency will be committed. In 1969 we expect to do even more.

Family planning is a family matter. The United States will not undertake to tell any government or any parent how and to what extent population must be limited.

But neither we nor our friends in the developing world can ignore the stark fact that the success of development efforts depends upon the balance between population and food and other resources. No government can escape this truth. The United States stands ready to help those governments that recognize it and move to deal with it.

5. Balance-of-payments protection

Our ability to pursue our responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. Economic aid now helps—not hurts—our balance of payments position.

In 1963, the dollar outflow from foreign aid expenditures was over \$600 million. Last year, it was down to \$270 million. I have already directed that even this figure be reduced in 1968 to less than \$170 million. More than nine dollars of every ten dollars AID spends will buy American goods and services. And the repayments of prior loans will more than offset the small outflow from new loans.

Moreover, our AID programs have a favorable long range impact on our balance of payments by building new markets for our exports.

6. Efficient administration

Over the past few years AID has reduced by twenty percent the number of U.S. employees serving overseas in posts other than Vietnam. Last month I directed a ten percent reduction in the number of employees overseas in all civilian agencies. In addition, AID is further improving and streamlining its over-all operations.

A CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Foreign aid must be much more than government aid. Private enterprise has a critical role. Last year:

All 50 states exported American products financed by AID.

The International Executive Service Corps

operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen counseled local executives.

Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a private, U.S. non-profit organization.

More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.

Thirty-three American states supported development work in 14 Latin American countries under AID's Partners of the Alliance program.

All of these efforts will be sustained and expanded in the coming year. We are committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in and assistance to the developing countries. We shall remain so.

A YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY, A YEAR OF RISK LATIN AMERICA

I propose appropriations of \$625 million for the Alliance for Progress.

The American Presidents met at Punta del Este last spring to reaffirm a partnership which has already produced six years of accomplishment:

The nations of Latin America have invested more than \$115 billion, compared with \$7.7 billion in American aid.

Their tax revenues have increased by 30 percent.

Their gross national product has risen by 30 percent.

A new course was charted for that partnership in the years ahead. At Punta del Este, the American nations agreed to move toward economic integration. They set new targets for improvements in agriculture, in health, and in education. They moved to bring the blessings of modern technology to all the citizens of our Hemisphere.

Now we must do our part. Some nations, such as Venezuela, have progressed to the point where they no longer require AID loans. More than two-thirds of our aid will be concentrated in Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Central America. Each has done much to deserve our help:

Brazil increased food production by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall real economic growth of 5%. Inflation was cut from 40% in 1966 to 25% in 1967.

Chile, under President Frei's Revolution in Freedom, has launched a strong program of agricultural and land reforms, while maintaining an overall growth rate of about 5%.

Colombia has also averaged 5% growth while undertaking difficult financial and social reforms.

Central America leads the way toward the economic integration so important to the future of Latin America. Trade among these countries has grown by 450% in the six years of the Alliance—from \$30 million in 1961 to \$172 million in 1967.

This peaceful Alliance holds the hopes of a Hemisphere. We have a clear responsibility to do our share. Our partners have an equally clear responsibility to do theirs. We must press forward together toward mutual security and economic development for all our people.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

I recommend \$706 million for the Near East and South Asia.

Half the people we seek to help live in India, Pakistan and Turkey. The fate of freedom in the world rests heavily on the fortunes of these three countries.

Each is engaged in a powerful effort to fight poverty, to grow more and better food, and to control population. If they succeed, and in so doing prove the effectiveness of free institutions, the lesson will be heard and heeded around the world.

This is a year of special importance for all three countries.

INDIA

India has survived two successive years of the worst drought of this century. Even as she fought to save her people from starvation, she prepared for the day when the monsoon rains would return to normal. That day has come. India is now harvesting the greatest grain crop in her history. With this crop, India can begin a dramatic recovery which could lay the groundwork for sustained growth.

India must have the foreign exchange to take advantage of this year of opportunity. A farmer cannot use the miracle seed which would double or triple his yield unless he can get twice as much fertilizer as he used for the old seeds. A fertilizer distributor cannot sell that much more fertilizer unless it can be imported. An importer cannot buy it unless he can get foreign exchange from the Government. India will not have the foreign exchange unless the wealthy countries of the world are willing to lend it in sufficient quantities at reasonable terms.

This is the crux of the matter. If we and other wealthy countries can provide the loans, we have much to look forward to. If we cannot, history will rightly label us penny-wise and pound-foolish.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan, though also plagued by drought, has continued its excellent progress of the past few years. Her development budget has been increased. Her military budget has been reduced. Agricultural production is growing faster than population. Private investment has exceeded expectations.

Now the Government of Pakistan has undertaken further steps to reform its economic policies—to free up its economy and give more play to the market. These reforms are acts of wisdom and courage, but they require foreign exchange to back them up. Pakistan deserves our help.

TURKEY

Turkey's economic record is outstanding. Her gross national product has grown an average of six percent annually since 1962. Industrial output has grown nine percent per year. Food production is growing much faster than population growth.

Turkey's own savings now finance some 90 percent of her gross investment. Difficult problems remain, but we may now realistically look forward to the day—in the early 1970's—when Turkey will no longer require AID's help.

AFRICA

I recommend \$179 million for Africa. Just one year ago, I informed the Congress of a shift in emphasis in our aid policy for Africa. We moved promptly to put it into effect:

There will be 21 U.S. bilateral programs in Africa in Fiscal 1969, compared to 35 last year.

Most of our bilateral programs will be phased out in eleven more countries in the following year.

Expanded regional and international projects will meet the development needs of the countries where bilateral aid is ended.

The past year has provided further evidence that this support for regional economic institutions and projects is a sensible approach to Africa's problems. It expands markets. It encourages economies of scale. It gives meaningful evidence of our concern and interest in African development.

This is not a policy of withdrawal from Africa. It is a policy of concentration and of maximum encouragement of regional cooperation. A continent of 250 million people has set out with determination on the long road to development. We intend to help them.

VIETNAM

I recommend a program of \$480 million to carry forward our economic assistance effort

in Vietnam. This effort will be intensified by the need to restore and reconstruct the cities and towns attacked in recent days.

Defense of Vietnam requires more than success on the battlefield. The people of Vietnam are building the economic and social base to preserve the independence we are helping them to defend.

Since 1965, when galloping inflation loomed and continuity of government was repeatedly destroyed, the people of Vietnam have achieved two major civil victories which rank with any gallantry in combat:

They have written a Constitution and established representative local and national governments through free elections, despite a concerted campaign of terror, assassination and intimidation.

Runaway inflation has been averted, and the foundation laid for a thriving economy, despite the enormous stresses of war.

But still the innocent victims of war and terrorism must be cared for; persistent inflationary pressures must continue to be controlled; and the many problems faced by a new government under wartime conditions must be overcome. The framework for economic and social progress has been established. We must help the Vietnamese people to build the institutions needed to make it work.

In the coming year, we will:

Improve our assistance to refugees and civilian casualties. The wages of aggression are always paid in the blood and misery of the innocent. Our determination to resist aggression must be matched by our compassion for its helpless victims.

Intensify agricultural programs aimed at increasing rice production by 50% in the next four years.

Concentrate our educational effort toward the Government's goal of virtually universal elementary education by 1971.

Stress, in our import programs, the key commodities needed for agricultural and industrial growth.

The rapid program expansion of the past two years—in dollars, people and diversity of activities—is ended. The emphasis in the coming year will be on concentration of resources on the most important current programs.

We will pursue these constructive programs in Vietnam with the same energy and determination with which we resist aggression. They are just as vital to our ultimate success.

EAST ASIA

I recommend \$277 million for East Asia. For twenty years resistance to attack and subversion has been current and urgent business for the nations of East Asia. The United States has helped to make this resistance effective. We must continue to do so, particularly in Laos and Thailand.

But this year the larger portion of our aid to East Asian countries will be focused directly on the work of development. Asians know—as we do—that in the long run, economic, social and political development offer the best protection against subversion and attack. Despite communist pressure, they are getting on with the job. For example:

For the last three years, the Korean economy has grown by a phenomenal 10 percent per year; domestic revenues have doubled since 1965; exports have grown tenfold in the last seven years. Population growth has fallen from 2.9 percent in 1962 to 2.5 percent today, and a strong national population program is contributing to further reductions. We are now able to plan for orderly reduction of U.S. economic aid as the capacity for self-support grows. Despite recent pressure from the North, the momentum and self-confidence of this gallant nation must be—and will be—maintained.

Indonesia has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and rehabilitation and is

moving toward development. She needs help from the U.S. and other donors, who are working together with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is overwhelmingly in our interest to provide it.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

I recommend \$420 million for grant Military Assistance Programs under the Foreign Assistance Act.

More than three-quarters of our grant military assistance will support the military efforts of nations on the perimeter of the communist world and those nations where the U.S. maintains defense installations important to our own national security. These programs are a vital link in our own defense effort and an integral part of Free World collective security.

Elsewhere our programs focus on building the internal security necessary for lasting development progress.

Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures. Most less-developed countries have resisted large expansion of military expenditures. Their military budgets have remained a small portion of national income. Their leaders have made politically difficult decisions to resist pressure to acquire large amounts of new and expensive weapons.

We must help them maintain this record and improve it. We will give great weight to efforts to keep military expenditures at minimum essential levels when considering a country's requests for economic aid.

In the coming year, we will work directly with the less-developed nations and examine our own programs, country-by-country, to deal more effectively with this problem. In addition, we will explore other approaches toward reducing the danger of arms races among less-developed countries.

Over the past several years, we have significantly reduced our grant military aid wherever possible. Where new equipment is essential, we have provided it more and more through cash and credit sales. I will submit separate legislation to authorize necessary military sales and provide for credit terms where justified.

Our military assistance programs will provide only what is needed for legitimate defense and internal security needs. We will do no more. We can afford to do no less.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The internal peace and order of this steadfast ally is once again threatened from the North.

These threats summon Korea to strengthen further her defenses and her capacity to deter aggression.

We must help.

I propose that Congress appropriate immediately an additional \$100 million for military assistance to the Republic of Korea.

This can be accomplished within the authorizing legislation already enacted.

With this additional help, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Korea can gain new strength through the acquisition of aircraft and anti-aircraft equipment, naval, radar, patrol craft, ammunition and other supplies.

AMERICA'S CHOICE

Foreign aid serves our national interest. It expresses our basic humanity. It may not always be popular, but it is right.

The peoples we seek to help are committed to change. This is an immutable fact of our time. The only questions are whether change will be peaceful or violent, whether it will liberate or enslave, whether it will build a community of free and prosperous nations or sentence the world to endless strife between rich and poor.

Foreign aid is the American answer to this question. It is a commitment to conscience as well as to country. It is a matter of national tradition as well as national security.

Last year some Americans forgot that tradition. My foreign aid request, already the smallest in history, was reduced by almost one-third.

The effects of that cut go much deeper than the fields which lie fallow, the factories not built, or the hospitals without modern equipment.

Our Ambassadors all over the developing world report the deep and searching questions they are being asked. Has America resigned her leadership of the cause of freedom? Has she abandoned to fate the weak and the striving who are depending on her help?

This Congress can give a resounding answer to these questions by enacting the full amount I have requested. I do not propose this as a partisan measure. I propose it as an extension of the humane statesmanship of both parties for more than twenty years.

I said in my State of the Union address that it is not America's resources that are being tested, but her will. This is nowhere more true than in the developing countries where our help is a crucial margin between peaceful change and violent disaster.

I urge the Congress to meet this test.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AID PROPOSED PROGRAM AND LEGISLATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968

I. SIZE OF PROGRAM

\$2.9 billion is requested for economic and military assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act: A.I.D.—\$2.5 billion, Military Assistance—\$.4 billion.

The appropriation requested for A.I.D. together with other available funds will finance a program of \$2.7 billion (see attached table).

The \$2.5 billion requested for A.I.D. is about \$130 million less than the President requested for FY 1968. The Congress appropriated \$1.9 billion for FY 1968.

The A.I.D. request, together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 480 food aid contributions to multilateral institutions (IDA, IDB and the Asian Bank), and Peace Corps, represents about 0.5% of U.S. GNP—only half as much as the target of 1% of GNP set by the UN and OECD. In 1949 the United States put 2% of its GNP into foreign economic aid.

II. CONCENTRATION

Countries: The FY 1969 proposed A.I.D. program is heavily concentrated in key countries—15 countries will receive nearly 90% of all country program funds: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Peru, Tunisia, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam.

Nine of these will get about 85% of development loan country programs: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Peru, Korea, Indonesia.

Four will get 95% of Supporting Assistance country programs: Vietnam, Korea, Laos and Thailand.

Agriculture: About \$800 million of A.I.D. funds will be used in FY 1969 for agricultural development and increasing food production.

III. REDUCED COST TO U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Ninety-two percent of A.I.D. funds in FY 1969 will be spent on purchases of U.S. goods and services. In 1963 the dollar outflow resulting from A.I.D. operations was over \$600 million. In 1967 this dropped to about \$270 million. In 1968 it will be reduced to less than \$170 million. Repayments of over \$200 million on outstanding aid loans will more than offset this outflow.

Ending foreign aid would not, therefore, significantly improve the U.S. balance of payments. But it would adversely affect the U.S. industries, workers and farmers who are manufacturing, producing and exporting aid-financed goods.

IV. OTHERS SHARE THE BURDEN

United States leadership in the aid field has declined. We are now only fifth among DAC donors in share of national income devoted to official aid: eighth, when private investment in Less Developed Countries is included.

Despite fiscal and other economic problems, a number of other countries—Japan, Canada, Netherlands, West Germany—are increasing their aid programs. Britain is maintaining its aid budget levels.

V. SPECIAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR KOREA

A special supplementary appropriation of \$100 million will be requested in FY 1968 for additional military aid to Korea, to supply aircraft, anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft and other supplies. This appropriation request will be made under the existing FY 1968 military assistance authorization.

FISCAL YEAR 1969 APPROPRIATION REQUEST AND PROPOSED PROGRAM UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

(In millions of dollars)

Assistance category	Fiscal year 1969 appropriation request	Fiscal year 1969 proposed program ¹
Economic assistance:		
Development loans.....	765.0	850.3
Technical assistance.....	235.0	235.0
Alliance for Progress.....	625.0	685.2
Development loans.....	(515.0)	(567.2)
Technical assistance.....	(110.0)	(118.0)
Supporting assistance.....	595.0	629.5
Contingency fund.....	45.0	50.0
Contributions to international organizations.....	154.3	154.3
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	15.1	15.1
Surveys of investment opportunities.....	1.5	2.0
Administrative expenses, AID.....	58.8	61.4
Administrative expenses, State.....	3.9	3.9
Total, economic assistance.....	2,498.5	2,704.6
Military assistance².....	420.0	503.5
Total.....	2,918.5	3,208.1

¹ The fiscal year 1969 proposed program is the total amount of funds that would be available to carry out programs under the Foreign Assistance Act. The proposed program consists of: The new appropriations requested; and additional funds available for use in fiscal year 1969 such as repayments on prior loans, reimbursements, and uncommitted or deobligated funds from prior years.

² Excludes appropriations of \$120,000,000 to be requested in a separate military sales act.

AID and the Payments Problem

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has come up with some startling facts in his foreign aid message which I hope will finally lay to rest the old bugaboo about AID's role in the dollar drain. Rightfully, Mr. Johnson points out in the aid message that the ability of the United States to pursue its responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. It is gratifying—and indeed surprising—to learn from the message that foreign assistance is now responsible for virtually none of the tremendous balance-of-payments problem.

For example, in 1963, foreign assistance expenditures added \$799 million to the adverse balance of payments. The figure had been drastically cut by 1967 to a total of \$270 million. Bear in mind, too, that the repayment of foreign as-

sistance loans last year totaled \$208 million. This means, quite simply, that AID was responsible for \$62 million worth of a multibillion-dollar drain. The Defense Department alone last year was responsible for \$2.7 billion dollars worth of gold outflow—and that is billions, not millions.

In the foreign aid message, President Johnson says he has instructed AID to reduce its overseas expenditures another \$100 million during the current year. This means, my friends, that AID will be bringing more dollars home than it is spending abroad. The message, furthermore, calls for further reductions and a greater return of dollars during the coming year.

It is high time that each of us accept the fact outlined in the message that foreign assistance is no longer a part of the imbalance of payments, but has become a positive force in cutting the outflow of dollars.

Reserve Officers Association of America, Department of Pennsylvania, Panama Canal Resolution

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement by the executive branch of our Government of its intention to secure the abrogation of the basic 1903 treaty with Panama under which the Canal Zone was acquired, the Panama Canal constructed, and subsequently maintained, operated, sanitized, protected and defended, legislative bodies of six States and many political, civic and fraternal organizations have passed resolutions opposing the projected surrender of U.S. rights, power, and authority.

The latest resolution in opposition to such surrender was adopted on January 27, 1968, by the Department of Pennsylvania, Reserve Officers Association of America, a body whose members fully understand the vital importance of the Panama Canal to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

The indicated resolution follows:

PANAMA CANAL RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Panama Canal Treaty of 1903 is a permanent land-contract-ownership purchased out-right and for perpetual use by the United States, and is of vital strategic importance to our National Security, our interoceanic commerce, and hemispheric security, and

Whereas, the present existing treaty provided for and effected the outright purchase of the land directly from the individual land owners, thus granting essential rights for defense by the United States Armed Forces for all installations pertaining thereto, and

Whereas, Panama is a Nation of over one million people which at times has been politically unstable, and being mindful of the continuing Communist guerrilla, revolutionary and subversive activities of Latin-American nations in this hemisphere, and in view of the announced revolutionary in-

tentions and aspirations of the present Communist regime;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Department of Pennsylvania Reserve Officers of America urge and request the National administration of R.O.A. to call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to reject any and all proposed modifications of the current Panama Canal Treaty of 1903, and that the R.O.A. supports the United States' rights to the full and complete utilization, control and protection of the Panama Canal.

Credibility and the "Pueblo"

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the attached editorial which appeared in the Copley newspapers in Illinois and California on February 6:

Credibility of the United States of America suffered an incalculable setback with the admission of the administration that the U.S.S. *Pueblo* could have violated the territorial waters of North Korea.

Who can believe us now?

On the day after the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized Jan. 23, Secretary of State Dean Rusk called the piracy—correctly—one which was tantamount to an "act of war."

Now he says it is possibly not.

At the United Nations, January 26, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg correctly labeled the North Korean action a "warlike act" and went to great lengths to prove the U.S. vessel was 15.3 nautical miles from the nearest North Korean land.

Now what can he tell the United Nations?

And the President of the United States declared to the Nation January 26: "This week North Koreans committed yet another wanton and aggressive act by seizing an American ship and its crew in international waters. Clearly this cannot be accepted."

What can he tell the American people now—that it has been accepted.

Can the United States now be believed when it tells the more than 40 nations with which we have treaties that we will defend them firmly against aggressors?

Can one now blame the South Koreans, who have given us staunch support in South Vietnam, if they bitterly complain about being "sold out?" They are not even given the courtesy of being present during negotiations with their implacable enemy, the Communist aggressors.

What can we tell the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*? That we believe they disobeyed orders and went into North Korean waters?

We do not think the men of the *Pueblo* would want their release at the expense of national honor and integrity for which they willingly worked as members of the Armed Forces. Would these courageous men of the United States Navy want to live a lie?

And now that we are retreating before the propaganda of North Korea, how can we prevent future incidents of the *Pueblo* type from any puny upstart? Must we retreat from the high seas as a maritime nation?

The *Pueblo* capture was stated, of course, as a diversionary tactic to draw attention from the new Communist aggression in Vietnam.

Can South Vietnam now believe, in view of the diplomatic retreat about the *Pueblo*, that we will not sell them out to obtain the release of more than 800 armen held by North Vietnam? And if we lie about the

Pueblo, what rationale can we use to tell North Vietnam we are all they claim if this will obtain the release of our men?

The answer of course is national security, integrity and honor. This is why we are fighting in Vietnam. This is why the gallant *Pueblo* took risks off Korea and this is why we maintain a defense posture.

That posture should not be used to perpetrate a lie even for ultimately good motives such as the release of prisoners.

Once we resort to the lie as a national policy we are no different from the enemy we are fighting. We will have lost our national integrity!

Legislation To Provide Electronic Inspection of Airplanes

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1955, July 25, 1957, January 6, 1960, May 22, 1962, and May 7, 1964, the normal course of events was blasted from the front pages of our newspapers by stories of death in the air caused by bombs placed aboard commercial airplanes.

Although air science has been so highly developed in the past few years that we are virtually safer miles above the earth's surface than we are driving on some of our most modern highways, it cannot protect us from the random, madman bomber.

What can be done though, Mr. Speaker, is to employ technology in a different sense—in a preventive sense. So I am today introducing legislation to require all domestic and foreign air carriers operating over the United States to provide electronic inspection of all baggage and freight before enplaning to detect bombs and other destructive devices.

I look for support on this measure from the airlines as well as the public. In addition to the tragic and unnecessary loss of life, on-flight bombs have cost the airlines alone over \$9 million in loss of aircraft.

Insurance claims, I am sure, have amounted to millions more dollars lost—all because there was no protection against the random, madman bomber.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is another problem this preventive action will eliminate, that of the prank bomb threat. If we have an effective means of inspecting baggage and freight, these calls can be almost dismissed. As it is now, the passengers have to disembark and the baggage and freight must be inspected, sometimes by hand—a job that takes hours—and then everyone and everything reloaded and the plane rescheduled—once again—all because there was no protection against the random, madman bomber.

Every minute a fully fueled plane is on the ground, it is losing money. Extra manpower is needed, and missed-connections and other inconveniences to passengers must be paid for by the air carriers. All this is very much worthwhile, to find a bomb. But it is an unnecessary expense and an annoying in-

convenience simply to assuage a prankster's warped sense of humor.

A poignant example of this, Mr. Speaker, appeared on television in an NBC-produced movie especially for television, entitled "The Domsday Flight."

This was a story about a frustrated man seeking vengeance for being fired from an airlines job. He planted a bomb on a Los Angeles-to-New York jet. The device he used was an aneroid bomb, one activated by air pressure. As the flight soared above 4,000 feet, the bomb was activated, and if the plane descended below 4,000 feet, the bomb would trigger.

As it turned out, these facts were discovered and the plane set down in Denver—above the 4,000-foot trigger mark—just in the nick of time.

This film points out a number of lessons:

First of all, it was a documentary of terror—almost 100 people trapped for several hours in an aircraft more than 2 miles up, with apparently no possible means of descent.

Second, this movie caused a rash of eight bomb threats for this same aneroid type of bomb.

Bomb scares now number over 400 a year. And in addition to the cost and inconvenience, they disrupt flight and airport docking schedules.

Mr. Speaker, when there is a bomb, it is a tragedy; when there is no bomb, it is a nuisance. But either way, these alternatives can be eliminated by the prompt enactment of the bill I have just presented.

Fino Introduces Legislation To Facilitate Irish and Italian Immigration

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills to ease the restrictions on Italian and Irish immigration to the United States.

Since the most recent changes in the Federal immigration law, several unduly restrictive situations have emerged with respect to Irish and Italian immigration to this country. In the first place, Ireland no longer enjoys the immigration quota it once did; Irish immigrants are now effectively confined to close relatives of American citizens and to skilled workers. Unskilled workers can only come to this country if the Secretary of Labor certifies that no American workers will be displaced. This is a basically good idea, but it enmeshes the prospective immigrant in unnecessary redtape.

My first bill would allow such immigration unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that an American worker would be displaced in effect shifting the burden of proof. Of course, my bill changes the law for prospective immigrants of all national origins, but on the basis of past patterns, a large number of the persons affected would be Irish.

My second bill changes the preference given to brothers and sisters of American citizens, restoring the preference to what

it was before the 1965 immigration law changes. This change will be of great assistance to prospective immigrants from many nations, but especially from Italy.

I believe that these are two of the most important inequities left by the 1965 immigration law changes and I hope that mine or similar bills can be passed to rectify them.

Mendell Looks at Soil Conservation

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we in Iowa are losing a great and dedicated leader in the field of soil and water conservation. Frank Mendell is retiring after serving 30 years as the State soil conservationist for the Soil Conservation Service in Iowa.

I have known Frank for many years and am well aware of the tremendous contributions he has made. We in Iowa will miss his steady hand.

Recently Frank reviewed the years he spent as our soil conservationist in an interview in the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman. I think you will agree with me that this contribution and record are unparalleled in Iowa.

The interview follows:

MENDELL LOOKS AT SOIL CONSERVATION

(NOTE.—Frank Mendell is retiring this month as state soil conservationist for the Soil Conservation Service in Iowa. He started in soil conservation work in the state in 1934 and has served 30 years as state conservationist. Booth Wallentine of the Spokesman staff interviewed Mendell to get a look at the progress in soil conservation and the challenges ahead. Here's the interview:)

Looking back over the past 30 years, what improvements in soil conservation in Iowa have you noted?

Well, we've noted many, many improvements. You know when I started out at Shenandoah we were building so-called wire brush dams for gully control and we were planting honey locust trees in the gullies to try to control the gullies. And we found out after while that those weren't very effective in getting conservation on the land.

As a matter of fact, I think you would have to say that we found out that you had to start out at the top of the hill instead of down in the gully where the damage had already occurred. So there has been tremendous progress.

I can remember in 1934 when I started to work in Iowa at Shenandoah that you could hardly find a grassed waterway except for the Northeast area where they had quack grass. And today grassed waterways have developed and are very common.

On the other hand, we face a real problem in the future with waterways because of the use of atrazine. Atrazine destroys grass so if you've got a grassed waterway and you get runoff from a field that has been treated with atrazine, the first thing you know you don't have any grassed waterway anymore.

We really have a solution to this because of the new type terraces with tile outlets for the terraces. This eliminates waterways and this is a real important development in my opinion as we look forward.

Because surely the use of pesticides and insecticides and herbicides will continue in

one form or another and we had just better start facing this fact and start preparing ourselves and using practices that are going to fit the needs of the current day farming.

If you can, Frank, measure the growth or improvement or change in the attitudes and knowledge of farmers towards soil conservation.

You find many people today that are ready and willing to accept practices and ready to make changes even before the technical people get back to visit with them. I had a farmer not long ago. He made the comment that nobody was selling conservation and I said what do you mean?

He said he had a farm plan for a long time and wanted to make some changes in it but he had to go in and get the technician to come out and look over the farm to make the changes he wanted to make. Well, you see what I mean, he's moving rapidly in this field because he's recognizing the need for changes.

By contrast though, Frank, as you look back can you recall any instances when you had some real opposition from particular farmers?

Oh, yes, real opposition. I can well remember in the early days of the Little Sioux program, for example, in some of those small watersheds with tremendous gullies in Western Iowa, they said we can't afford this kind of a program because the cost is more than the land is worth today. It's only worth \$50-\$60 an acre and you're spending \$50-\$60 an acre for flood control.

So in the short run they were right but today that is \$300-\$400 land so you can't say that you can't afford to spend today on the basis of the value of the land because who knows what this \$600 land is going to be 40-50 years from now.

You have already mentioned two or three of them, but what are some of the programs and techniques and laws that were passed that aided in this physical and attitude development?

One of the real significant acts of the state legislature was the soil conservation districts law which gave the farmers an opportunity to organize soil conservation districts, to elect their own governing body, to exert their local control, their local initiative and their local leadership in the conservation program.

That was 1939 when the law was passed. And the late Governor Wilson told the first state soil conservation committee . . . if you get three districts organized in the next year you'll probably be doing pretty well. He said you get three districts organized.

And Earl Elijah, Clark Huntley and Clyde Spry, who were the first three members, said we aren't going to organize any districts . . . it's the farmers who are going to decide whether they organize districts or not.

And I'm very proud of the fact that I think this was true throughout the state. The farmers made this decision, there was no pressure from the state committee or extension service or others to organize . . . they simply said here's what you can do with a soil conservation district if you want to form one.

What about federal activities?

Federal legislation . . . probably one of the most significant has been the watershed act . . . the watershed act of 1944 that authorized the Little Sioux and the other 10 watersheds in the United States.

And then the Public Law 566, passed in 1954, which set the stage for the present cooperative watershed program. And again one of the significant things in this act was that this placed the initiative and responsibility for the watershed program back with the local people.

We have mentioned one or two of the physical developments—watersheds for one—what are some of the other techniques for soil conservation that come to mind quickly

that made a real impact and changed the face of Iowa?

I would say that the terrace program is still the most important single conservation practice and, of course, in the earlier days we laid out terraces according to the lay of the land and they ran around here and streamed around here like a snake in many cases. And through the years, of course, we recognized that with larger equipment you don't farm point rows as well as you do with two row equipment.

So there has been tremendous change in the terrace program, particularly in the past 3 or 4 years with what we've called seeded backslope terraces on the steeper land and building them parallel so that you eliminate insofar as possible the point rows and then making them as straight as possible, going across lines and making cuts and fills rather than going around the natural curve of the land.

And then about 4 years ago now, the service got quite enthused about the potential of the so-called tile outlets for terraces. Paul Jacobson, who was a real enthusiast for this program and was state conservation engineer at the time, and I wondered how many farmers would really want to do this.

But that first year there were about 100 farmers that installed tile inlet for terraces . . . tile inlet-outlets. And that has almost doubled every year since then. So farmers have really accepted this philosophy of parallel terraces with tile outlets and eliminating the problem of grass waterways.

Frank, let's look on ahead. What needs to be done now? What are some of the critical needs in soil conservation—attitudes or physical needs?

I think the consumer needs more information and help on understanding what the farmer's problems are and what he's doing and the contribution he's making to the consumer today in terms of efficiency.

If you sat down and asked people how they felt about this program and you can take the 40 people that depend on the farm for food and fiber today and let them stand around the outside fence of that farm and see you operating and doing a good job, they would have a much better appreciation of what you are contributing to their welfare and to their economy.

And then if they went over to my farm a few miles away, let's say, and those same 40 people that depended on me stood around that fence and they saw me farming up and down hill and raising poor crops and not doing a good management job, I think you know how they would feel about it.

Well, to me this is one way of expressing the recognition and understanding that ought to exist between the consumer and the farmer today. And I think if the consumer still doesn't understand that you are doing a good job and are trying to do the best job you can and that they feel that all farmers are doing what I'm doing then they are about ready to start some legislation . . . they are ready to start pressuring and say why doesn't somebody make it mandatory that Mendell do something out there on this farm instead of doing as he's done in the past.

So we need to learn how to get the consumers more interested and better informed about the need for soil conservation?

I think that's right. I think another area we need to continue to expand is conservation education in schools. A great deal of progress has been made in this in Iowa.

The Springbrook training program for teachers has been going the longest of any training program of its kind in the United States continuously which we are very proud of and I've had a little bit to do with that so I can boast a little if you'll permit me to.

And the teachers' workshop at the 4-H camp in the fall has been attended well and

increased attendance every year. And these folks are doing a marvelous job of helping these youngsters understand what natural resources are and how important they are.

And if the youngsters grow up in cities like Des Moines without any knowledge or appreciation of our natural resources, they are going to miss something and they're not going to have the kind of attitude and understanding they ought to have toward the total economy in this country.

Frank, no man works for 33 or 34 years at soil conservation as successfully as you have unless he has recognized a personal challenge. What are some of the personal challenges that have motivated you and kept you involved and interested and urged you on?

Well, I think one thing for all of our people is the confidence that people have expressed. In other words, people have said well I think we can depend on you . . . I think we can rely on you to accept the challenge and to do the things that are necessary and the best job possible.

So I think this challenge has probably been one of the real items that has kept me and most of our people I'd say working hard in this field.

What have you enjoyed most about your job?

Oh, I think I've enjoyed most the working with people, the fine people. As I've said about the soil conservation district commissioners, they're the finest people in the world and they are people who are willing to take responsibility.

You know in this day with the comments about federal domination, if you don't have local people who are willing to tackle these problems, you can't argue much that the government shouldn't come along and tell you what to do.

But district governing bodies have always accepted the challenge. Whenever you've had a problem and we've said what do you think is a proper solution to this, they've come up and said we are willing to stand up and be counted, so to speak, and tell us what they think. And this is a nice feeling and this is appreciated and this keeps you working, too.

Thadusz Kosciuszko

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, we commemorate the 222d anniversary of the birth of Thadusz Kosciuszko, a Polish national hero in the war against Russia and a major military figure in the American Revolution. This anniversary is observed by Polish people throughout the free world. Unfortunately, the Polish people are captives of communism, and public celebration of this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

On this great historic day, Mr. Speaker, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Poland and all the other captives of communism.

The birthday of Thadusz Kosciuszko is of historical significance to the United States, since this great Polish hero made an outstanding contribution to the American Revolution. He served courageously in a number of Revolutionary War battles and worked on the planning and construction of fortifications for the Delaware River, Fort Defiance, and West

Point. Kosciuszko was given the rank of brigadier general in the American Revolutionary Army for his contribution to our struggle for independence.

He then returned to his homeland and served in Poland as a leader in the unsuccessful insurrection against the Russian invaders.

It is an especially tragic historic commentary to note the great affection of the American people for Poland and the Polish people for America, as well as the great affection for General Kosciuszko and the place he holds in American history, when we note the Polish Communist dictatorship playing a leading role in supplying the North Vietnamese in paralyzing the activities of the International Control Commission in Vietnam.

It is fine for us to commemorate these days, Mr. Speaker, but our commemoration should be a practical one. Therefore, I strongly recommend the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Strong Support for President Johnson's Proposals

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American, the late Judge Learned Hand, once said:

If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment. Thou shalt not ration justice.

The proposals advanced in President Johnson's civil rights message are designed to fulfill this urgent commandment.

They are not panaceas, but rather needed steps in the long, and sometimes painful process of ensuring that every American citizen is entitled to live with dignity, freedom, and justice.

The proposal to outlaw racial violence should be our answer to those who seek to interfere by force with this process.

The House has responded to this task. The Senate must also respond.

The President's proposals, in my judgment, will provide badly needed protections that will preserve the legal and constitutional rights of Americans against those who resort to force and intimidation.

Any doubt of the constitutionality of such legislation was laid to rest by the opinions of Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Brennan—speaking for six of the nine Justices—in United States against Guest, an opinion handed down last year. They stated that there is no doubt that Congress has the authority to enact laws to punish private interference with 14th amendment rights. The same reasoning, of course, applies to 15th amendment rights.

We must ensure the continued vitality of our democracy. I urge prompt enactment of this new criminal law, as well as the other vital proposals contained in the President's message.

I believe Congress is morally obligated to continue the historic progress in civil rights that America has enjoyed under the leadership of President Johnson.

There can be no retreat in matters relating to justice, freedom and democracy. And that, of course, is what civil rights is all about.

Industrial Safety Week, 1968

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the State of California is calling attention to the problem of protecting the worker from the hazards encountered in industry, by designating this week as Industrial Safety Week. It is appropriate, therefore, for me to take a few minutes today, to look at this problem as it applies not only to California but the entire Nation as well.

Between 1912 and 1966, accidental work deaths per 100,000 population were reduced 67 percent, from 21 to 7. In 1912, an estimated 18,000 to 21,000 workers' lives were lost while producing \$100 billion worth of gross national product. In 1966, in a work force double in size and producing more than seven times as much, there were only 14,500 work deaths. These are some encouraging facts supplied by the National Safety Council's 1967 edition of Accident Facts.

However, I hope I have not implied that 14,500 deaths is a statistic we can accept with callous complacency. It is small only when compared with the early shockingly negligent days of industrial development in this country.

At least some of this improvement may be traced to the enactment of Federal and State workmen's compensation laws. These laws had their origin in this country in 1908 when the Federal Government passed an act covering certain civil employees. By 1920, all but six States had workmen's compensation laws. Shortly thereafter, Federal laws were passed covering longshoremen, harbor workers and private employees. There can be no doubt that workmen's compensation has encouraged safer working practices since the insurance rate which is charged to the employer is determined by the accident frequency and severity record. In addition, the Federal Government has sponsored such worthwhile safety legislation as the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act and Amendments and the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act.

Nonetheless, it is ironic that a nation like ours, with such advanced technology has not made more advancement in regard to health and safety at work. Disabling injuries totaled about 2,200,000 in 1966, an increase of 100,000 over the previous year's count. The National Safety Council also figures that lost time, equipment damage and insurance premiums cost U.S. plants \$6 billion in 1966. According to Governor Reagan:

California's disabling injury rate is approximately 32 for each 1,000 employees in

the State. There has been little improvement during the last ten years and, in fact, the injury rate in our large manufacturing industry has increased about 25 percent during this same period.

More production time is lost from accidents than from all other work stoppages, including strikes. The Safety Council says that in the United States job accidents cost 244 million man-days in 1966, nearly 10 times the 25 million man-days the Labor Department says were lost from strikes and other stoppages.

It is to be hoped that Industrial Safety Week, by making all of us more keenly aware of the importance of industrial safety, will bring us closer to achievement of maximum results in the field of safety.

Airline Safety

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on all levels of government, in the press, and in the airline industry, there is mounting concern with the growing tide of congestion at the Nation's commercial airports.

One way to decongest our crowded commercial airports is to limit their use by private or business aircraft.

In so doing, it is important to provide operators of private aircraft with attractive alternate facilities.

It is heartening, therefore—at a time when we are still planning rather than doing—to see some positive action toward easing airport congestion. This action has been taken by Pan American World Airways which has taken over operation of two smaller airports in the New York City area with the intent of developing them into attractive facilities for private aviation.

The extent of the problem of congested airports and details on the Pan Am program were told in a recent article by Ralph de Toledano which appeared in the Reading Eagle and other newspapers.

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

IN WASHINGTON

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Airlines safety is everybody's business. Newspapermen fly—and so do businessmen, housewives, school kids and movie stars. But because America is so thoroughly airborne, the traffic snarl at major airports are reaching blow-your-stack proportion. And safety is being endangered—no matter how many new safety devices the airlines install.

It comes down to numbers. There are now 2,022 airlines' planes flying today—and 104,000 private planes, known as general aviation. The airlines' planes are piloted and maintained by experts. But it becomes increasingly simple to learn to fly, and those at the controls are sometimes not as experienced as they should be.

The result:

Flying into Washington recently, the plane I was on was making a routine landing. Suddenly, just before the wheels had touched ground, the pilot suddenly brought the plane up, climbing at what seemed a full perpendicular. Had he been less alert, the

crowded New York-to-Washington flight would have crashed into a small two-seater that had scooted onto the runway. In the statistics, it was one more "near-miss" instead of a disaster.

A "near-miss" is too close for comfort, and some 600 of them are reported each year, with twice that number going unreported. Most of them involve private or corporation planes. This statistic is understandable. This year, 74.4 per cent of all operations at FAA towers are general aviation, according to the Air Transport Assn.

This preponderance of small planes using major airports affects the air traveler in other, though non-lethal ways. According to the ATA, more than seven million man-hours were lost in passenger delays just for 1965 and that number has been rising steadily. In 1966, businessmen lost \$50 million in earning time because of delays in take-off and landing due to heavy air traffic. The airlines lost an estimated \$328 million in fuel and crew time—money that could have been plowed into improved services and facilities.

Can something be done about it without depriving general aviation of its rights to airport facilities—rights which the airlines are ready to acknowledge? By 1976, ATA President Stuart G. Tipton estimates, the number of private planes will have escalated to 180,000. The answer is to find other facilities for general aviation. And a real start in that direction has been made, not by the government but by a commercial airline.

The pioneer is Juan Trippe, board chairman of Pan American World Airways. To relieve the congestion at New York's LaGuardia and Kennedy airports, and at Newark airport, Pan Am is modernizing two smaller airports. Teterboro in New Jersey and Republic in New York, for the use of private and other general aviation planes. Pan Am is putting some \$20 million in capital improvements for Teterboro alone. And arrangements have been made for limousine service every half hour to these rebuilt airports, with Pan Am picking up any loss for this service.

In moving to establish excellent facilities for private aviation, Pan Am is showing the kind of enlightened self-interest which makes the wheels go 'round. As these airports begin to siphon off private flights from the big New York airports, passengers will not have to undergo the frustration of long delays in taking off and landing. The spectacle of 30 planes lined up nose to tail, waiting for a word from the tower—and of other planes stacked up overhead waiting to put down—may well become a forgotten and unlamented fact of flying life.

Of more importance, the "near-misses"—most of which take place on landing and takeoff—will be greatly reduced. For the millions of Americans who fly, this will be good news indeed. If the other airlines follow suit, a major problem will be eliminated—without the costly and deadening intervention of the federal bureaucracy.

Private Nielson, of Takoma Park, Dies in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. John L. Nielson, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE NIELSON, OF TAKOMA PARK, DIES IN VIETNAM

A 26-year-old combat photographer from Takoma Park was killed January 31 while on guard duty outside Saigon, the Defense Department said yesterday.

Pfc. John L. Nielson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl A. Nielson, of 107 Grant avenue, was reported killed by rifle fire just a few weeks before he was scheduled to go to Hong Kong for rest and relaxation and less than two months before he was due for return to the United States, his father said yesterday.

Mr. Nielson said his son, an amateur photographer and senior at the University of Maryland before his enlistment July 13, 1966, was "always looking for the beautiful."

Private Nielson was a graduate of Takoma Park schools and attended Montgomery County Junior College before enrolling at the University of Maryland.

He had been in Vietnam nearly a year, his father said.

Besides his parents, he leaves his sister, Mrs. Carolyn Gross, of Los Angeles, and a brother, Joseph, of Takoma Park.

V-Day Minus One

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud mother of a marine, I take particular pride in a very special anniversary taking place tomorrow.

Twenty-five years ago, in 1943, on the day after Lincoln's birthday and on the eve of Valentine's Day, women marines were inaugurated into the corps.

The admission of women into this proud old service caused consternation in the hearts of many a salty marine, but their apprehension turned to admiration before the first anniversary.

Now at the quarter century mark, the esteem with which they are regarded by their male comrades is attested to by M. Sgt. Jack Fletcher in an article entitled, "V-Day Minus One," which I include for your interest.

I join Sergeant Fletcher, my son, Officer Candidate James May, and all Marines, in saluting the Women of the Marine Corps for their superb service that has brought them to this auspicious anniversary, and wish them many, many happy returns.

The article follows:

V-DAY MINUS ONE

(By M. Sgt. Jack Fletcher,
U.S. Marine Corps)

They don't wear a man's trousers, but they fill his shoes.

During World War II they came to "free a Marine to fight"—and stayed to serve.

Valentine's Day minus one is their Silver Anniversary.

You'll find them up in the control tower, passing a pilot some word; down at disbursing, computing your pay; in data processing, programming a machine; writing a news story for ISO; doing photography. And, should the need arise, manhandling a "six-by."

They serve in the States and overseas—England, France, Hawaii, Germany, Panama, Dominican Republic, the Philippines, Italy, Okinawa; Land of the Rising Sun. And in Vietnam, within sound of enemy guns.

We've "skirted" the identity quite long enough. Add a verse to the Hymn for Her.

It's proud we are to share our Corps with them—the Women Marines.

Happy birthday.

Conference Discusses United Nations Peacekeeping

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging reports resulting from the Eighth Conference on a Strategy for Peace held last October at Airlie House is entitled, "The United Nations: The Third Decade."

The report discusses the experience of the United Nations in the Middle East, Rhodesia, and South Africa and makes suggestions on strengthening the U.N.

I commend to all my colleagues this brief report. Prof. Urban Whitaker, of San Francisco State College, was chairman of the panel that produced this report and Mr. William Butler, of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, was the rapporteur.

The report follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS: THE THIRD DECADE
(By Discussion Group IV; Prof. Urban Whitaker, chairman; Mr. William E. Butler, rapporteur)

As in the past, the United Nations in 1967 remains the single most trusted instrumentality for attaining a modicum of world public order in our anarchical state system. All of us share the hope that more than minimal order can be achieved, that the United Nations can continue to grow in its capacity as a catalyst for transforming the international system into one of peacefully competing rather than constantly warring (*at one level or another*) states. Hence we need not search for justification to focus our inquiry on strengthening the peacekeeping functions and decisionmaking machinery of the United Nations.

If we are to record hopes and expectations, we must also register doubts and disenchantment. Perhaps more than at any previous Strategy for Peace Conference—and in striking contrast to most—a majority of those grouped together believed that the United Nations had reached a plateau in the sphere of political development. Hopefully, this would be a transient phenomenon. While the excellent productive activity of United Nations specialized agencies has been undeservedly overlooked by most critics of the organization, the majority of discussants were of the view that, on balance, the United Nations was a weaker force in the international community than originally intended and a less effective body than the needs of the world demanded. Although it would be misleading to paint too stark a portrait, few present were prepared to postulate a favorable prognosis for the United Nations over the next ten years in terms of playing a qualitatively larger role in ordering the international system.

The reasons for this disaffection—perhaps dismay is a more appropriate term—are not easily articulated. Some no doubt adhere to the feeling that basic changes in the membership, structure, and functioning of the organization will not come to fruition, notwithstanding overwhelming evidence of their necessity. These are discussed below in detail. Of greater importance is the subject-

tive determination that the United States is to an unwarranted degree pursuing its national interests outside United Nations parameters in a manner which is detrimental to both the organization and our country. There appears to be no immediate prospect of change in this regard. All fervently wish it were otherwise.

The peacekeeping role of the United Nations is more vital today than ever before. Section I of this report considers the Middle East, Rhodesia, and South Africa as case studies illustrating where the United Nations is in 1967. The succeeding section examines proposals for improvements in the procedures, structure and authority of United Nations organs with respect to peacekeeping and recommends modifications when deemed desirable and feasible. The last section contains recommendations for United States policy in the United Nations.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PEACEKEEPING *The Middle East*

The Arab-Israeli War of 1967, by virtue of special circumstances, did not lend itself to constructive international intervention. Underlying the response of the great powers was the nuclear balance, the clear danger that direct involvement by any of them would entail unacceptable escalation, and the unwillingness of these powers to cooperate in restraining the belligerents while the outcome was in doubt. Moreover, the lightning speed of the campaign precluded organizing collective enforcement action; the United Nations was neutralized by the speed of events. The role of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), however, provoked comment in two respects. First was the action of the Secretary-General in withdrawing UNEF promptly at the Egyptian request. Although there was some sentiment that the Secretary-General could have been diplomatically dilatory in executing the request, the majority of discussants was of the opinion that the United Nations Executive Officer acted legally and properly, showing good judgment in the Middle East crisis, where his role necessarily was modest.

Second, there was consensus that the Arab-Israeli War brought greater clarity with regard to the size, functions, powers, operation, and administration of UNEF. The majority believed that the Secretary-General possessed adequate powers under the United Nations Charter to act in the peacekeeping sphere. What he lacked was sufficient guidance, in a positive manner, from the Security Council or General Assembly. The absence of regularized organizational procedures for administering UNEF, the *ad hoc* character of UNEF operations, the power of states contributing troops to UNEF to request their withdrawal in time of crisis, and the continuing cold war environment of UNEF activity all severely handicap the Secretary-General's ability to execute optimally his peacekeeping duties. It was strongly recommended that these deficiencies be remedied by placing UNEF on a more permanent and explicitly instructed basis. At the same time, the discussants in general were opposed to proposals that would curb the independence and discretion of the Secretary-General by compelling him to consult with the Security Council or General Assembly on peacekeeping activities in each individual instance.

Given the pattern of events in the Middle East crisis, it is unlikely that the General Assembly could have played a larger role, although it happened to be in session during hostilities. The continued opposition of the Soviet bloc and France to a General Assembly peacekeeping role on a voluntary basis was noted. There was general consensus that the United States might exhibit greater flexibility vis-a-vis the Soviet and French position on enforcement action pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter

in return for a modification of Soviet-French intransigence on voluntary General Assembly peacekeeping. Above all, the lesson for peacekeeping derived from the Middle East crisis was that a minimum favorable political environment must exist for collective enforcement action to be practicable.

Rhodesia

The United Nations Security Council and General Assembly resolutions declaring Rhodesia a threat to international peace and security and calling for voluntary and mandatory limited economic sanctions have committed the prestige of the United Nations on their ultimate success in an unprecedented manner. The group expressed concern that several members of the United Nations, especially Portugal and the Republic of South Africa, had not complied with United Nations resolutions in derogation of their obligations under the United Nations Charter. There was general consensus that at present it would be inadvisable to undermine the principle of universality by depriving states of their United Nations membership in response for failure to implement sanctions, and at the same time it would be inappropriate to resort to force against Rhodesia. There was some sentiment for resuming direct approaches to the white Rhodesians to reach an accommodation on the basis of gradually entrusting the Black majority with a responsible governing role. A substantial majority recommended that the Security Council expand the scope of mandatory sanctions to include presently exempted commodities and financial transactions and to interdict other forms of Rhodesian relations with the outside world. A minority feared that broader sanctions would be counterproductive and would stiffen Rhodesian determination to resist. All, however, urged that the Secretary-General remind nonmember states of their duty to conform to Charter obligations with regard to sanctions against Rhodesia.

South Africa

The United Nations has declared the League mandate held by the Republic of South Africa over the territory of Southwest Africa to be terminated. As a matter of international law and morality, the problem must be dealt with. There is no doubt that the Republic of South Africa is morally and legally wrong in continuing to administer the mandate. On the other hand, the political and economic realities of Southern Africa dictate a cautious approach. It is unlikely that resort to force or other sanctions against South Africa would be possible or effective at present. Exposure of the United Nations to rebuff would foster an impression of impotence and dismay. Moreover, the organization of a viable indigenous government in Southwest Africa is inconceivable in the foreseeable future. A policy of unheroic temporizing commended itself to the group. Such a policy might take several forms. Some participants suggested that the United Nations establish a symbolic presence in Southwest Africa. Others recommended that the United Nations avoid directly challenging South Africa's control over Southwest Africa, but indirectly establish a presence by granting United Nations technical assistance to the territory, having a comprehensive economic survey conducted by the World Bank, or sending personnel from specialized agencies to carry out health and welfare programs. There was some sentiment for sending the foreign ministers of major states to Southwest Africa in order to assert a United Nations presence, even if this would result in a dramatic and direct political confrontation with the Republic of South Africa.

STRENGTHENING UNITED NATIONS DECISION MAKING MACHINERY

It became clear in the discussion that steps must be taken to restore great power con-

fidence in the efficacy of General Assembly actions. As the General Assembly enlarged its membership from year to year, a disproportionate voice and voting strength passed to states whose desire to alter or guide international politics far exceeded their ability to do so. The major powers in recent years have evidence a marked preference in the area of peacekeeping for Security Council action or unilateral or multilateral actions outside the United Nations system. The United States in particular, although more favorably disposed than the U.S.S.R. or France, appears reluctant to vest greater authority in the United Nations, especially the General Assembly. Several proposals to improve the existing procedures and structure of the General Assembly and thereby enhance great power confidence in that body commended themselves to the discussants.

Weighted voting

On the whole the group was pessimistic about weighted voting schemes. Practically speaking, most doubted that the Assembly majority would consent to reduce its own power. Moreover, some research has suggested that on the basis of past voting patterns the present arrangement was more advantageous to the United States than would be the various weighted voting schemes. However, it was noted that the research was based on the assumption of bipolarity, whereas recently the concern over voting has pitted the major powers against the small state majority. The group urged that more study be undertaken in this area to ascertain whether under these conditions a weighted voting scheme might prove advantageous.

General Assembly committees

One proposal which commended itself to the group as an indirect means of combating the tyranny of the majority while improving the efficiency of the Assembly would entail the formation of committees smaller than Committees of the Whole. Such committees should reflect in their composition the actual realities of distribution of national power and in their fields of competence should be seized of issues prior to consideration by the entire Assembly. It was felt that the experiences with the Committees of 24 and 33 were not typical because of peculiarities of jurisdiction and leadership. On the other hand, if such a committee were to function in the sphere of peacekeeping and also were to involve advance commitments of funds for peacekeeping operations, several discussants were of the view that the major powers would not accept this proposal unless some sort of veto arrangement were available. Moreover, under this scheme the United States position on the residual authority of the General Assembly to authorize peacekeeping on a voluntary basis would have a bearing on the attitude of the other great powers.

As a modification of the working committee proposal, some suggested that such committees, reflecting international political realities in their membership, might provide expertise to the Assembly on political issues pending in that body. In general, there was consensus that studies concerning the rearrangement of the United Nations political structure to reflect power differential should be pressed with vigor. There was no consensus as to whether such differential should be expressed in financial terms or otherwise.

Ministates

The group noted that extreme differences in size, resources, and influence among new entrants to the international state system raised the question of differential membership privileges in the General Assembly.

The recent suggestion of the Secretary-General that another form of association, perhaps associate membership with the United Nations, be investigated received ap-

proval. It was recommended that a representative working committee of the General Assembly might set down criteria for such association in response to the initiative of the Secretary-General.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

There was a general feeling that the next year or two would be a time for the United Nations to tread water on major issues. Pending the forthcoming United States Presidential election in 1968 and further rapprochement in Soviet-American relations, bold and constructive proposals are not likely to be acted upon in the United Nations. Nonetheless, the group felt that substantial progress could be made on such issues as international trade and development, encouraging Soviet participation in inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency under a nonproliferation treaty, and cooperative ventures in space with the Soviet Union. Extensive consideration was given to two questions: Vietnam and United Nations Charter revision.

Vietnam

There was unanimous opinion that the Vietnam war is an overriding concern to the international community and is having a deleterious effect on progress in many other vital spheres of constructive endeavor in the United Nations and elsewhere. The failure to internationalize this conflict at a much earlier stage contributed significantly to the present state of affairs. Accordingly, it was strongly recommended that incipient or developing crises be brought to the United Nations by member-states or by the Secretary-General, acting under Article 99.

With regard to the present war, the discussants fully recognized the diplomatic and political complexities involved in reaching a settlement and the limitations on the ability of the United Nations to intervene effectively. Nevertheless, there was consensus that, given the unassailable fact that Vietnam is a threat to the peace, the full resources of the United Nations have not been exploited. It was unanimously suggested that the United States continue to search for opportunities to involve appropriate organs of the United Nations effectively in the Vietnam situation, including the General Assembly.

Charter revision

The discussants generally endorsed the statement of the *First Conference on the United Nations of 1975* with respect to Charter revision. Review of the Charter in light of experiences and changing times should be a continuing responsibility of our government and others. The task today is to mechanize the process of concentrating on questions of revision. Hence, the group unanimously called upon the President of the United States to appoint a broadly representative commission of concerned citizens and officials to consider objectives and proposals for revision of the United Nations Charter. It was felt that the creation and operation of such a commission should draw upon the experiences and procedures of the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

In conclusion, the group welcomes and commended for careful consideration the Statement of the *Second Conference on the United Nations of 1975* held at Burgenstock, Switzerland, in July, 1967. It should be noted, however, that in certain respects the present report amplifies some of the proposals made at Burgenstock. In particular, we would draw attention to the concrete recommendations herein for making the General Assembly more responsive to the actual distribution of power in the international community and for the establishment of a Commission to consider the objectives of Charter revision.

The Vulnerable Russians

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now with the *Pueblo* incident, it is interesting to observe how the Red syndicate has exploited the partitioned captive nations for all types of harassment and aggression against free world states, particularly our own country. Placed in perspective, this and previous, premeditated incidents are calculated extensions of the unending cold war.

The new book on "The Vulnerable Russians" provides this solid perspective with its guiding captive nations thesis. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book is easy reading, revealing and well-documented. The structure of thought developed in this work will doubtlessly prepare us for many more of such incidents in the future.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work. The excerpts follow:

THE STORY BEHIND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

The resolution and the proclamation struck Moscow with the force of a lightning bolt. Khrushchev precipitantly decried the resolution and viewed with apprehension Nixon's aim in coming to Moscow. In Warsaw at the time he foolishly railed, "The only enslaved peoples are in the capitalistic countries."

Great perturbation was displayed over the "coincidence in the timing" of the proclamation and Nixon's visit. Moscow viewed the resolution as a "new provocative anti-Soviet campaign." One began to wonder who was hysterical when he read these cries of pain and Khrushchev's further spasm that this "hysterical campaign" of "petty provocation" proves that "panic-stricken monopolists . . . are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions."

Khrushchev's tirade at the Soviet-Polish Friendship Rally in Moscow that Captive Nations Week was a "direct interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs" is an old Russian technique to deflect any world interest from the imperial and colonial spoils of Moscow.

Actually, the affairs of the Soviet Union *per se* are no more internal than those of a jaller incarcerating independent, innocent citizens. Khrushchev knew this all too well, and he feared it morbidly. In fact, as a UPI dispatch well observed, "At the end of his 40-minute speech, as if unable to get the subject off his mind, Khrushchev returned to the 'enslaved peoples' theme."

Before television cameras Khrushchev again cried, "I cannot go on without saying it—if you would not take such a decision [Mr. Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Peoples Week] . . . your trip would be excellent." Then the professed atheist blurted, "Why this was necessary, God only knows. What happened?" The answer to his question

is quite obvious. The American people have not been as naive as Khrushchev presumed them to be. The theatrics of controlled cultural exchanges, international cocktail parties, futile talkathons, and other superficialities have not blinded many of the American people to the real issues. Without this Captive Nations Week event and its impact Moscow would have kept on deceiving itself in this regard.

The above review sufficiently demonstrates the undeniable impact and effectiveness of the resolution. The general timing of the resolution could not have been better, though by happenstance the Week coincided with Nixon's visit. Had the observance been two weeks before, the Muscovite reaction would have been the same. Pavlov's dog was not trained in Russia without purpose. Moreover, the resolution was really in no way embarrassing to Nixon. On the contrary, it provided him with a God-sent opportunity, which, as we noted before, he failed to capitalize on to good advantage. Then, too, the President himself saw no embarrassment to Nixon. The parties that were embarrassed and showed it angrily were the Muscovite captors.

Reflecting accurately and impeccably the history of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism these past 50 years, the resolution lists those nations and states as captive which have directly or indirectly fallen under the foreign domination of Moscow. One of its clauses allows for other and new captive nations. Obviously, the basic criterion is the destruction of national independence. In this fundamental sense the Russian nation cannot be construed as captive. There is no doubt that in the sense of a search for surcease from domestic totalitarian tyranny there are millions of Russian captives. But with equal certainty they by and large were not the ones in Khrushchev's packed stadium or those bathing in the Moskva River. It goes without saying that we should always hold out to these individuals the hope for democratic rights and liberties. But the best and most efficacious way to further this hope is by striving to cut the institutional nexus between Russian imperio-colonialism and domestic Russian totalitarianism. The one feeds on the other. This nexus has existed for centuries and has been the key to Russian imperial power whether under the Whites or the Reds.

For the first time our Government has taken official cognizance of the tremendously important fact that the Soviet Union itself is a colonial empire. By these documents we have shown that we are fully aware of the captive status of all the non-Russian nations in the USSR. Indeed, for the first time we have faced the reality that the majority of captive nations are in the Soviet Union and Asia. Historically, the nations in Central Europe, such as Poland, Hungary and others, would never have become captive to Russia if other non-Russian nations, like Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan and others, had not fallen under the imperialist and colonialist domination of Soviet Russia. This is a stubborn truth we cannot escape. It is an elemental historical truth that these documents confirm. It is this confirmation that rocked Khrushchev.

It is also instructive for us to note that some of our State Governors who visited the Soviet Union in 1959 continually spoke of it as a nation. Even those in the Kremlin have hesitated to speak in this vein internally. When basic, elementary truths escape us, how much value can be assigned to the conclusions and recommendations made by these

touring Governors or other groups? It is patently evident that the legalistic facade of the Soviet Union befogged their understanding of the foremost issues within this substrate empire.

Khrushchev recognized the psychological blow that the resolution represented. For too long he had boasted of the allegedly rapid strides made by Moscow in economic development, in military prowess, scientific, achievements, cultural betterment and the like. He compared these with the achievements of our nation. But one need only ask whether Russia's over-inflated accomplishments would have been possible without the captive resources of Ukraine, Turkestan, Georgia and other rich non-Russian nations subjugated within the Soviet Union.

The well-founded perspective laid down in the resolution truthfully devaluates the boasts and bluffs of Moscow's comparisons with the real achievements of our nation. This is what troubled Khrushchev most. On the basis of this historical perspective the economic, scientific and other comparisons made between the substrate empire and our nation are out of real context. Psychologically and politically it is hardly comforting for the Kremlin and its propaganda apparatus to have the world know that Russia's strength, such as it is, is parasitically built on captive resources both within and outside the Soviet Union. Yet this is the moving truth which we have scarcely tapped. The resolution and the proclamations have in themselves begun to tap it.

Made consistently insecure about its captive millions, Moscow would not push as vigorously its borderland policy in Iraq, Iran and elsewhere; and such organizations as the Central Treaty Organization, which replaced the old Baghdad Pact, would not be under the same pressures. Troubleshooters, like Vladimir Y. Semichastny, the defamer of Pasternak, would have to be sent frequently to areas like Azerbaijan to try to deal with recurring upsurges of "bourgeois ideology." For surveillance and control it has been Moscow's policy anyway to place Russians in the second secretaryship of the party in the captive non-Russian republics. For our national interest and the goal of world freedom these and countless other results would manifest Moscow's basic insecurity. We can insure this insecurity by preventing Moscow from ever thinking that we would accede in any circumstances to the permanent captivity of the more than twenty enslaved nations.

In raising the points that he did Khrushchev was banking on the unfamiliarity of his American readers with the realities of the Soviet Union. First, the introductory sentences on socialism and capitalism can be easily dispensed with. As mentioned above, a point of argumentative deflection was introduced here with no real bearing on the issue troubling Khrushchev. A complete and thorough politico-economic comparison between the national economy of the USA and the empire economy of the USSR would lead to a day-and-night conclusion when it comes to the values of "efficacy," "prosperity," and "happiness."

The second point of interest is Khrushchev's own misreading of the resolution, or, if he read it correctly, then his dishonesty in the treatment of its contents. The resolution specifically refers to enslavement by Russian Communist aggression, not by the vague and meaningless concept of Communism. By this honest specification the resolution is grounded in historical fact, not in philosophical vaguery. Moreover, as concerns the liberation of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, nowhere does the resolution contain any specification of "Kazakhstan,

Turkmenistan and even a certain 'Ural Area.'" It does specify the Turkestan nation and Idel-Ural, which consists of the Tatars, Bashkirs and other non-Russian peoples between the Volga and the Urals.

But what is most illuminating in these passages is the Russian's use of a spurious argument that has been characteristically exploited by some anti-Communist Russian emigres and their unwary American friends who seek to preserve the territorial integrity of the basic Russian empire. Khrushchev's implied comparison between Texas, Arizona, and California and comparable areas in the USSR is, except for geography, a speciosity which has hoodwinked many Americans. Some of our leaders in public life have used precisely the same specious argument.

Here, too, the cardinal objective sought by Khrushchev in the period ahead was again evident. His cynical remarks about prayers and God did not conceal his sustained concern about "interference in other peoples' affairs." Such self-insuring interference on our part is in reality directed at the widespread Russian interference in and domination of all the captive non-Russian nations. In brief, Khrushchev again singled out the resolution, and in the abiding hope that "now times have changed" he bade us not to interrupt his colonialist interference with the lives of the captive peoples. Moscow's victory in this fundamental respect would exceed in value all the military might it now has or will have in the future.

MOSCOW SEEKS TO BURY THE RESOLUTION

Before commenting on the Russian "peace and friendship" or "peaceful coexistence" technique, it would profit us to review briefly several additional examples of Red totalitarian reaction to Captive Nations Week from its inception to recent years. At Camp David, in September, 1959, Khrushchev seemed to be obsessed with the resolution. As described by Governor William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania, who then had been attached to the Department of State and accompanied the Russian dictator, the situation appeared as follows: "I think anybody who was connected with this visit in any way will tell you that this particular resolution made more of an impression on Chairman Khrushchev, and he invected against it at a greater rate almost daily while he was here, than any other single thing that America was doing in the Cold War."

Examples abound for 1961 also. Moscow's *Pravda* attacked the Week at length and held that "it is not at all fortuitous that this time the farce represented by the 'Captive Nations Week' should coincide with the hullabaloo created by American propaganda around the West Berlin question." As another highlight of the period, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the resolution at the Communist Party Congress in October, 1961.

These vehement assaults continued into 1962. For example, the organ of the Soviet government, *Izvestia*, leveled its big guns against President Kennedy for his proclamation of the Week.

Months before the 1963 Captive Nations Week was proclaimed, a Soviet Russian weekly raised the question, "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States?" Its ostensible reason was: "That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question'."

Among the underlings in the Red Empire, North Korea was about the most vicious that year, smearing the President as a "third-class clown," and, over the Pyongyang Radio, calling the Week "a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles."

In 1964 the nervous responses were much the same: *Izvestia* rattled along with these choice comments: "With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance" and "The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the U.S.A."

And, on the very eve of his ouster, Khrushchev once again had to shout before an audience in Czecho-Slovakia, "In the United States a farce entitled 'captive nations week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for twenty years but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."

These selected examples for each year form an illuminating background for any consideration of Moscow's propaganda efforts along the lines of "peace and friendship" or "peaceful coexistence."

The Kremlin's denunciations of the resolution from July, 1959 to the present have clearly demonstrated how deeply it has penetrated Moscow's cold war armor. Moscow fears this resolution more than anything else on the politico-psychological front. As we shall see, the chief reason for this is that the law symbolizes enormous and even decisive cold war possibilities.

At the time, many reporters, writers, and analysts required to know where Turkestan or White Ruthenia is located. Some wrote as though the minority captive nations in Central Europe were the only nations listed in the resolution. But what could one expect, when on the highest levels of our Government the USSR has been referred to as "the Soviet nation," and the different nations within the Soviet Union have been arbitrarily and somewhat insultingly called "the Soviet people" or "the Soviets."

Furthermore, in terms of the resolution and the wealth of evidence underlying it our many economic, military, scientific, and other comparisons between the USSR and the USA are drawn on false premises. We have pointed this out for the military in an article on "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the USSR." In a later chapter we shall observe that the same criticism applies to our unrealistic economic comparisons.

One cannot begin to evaluate the breadth and depth of these activities unless his intellectual approach to Moscow's total activity is an integralist and holistic one. A grasp of the total war being flung upon us is impossible also without a working concept of the Cold War. An effective concept of the Cold War holds that it is a twilight condition of neither real peace nor hot war, one where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present except for open military combat between states. As long practiced by imperialist Russia, a cold war is the very soul and spirit of a hot war with the massive body of military conflict kept in secondary reserve.

Reclaiming Lost Manpower

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the Members of this body an important project which has just been

launched in my city of Cleveland under the direction of the superintendent of public schools, Dr. Paul Briggs, with the cooperation of the General Electric Corp., which has large industrial commitments in the city of Cleveland.

This project relates to the establishment of a meaningful practical vocational institution in which the enrollees, regular high school aged students will spend part of their school day in educational activities and the remainder in actual productive manufacturing work to produce salable electrical items.

The school will be run like a regular factory, is located within the ghetto and will deal for the most part with young people who would otherwise be potential or actual dropouts. This project is most exciting and will be followed closely by educators and industrial management people throughout the country. This unique experience is a credit to the forward thinking of the executives and staff of GE and our own superintendent and his splendid staff at the Cleveland Board of Education who give unstintingly of their time and their mental energy to develop and support creative, meaningful educational programs. The story from the magazine Steel on this important project is as follows:

THE DROPOUT—HOW TO RECLAIM LOST MANPOWER

Take a hard look at a program that's being set up in Cleveland. It's jointly sponsored by the Cleveland Board of Education and area business, commerce, and industry and will, they hope, be under way by fall 1968.

"This . . . effort," explains Dr. Paul W. Briggs, superintendent, Cleveland Public Schools, "is aimed specifically at breaking the poverty and welfare cycle of the innercity and providing job training for immediate placement in productive work."

Donated by General Electric Co., the four-level, 222,598 sq ft facility in the heart of the ghetto will house a project combining basic education and paid work experience. Students will be "young unemployed dropouts," says Dr. Briggs. "These are the ones we have to get to. We have lost them to date." And unemployment among youths aged 17 to 25, both male and female, who are no longer in school is a staggering 58%. How many can the facility handle? "We don't know the capacity of the project so far."

LOGISTICS

Recruiters who live within the ghetto will contact dropouts about the program's availability, and a bus service will operate between the ghetto and the training center.

Participants will spend part of each day in an environment devoted to learning how to get and hold a job—studying subjects like basic reading, writing, and mathematics, as well as money management, personal hygiene, and good work habits. The rest of the time they'll be in industry-sponsored work areas for on the job training in actual reproduction work.

"An important feature of the program, probably unique, (will) be immediate paid employment upon enrollment," the superintendent points out. Industry will finance this part of the project and will sublease space in the facility for the training setups. General Electric was the first to sign up.

"The participant won't necessarily go to the company which trained him when he's ready for full-time employment," Dr. Briggs tells Steel. "We don't want to 'trap' him that way. And the length of the course will depend on the individual. We'll program it around each person, according to his needs.

"The teachers," he continues, "will come from trade schools and some may be loaned by industry as a special task force. We're also looking to the type of person who has volunteered for VISTA and the Peace Corps."

WHY A PUBLIC-PRIVATE EFFORT?

"While industry can, should, and will provide jobs for underprivileged persons, it cannot be expected, nor does it have the know-how to provide all the training and education required to help build full, productive lives," Dr. Briggs explains.

"The urban school must cooperate with business and industry in finding new ways to help the ghetto youth prepare quickly and adequately for the jobs that are now available and that expanding technology is making available for tomorrow."

Adds Robert V. Corning, general manager of GE's Lamp Div., Cleveland: "The economy now has more jobs than qualified workers. The problem is that the disadvantaged unemployed often are not qualified for industrial jobs. One way that the business community can help is to cooperate with the Board of Education in closing this employability gap . . . Urban problems, like education and employment, have to be tackled on a systems basis—that is, pulling together all the talents and resources of key community groups into a cooperative problem-solving approach."

The project will be run with funds from federal, state, and private sources. "It will be heavily financed—75%, perhaps—through vocational rehabilitation funds," says Dr. Briggs.

Architectural and other fees for setting up the facility may be paid for by a foundation. These, however, will be low compared with the cost of a totally new building—\$5 million.

Formation of the Civil Air Patrol Congressional Squadron

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride and pleasure that I call my colleagues' attention to the charter issued to the congressional squadron by the Civil Air Patrol, the official U.S. Air Force Auxiliary.

Last Thursday morning, February 8, Brig. Gen. William W. Wilcox, USAF, National Commander of CAP, was guest of honor at the first breakfast held by the congressional squadron. The general welcomed the 20 Members of the House and aides who have already joined this dedicated organization.

In the 1940's I was privileged to be an active member of CAP, and it is most rewarding once again to be a member of an organization that is credited by our Air Force with having flown 70 percent of all search and rescue missions in the United States.

The CAP Congressional Squadron hopes to undertake a program of flight instruction and other skills related to CAP activities, including the enlargement of its youth program. The CAP cadet program, which currently has some 47,000 cadets, is a very potent weapon in combating juvenile delinquency. As General Wilcox has stated, however, the goal is some 250,000 cadets.

Our squadron will do everything possible to help the CAP achieve this goal.

On behalf of the congressional squadron I invite and welcome all Members of the House, their wives and families as well as permanent staff assistants to join us in these worthwhile endeavors.

Urgent National Need for a Modern Nuclear Navy

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of Navy magazine, a publication of the Navy League of the United States, contains a very concise but nonetheless complete summary of the inertia displayed by the Pentagon toward providing our Nation with a modern nuclear Navy.

The article, written by the national president of the Navy League of the United States, Charles F. Duchain, deserves careful reading by every Member of Congress.

I trust that this article, which hopefully looks to the newly designated Secretary of Defense, Clark M. Clifford, as an advocate of a nuclear-powered Navy, is prophetic.

I share the hope of the president of the Navy League that Clark M. Clifford will join the Congress of the United States and insist on providing our Nation with a truly modern Navy.

The article, entitled "A Modern Nuclear Navy—An Urgent National Need," is included at this point in the RECORD so as to enable the Members of Congress to reflect on this vital defense problem:

A MODERN NUCLEAR NAVY—AN URGENT NATIONAL NEED

(By Charles F. Duchain, National President, Navy League of the United States)

The congressional clarion has sounded loud and clear.

L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, spoke for a restive Congress recently when he denounced the ploy of the contractual "stretch out," the Pentagon-ordered re-studies of studies already made, and he demanded a halt to the self-imposed moratorium on construction of nuclear-powered surface ships.

"Frankly, I do not know how Congress can make its position on this matter anymore clear. We are bound and determined that we shall provide our Navy with nuclear-powered warships . . ." he said.

Deep is the debt of gratitude owed the Congress by the American people, for its persistent advocacy kept the nuclear-powered surface ship program alive and preserved a major strategic advantage the United States holds over the Soviet Union.

Heavy pressure from the lawmakers gave the Navy, after a five-year delay, its latest—and second—nuclear frigate, the USS Truxtun, which is now at combat ready in the Sea of Japan. Congress, with the wisdom of years of defense experience, re-enforced by the courageous counsel of Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, has set an unflinching course.

Notwithstanding congressional effort, controversy still marks the pace of the transition from "oil to the atom," reminding one of

President Kennedy's favorite biblical quotations: "Where there is no vision the people perish."

The USS Kennedy, a fossil-fueled carrier, steams toward the 21st century a red-neon reminder of his thoughts on "vision." In glaring contrast to the late President's oceanic vision, is the obsolescent power plant of the ship bearing his name.

Thirteen years after the submarine USS Nautilus first signaled, "Underway on nuclear power," only four nuclear surface ships have joined the U.S. Fleet. For a nation that boasts a yearly gross national product of more than \$800 billion, the record is singularly uninspiring.

But hopeful signs show on the horizon. The sharp focus Secretary of the Navy Paul R. Ignatius developed on the spectacular performance of nuclear-powered ships in his 1967 Navy Day talk in Chicago was one. He concluded that three warships during a Viet Nam deployment can accomplish the task of four conventionally powered ships. Notwithstanding the slight oversimplification, the superiority of a nuclear Navy, as an instrument of national policy offering decision-makers a wider choice of options, was driven home convincingly.

The conclusive evidence of actual operations support this thesis. Commanders at sea appreciate the increased tactical flexibility made possible by unlimited endurance at high speed. Experienced military planners grasp the significance of the totally new strategic and tactical dimension gained with the sustained mobility of nuclear power. They understand the quantum jump in naval readiness provided, but unfortunately this escapes the "Cost Effectiveness" analysts and their computers.

The under-publicized first circumnavigation of the globe by nuclear-powered surface ships on operation Sea Orbit in 1964, dramatically demonstrated the superb strategic performance of the nuclear task force. Throughout the 31,000-mile, 57-day voyage, USS Enterprise, USS Long Beach and USS Bainbridge cruised at close to top speed, showing how quickly the U.S. presence can be re-enforced in remote areas of the world. There were no stops for refueling or replenishment, revealing an unprecedented logistic self-sufficiency. The integrity of the task force in long-range high-speed steaming high-lighted the importance of nuclear destroyers within the task force. The strangulating necessity for slowing or stopping to fuel destroyers having been eliminated, the top speed of advance of nearly 30 knots could be maintained indefinitely.

Subsequent to Sea Orbit, wartime deployments in Viet Nam confirmed the vastly improved tactical performance. Not needing fuel, they remained on the line far longer with an "instant readiness," enhancing their safety.

Both strategically and tactically, even in terms of cost, the concept of a nuclear Navy speaks convincingly for itself. The rapid shrinkage of multibillion dollar overseas bases, the closure of the Suez Canal, the sovereignty struggle for the Panama Canal and the existing power vacuum in the Indian Ocean, coupled with the rapid rise of the Soviet challenge at sea, failed to impress a land-oriented, cost-conscious Defense regime as to the vital need for a nuclear fleet. But these same facts must now be faced up to frontally to fulfill the Nation's future.

I contend, with the Congress, that now is the time to pull out the "nuclear propulsion stops," and gain the full advantage of this revolutionary power for peace. But to do so, a new order of determination is needed.

In building a nuclear Navy, the Polaris precedent is well established. Given purposeful policy by our government, rapid results follow. Forty-one nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarines were built in eight years. The McNamara-prepared Pentagon budget presented to the Congress by the

President fails to provide for any new nuclear ship construction in FY 1969. However, the long-awaited breakthrough may have been heralded when Clark M. Clifford, the newly appointed Secretary of Defense, told the Senate Armed Services Committee late last month, that he favors construction of nuclear powered surface ships.

The Navy League pledges its fullest support in this premise to the new Secretary of Defense, holding as a matter of deep conviction, that the course of action proposed by the Congress is clearly in the national interest.

It is our hope that the Navy—to borrow a Churchillian phrase—soon will be able to "stop breeding slow race horses" of the sea, and help the Nation celebrate its 200th Anniversary with a new and modern nuclear Navy.

Safe Streets Bill

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 1 year has passed since the safe streets and crime control legislation was introduced in the Congress. During that year, crime has risen steadily in this Nation and new patterns of civil disorder have emerged in many cities. Meanwhile, during the year, law-enforcement agencies continued to work against difficult odds: hampered by shortages of men, by lack of training, and by outmoded equipment. Some were aided under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965—our Federal grants program for criminal justice—but more, many more, were not. They could not be. Since December 1965, \$17.5 million in these LEA grants has been given to the agencies of criminal justice—primarily law-enforcement agencies.

That has meant an average of about \$7 million a year available for training police and the staffs of corrections institutions, for research and demonstration in crime prevention and control, and for improvement of courts and the administration of criminal justice. That is a tall order for \$7 million. It is not enough and the LEA Act is not broad enough to cope with crime in this Nation, the safe streets bill, as proposed by the administration, is. It will permit a widescale attack against crime, lending assistance to local-law enforcement, stimulating new technology, increasing efficiency with training and equipment support, and encouraging coordination in planning, operations, and research by law enforcement and criminal justice agencies throughout the Nation.

The full national anticrime strategy was laid before us today in the President's special crime message. Although I may not agree with all points, I believe the major program and policies to carry it out are necessary. I believe this legislation, in conjunction with the additional stress on the ever-increasing problem of the misuse of narcotics and other dangerous drugs, as outlined in the President's message, may go a long way, if properly implemented, in curing this ever-growing scourge on America and especially young America.

Address by U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger at American Chamber of Commerce Luncheon, Bangkok, Thailand

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on my recent trip to Southeast Asia I had the privilege of visiting Thailand. What I observed there was a responsible, restrained and widely supported American presence, which the Thai people appreciated and identified with the cause of their own national independence and aspirations.

Much has been said about the American efforts in that country, and it has at times become the focal point for a strain of debate in the continuing controversy over Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, no matter what the result of the American intervention in Vietnam, it is likely to be felt in this more stable, highly nationalistic neighboring state.

Thailand will continue to have an interest, then, in the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam. But it should be duly noted here that Thailand's own position is quite different and more secure than that of her neighbor, and that she faces the problems of development and Communist hostility with strength. The King, government, and people of Thailand are aware of their capabilities and share national pride. This pride is coupled with a great sense of respect for Americans, and the active participation we play in Thai development.

The Honorable Leonard Unger, the American Ambassador in Bangkok, recently made a speech at the American Chamber of Commerce there, and outlined some of his most important experiences during his past 10 years—in Thailand and Laos, and dealing in Asian matters in Washington. His remarks clarify a number of questions Americans have about this land—and the stake we have in its survival and prosperity. They leave no room for doubt as to whether or not our efforts have been recognized; and his words should be reassuring to all of us who wonder if it is worth the trouble.

Reading the Ambassador's speech should give one the greatest confidence in the competence of the U.S. Foreign Service, and the deep as well as wide range of knowledge possessed by some of our top diplomats.

Mr. Unger is certainly one of these men. His message is of particular pertinence to the whole issue of what the role of the United States ought to be, in that part of the world.

I highly recommend the Ambassador's remarks to all of us in the House, and to the American people at large. Both "dove" and "hawks" alike will find a refreshing outlook here, and his words are those of experience and realism. They offer a vision of the task ahead, a reasonable respect for the Thai people and a decent hope for the success of our mutual effort. I place his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY U.S. AMBASSADOR LEONARD UNGER AT AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON, BANGKOK, THAILAND, JANUARY 17, 1968

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with members of the American Chamber of Commerce in Thailand, and welcome the invitation to carry on the tradition of an annual appearance by the American Ambassador. Much of what I have to say today will relate to our relations, as Americans, with the Thais in whose country we are living as guests. While the record of Thai-American relations speaks for itself, generally, sight tends to be lost from time to time of certain basic realities which I would like to put in better perspective. I should state at the outset, that in addition to speaking as the President's personal representative to Thailand, I am expressing deep, personal convictions based upon experiences over the past ten years—first in Thailand, then in Laos, and more recently in Washington, where I dealt with many Southeast Asian matters, particularly the problem of Vietnam.

I

Vietnam, by almost any standard, is the most absorbing and complex issue in American political life today. The issue is whether the nations of Southeast Asia shall be able to set their own independent course and be free of subversive aggression. Thailand, therefore, also attaches extreme importance to the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. Its determination equals that of the United States to bring about a final settlement in Vietnam which assures national freedom and fosters the return of peaceful order to Southeast Asian affairs.

The government of Thailand has made its position unmistakably clear. It has done this through active participation in collective defense arrangements under SEATO. Thailand has also enabled the U.S. to bring its air power to bear against North Vietnam and its infiltration into the South. Thailand has sent troops of its own to help defend South Vietnam, and it has taken firm measures to protect its own people against those assaulting not only South Vietnam and large sectors of Laos today, but Thailand itself.

Communist hostility toward Thailand is but one of many reflections of this nation's strategic importance in the total Southeast Asian picture. Ironic as it may seem, another measure of Thailand's key role in Southeast Asian events is this country's growing prominence in the American controversy over Vietnam.

In the cross fire of political battles over Vietnam, many Americans naturally want to examine our commitments elsewhere in the area, and to assess the dependability of those with whom we have aligned ourselves. I do not quarrel with the usefulness of responsible, free debate. I am seriously troubled, however, when I see certain facts about Thai-U.S. cooperation misread in ways that damage Thai-American interests, and encumber the Vietnam problem with negative and discouraging implications which do not actually exist.

The frequency of late of such distortion and misinformation has provided a new and disturbing experience for the Thai government and people. It is never pleasant to find one's country being criticized or subjected to hostile cross examination by foreigners. It is even less pleasant when they seem to question the validity of national policies, programs and institutions that have been carefully developed over the years for the express purpose of self-preservation. Having governed themselves for over 700 years, the Thai feel no need to adjust their way of doing things to meet foreign concepts of how things should be done. Moreover, having decided that defending Vietnam is in Thailand's own best interests, they do not want their actions interpreted—or misinterpreted—in lights cast by the clash of con-

flicting views over similar U.S. policies. Neither do they want it assumed that their fundamental policies are merely a response to the wishes of a large power. Understandably, they resent the bland assumption that the pattern of events in a neighboring state inevitably will be repeated in their own.

II

Nevertheless, perhaps largely because Thailand is known to have both communist guerrilla forces and U.S. military units in the country, it seems often to be assumed that American forces have been sent here to deal with the internal threat and are more or less covertly engaged in combat against insurgents in Thailand's rural areas. This of course is not the case. The only combat actions in which U.S. forces here participate are those well-publicized out-of-country operations directed against Vietnamese communist targets. U.S. military units in Thailand, other than those belonging to the Air Force, are neither equipped nor organized for combat assignments. The Thai government has stated repeatedly that in suppression action against the guerrillas, the only American help it wants or needs is that giving Thai military and security forces their own means of dealing with the problem.

Combat operations by Thai-based units of the U.S. Air Force are carried out against North Vietnam by our fighter-bomber aircraft, and against Viet Cong concentrations in South Vietnam by B-52 bombers, and have entailed the assignment to Thailand of about thirty-three thousand U.S. Air Force personnel. The Air Force units require in turn, from other U.S. military services here, myriad forms of logistical support in which some seven thousand troops are engaged. There are roughly three thousand additional U.S. military personnel in Thailand serving with the military assistance program, working on engineering and military research projects, and in SEATO.

Let me add, if I may, a footnote to what I hope will end misguided speculation about U.S. involvement in guerrilla warfare here. A year ago, Ambassador Martin confirmed for you that unarmed U.S. Air Force helicopters were on assignment in the Northeast. As Ambassador Martin emphasized, this was a temporary, non-combat measure, taken at a time when added mobility was of critical importance to Thai authorities organizing their own resources to blunt an escalating insurgent threat. Accordingly, in January of 1967, after the Royal Thai Government had completed the transitional training required for field operation of its own newly acquired force of forty-nine troop-carrying helicopters, the U.S. helicopters were withdrawn from Thailand. They were replaced in the field by these Thai helicopters, furnished by the U.S., which Thai authorities are using with increasing effectiveness. Additional helicopters have been provided, including ten to the Thai National Police, and more will become available to the armed forces and police as Thai pilots and mechanics complete training courses and can make use of these aircraft.

The lesson here, I think, is two-fold: First, the nature of American assistance to Thai counter-insurgency programs does not lead toward direct American involvement in those operations. On the other hand, we must not become so transfixed by our Vietnam experiences that we lose our capacity here to take decisive, practical steps in providing the training and equipment with which the Thai government itself can bring the insurgency under control, and in due course eliminate it.

III

We will continue to hear dire predictions, that Thailand inevitably will go the way of Vietnam, and that sooner or later Americans will be fighting communist insurgents here. In fact, Thailand resembles Vietnam only in that it is another intended victim of the same communist effort to expand its domi-

nation by using the technique of the "war of national liberation." Violence and killing in Thailand by communist terrorists, most of them trained outside Thailand, does not express grass roots political sentiment.

Thailand's people are united in a rapidly developing nation seeking to work out its political and economic destiny with care and forethought. Land ownership is primarily in the hands of those who work the soil. There is no tendency to split along religious lines, since virtually all Thai are Buddhists. Minorities are for the most part being assimilated and woven into the life of the country. One could cite many other factors working in Thailand's favor—its sense of self confidence developed over centuries of managing its own affairs—its able leadership, competent civil service, and armed forces showing their mettle today in Vietnam—its economic growth rate running around eight percent per annum—its capacity to organize and carry out rural security and development programs—and the social and economic mobility of Thai life.

Furthermore, Thailand's well-educated, skilled and enterprising young people do not migrate to other countries except in rare instances. Among the hundreds who annually go abroad for long periods to further their education or professional experience, all but a few are drawn back by loyalty and family ties and by their country's ample economic opportunities. I think it is fair to say, incidentally, that in large measure these have been created by Thailand's heavy emphasis upon private initiative and enterprise.

Thailand is also unique in that the continuity of its life and institutions has never been broken by colonial experiences. There has never been any need here for a national independence movement aimed at dislodging colonial rulers. Communist bands do not find in Thailand, therefore, as they did in Vietnam, any real opportunity to generate loyalty to a revolutionary struggle, or to identify themselves with compelling patriotic causes.

Above all, there flows from Thai attitudes toward the person of His Majesty the King and the institution of the monarchy a sense of national unity and continuity so strong that it extends into the remotest villages. To the citizens of Thailand, the King's full endorsement of efforts to counter the guerrilla threat is a buttress against subversive attempts to undermine the government's authority. In Thailand, as the communists have discovered even in relatively unprotected rural areas, the task of marshaling popular support for anti-government causes is difficult and unrewarding.

IV

In the Northeast, for example, in a poor area encompassing more than ten million people, where several years of subversive groundwork has been followed by two years of intensive terrorist and recruitment drives, the number of armed insurgents remains below two thousand. Reliable intelligence indicates that considerably more than a thousand of them have been trained outside Thailand in Communist China, in North Vietnam, and Pathet Lao territory.

At present, the mission of the insurgents, almost all of whom are full time fighters, assassins and political activists, is simple. Their mission is to break the links between Thailand's government and villagers, and to then replace the government's authority with their own. While there are isolated villages where this mission has been accomplished for a few hours, there is no point in Thailand upon which the insurgents have thus far been able to impose more than temporary control.

To see the present situation in fair perspective, however, one must look back to 1966. During that year, the level of communist violence increased markedly over 1965, a rise consistent with the insurgent cam-

paign predicted by Peking in 1965. Communist operations reached a high point toward the end of 1966. In January of last year, the number of armed encounters rose as the Thai government's counter actions developed momentum. By March 1967 the insurgents had adopted the tactic of avoiding contact with government forces, and the number of monthly armed encounters dropped by two-thirds. The rate of forced village propaganda meetings has declined even more dramatically during the past year. Assassinations have shown a slight but steady decline and now are at a lower rate than at any time over the past two years.

A prime explanation of these trends, in my opinion, is the combination of armed pressures by Thai military and security forces and the expansion of Thai Government programs for the improvement of the villager's lot. The forces have chased the insurgents from past operational bases and forced them into other areas. This has broken or strained insurgent connections with established sources—often merely their own kinfolk—of food, intelligence and other forms of support. This has raised significantly the rate of defections and desertions, which reflect in general a lack of political motivation among those villagers recruited through intimidation or promise of material gains.

Given the Royal Thai Government's commitment of additional military and police forces to communist suppression work, its program to establish small, permanent security forces in threatened villages, and its growing attention to the aspirations and legitimate grievances of the villagers, I would expect insurgent efforts to organize the Thai countryside to meet with as little success in 1968 as they did in 1967.

They won't quit, however. Those who dominate the guerilla ranks in Thailand are disciplined, well-trained, fully-indoctrinated insurgents. Thailand's northeast border provinces, where most of them are operating, or some of the other Thai border areas where there have been indications of additional outbreaks of insurgency, are too important to long-range communist plans to create a revolutionary base within this kingdom. More immediate objectives include protection for the flank of communist infiltration routes through Laos into South Vietnam; development of a capability for striking Thai military installations, including those being used to help in Vietnam; inducing the Thai government to question its policy of close alliance with the U.S.; and shaking U.S. faith in the stability of its ally.

v

The Thai government has developed an effective program to contain and compress rural insurgency. It has committed the requisite resources for this as well as for accelerating rural progress to make it increasingly difficult for subversive influences to take root and grow. Our two governments have agreed on how American economic and military assistance can best provide support to such programs. In fostering rural progress, the Thai government plans to continue to emphasize provincial roads and other communications links; expanding agricultural, public health, educational, and other governmental services in rural communities; assisting farmers' organizations; and developing water resources for human consumption and irrigation. Other projects are designed to establish local security forces in more and more of the endangered remote villages, to mobilize military and police forces for quick reaction to the outbreak of insurgent violence, and to modernize Thai military forces for defensive action against larger scale communist penetrations. The U.S. will assist these efforts with substantial levels of economic and military aid which last year totalled more than one hundred-ten million dollars.

In all our programs here, however, whether they fall within economic, military, or other categories (the Peace Corps, for example), there is an additional underlying theme, which must not be overlooked to get a true impression of what Americans are doing in Thailand. That theme is education in the broadest sense of the word. The emphasis upon teaching, technical training, and advisory activities in our assistance programs here is in keeping with Thailand's traditional practice of welcoming and importing advanced knowledge and new skills. Historically the Thais have sought to draw generously upon the experience and know-how of others to improve their own techniques so that they will be in a position to manage their own affairs with ever-increasing effectiveness.

In response to Thai requests, the U.S. has undertaken to provide large numbers of technical advisors, training instructors, professional consultants, and other specialists capable of imparting the special knowledge, competence and skills which Thailand wants in greater abundance. Those who can be classed as advisors, trainers, instructors and educators account for more than three quarters of the total USOM staff of Americans. A substantial proportion of U.S. assistance funds are allocated annually to the training and further education of Thai civilian and military specialists. Under the Participant Training Program administered by USOM since 1949, over five thousand Thais have gone abroad, to the U.S. and elsewhere, for advanced training. Additionally, many of the large scale Thai government projects which receive U.S. assistance are directly concerned with training. These include, for example, a program for training twelve thousand new members of the Thai National Police by the end of this year; the training for Accelerated Rural Development programs of technical personnel, over seven hundred of whom have completed basic courses, while fifteen hundred others are receiving on-the-job training in the provinces; the instruction of paramedics for rural public health services; educating village youths in basic vocational skills taught by instructors in mobile training units. These, to be sure, are but some of the ways in which Thailand obtains professional competence and technical skills to meet problems at home and keep pace with the outside world. By the way, as proof of the wisdom of the Thai Government's policy, I have been impressed with the large number of fields in which Americans and others were providing training here some years ago, when I was last in Thailand, but in which I now find Thai carrying on by themselves.

vi

To understand fully why Thailand and the U.S. have undertaken many of the wide range of projects which engage us here, one must first look outside Thailand—toward Vietnam and beyond—at Southeast Asia as a whole. Within this vast, potentially wealthy area live 250 million people. None of them would be beyond the ambitious, domineering embrace of communism if no adequate obstacles existed to Red Chinese and North Vietnamese expansionism. We must add to this reservoir of Asian manpower, a fertile land mass the size of Western Europe, vast hydroelectric, mineral and petroleum resources, and a geographical position astride the air, sea and land routes joining the Pacific and Indian oceans.

U.S. policies toward the area take those strategic considerations into account, and above all the common determination among Southeast Asian states to preserve their national identities while advancing toward a more secure, stable and prosperous existence. U.S. policies in the individual nations of Southeast Asia are consistent with the basic American posture toward the area, but they vary from country to country, depending upon the capacity of each to maintain itself

to its own satisfaction without outside help. The U.S. objective in these bilateral relations is an equal, progressive, mutually advantageous partnership, such as we have long enjoyed with Thailand. Our partnership with Thailand has proven uniquely productive, both in bilateral terms and in the beneficial, steady affect it has had elsewhere in the area.

Thailand conducts its affairs on the basis of an independent, well-conceived set of policies which it has developed for itself toward the nations of this and all other areas of the world. On such basic matters, Thai and American positions are basically consistent. The effect of our alignment with each other, and with like-minded nations, is to give each of us greater influence than either nation could expect to exert in the absence of reinforcing policies and actions by the other.

Thailand, like America, is helping Vietnam in its own best interests. The United States is aiding Thailand for the same reason, and because it is our common firm belief that Vietnam is but one aspect of a much larger, potentially more formidable problem. Our efforts to solve and settle that problem depend ultimately upon people, both Thai and Americans, living and working in closer contact and in far greater numbers than ever before. This tests the capacity of Thai-American relations to withstand strains that our easy and cordial associations have not known before. I am fully convinced that the long term results from this period of intimate and broad Thai-American contacts will prove wholly positive.

No Harvest for the Reaper

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Education and Labor Committee is currently considering H.R. 4769, to extend the protection of the National Labor Relations Act to agricultural employees.

Numerous witnesses before the Special Subcommittee on Labor have described the continuing exploitation and the painful existence of farmworkers. The exclusion of these workers, who are the lowest paid large occupational group in America, from the labor law that covers almost all other workers is a fundamental cause of bitter grievances.

Now a new witness has stepped forward. NET Journal, a unit of the National Educational Television network, this week broadcast a thoughtful, carefully prepared documentary, "No Harvest for the Reaper." It focused on the lives of a group of migratory farmworkers recruited in Arkansas for employment in the potato, bean, and strawberry fields of Long Island, N.Y. It describes in detail the economic pressures they face.

The film is in the tradition of John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath" and Edward R. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame." It details in unmistakable terms the personal tragedy of an unjust and unnecessarily cruel system of labor management.

The transcript of this production is lengthy, but it is filled with insights into the feelings and problems of the workers and also the farmers, processors, and labor contractors. I wish each of my colleagues could see the camera work which adds an essential dimension to this text.

A rebroadcast this Sunday at 5 p.m. on educational television will give that opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to include the transcript of the documentary, "No Harvest for the Reaper," at this point in the RECORD and urge the 90th Congress to act swiftly to bring these workers under the Wagner Act.

The transcript follows:

NARRATOR. The following program is from NET, the National Educational Television Network.

The chronicle begins here in a parched, bloodless, cotton-bankrupt Southern town, with a crew chief, Andrew Anderson, seeking to recruit migrant labor to work the potato rich crops of eastern Long Island in New York.

RECRUITER. Is there anything going on for you to do? I'm trying to recruit some guys to go to New York and work for a little while.

MAN. Going to New York?

RECRUITER. Yeah, about eight weeks.

MAN. Yeah, well, I don't know nobody.

RECRUITER. If you see anybody interested in going, tell them to contact Anderson, Andrew Anderson on Water Street.

MAN. Okay.

RECRUITER. My boss will be sitting down there so they can contact and there will be somebody there to take the name. And you'll do that.

MAN. Yeah.

RECRUITER. You fellows already got a suitcase. All you've got to do is get on my bus.

MAN. Yeah.

RECRUITER. I'm trying to find some men who want to go to New York and work for a while. You know anybody interested in going, tell them to contact me. Okay. You know Henry DeFrance?

MAN. Yeah.

RECRUITER. You know him don't you. He's up there.

MAN. He's up there? Where does he work? **RECRUITER.** He works as a grader over there. So, if you see anybody, you tell them to check. I'm going to leave tomorrow evening.

MAN. Tomorrow evening, okay.

RECRUITER. Yup. I'd appreciate that. Okay.

MAN. Yeah.

RECRUITER. Would you be interested in going off for eight weeks?

MAN. About eight weeks?

RECRUITER. The first of December, that's when my job ends.

I don't rest—tomorrow. I've got about forty boys from here and there around, and Parkin.

MAN. I never have any money to go there.

RECRUITER. No, that's one thing. I'm getting you up there on credit. You see.

If I don't get you a job, they'll bring you back on credit. Now, I've got to have a job for you haven't I. I sure don't want to feed you and you're not going to work. Isn't that right, Cleo.

See if I were going to do that then Cleo would be ready to go.

What's your name?

MAN. David.

RECRUITER. David. What's your last name?

MAN. Brandon—B-R-A-N-D-O-N.

RECRUITER. Is many people out of work here now?

MAN. Yeah man.

RECRUITER. They need something to do?

MAN. Yeah.

RECRUITER. This would help Santa Claus, you see, if they go up and work until the first of December and make 'em four or five hundred dollars. They tell me that's where Santa Claus come by, you know.

MAN. Yeah, that's about . . .

RECRUITER. You know, in any situation. You're Santa Claus ain't you? You're Santa Claus now?

MAN. Yeah.

RECRUITER. You don't get no finances, you don't have no Santa Claus huh?

MAN. Yeah, for about eighteen years.

RECRUITER. I'll look and see what I can find out for you.

NARRATOR. The next night, six more men had been induced to make the journey north. Some with the help of the Arkansas State Employment Service.

They had been promised good wages, steady work and such creature comforts as decent housing, shower facilities and what is called a centrally located restaurant on the grounds of the labor camp.

Their guide for the 1800 mile trip will be crew leader Anderson. His charge is thirty dollars. Since none can now afford it, they are in debt to Andrew Anderson before the trip begins.

The bus marked "special" will take them away from the indifferent towns of Arkansas, past the county seats of Tennessee into the Virginias, then over hundreds of miles of sterile highway that bypass great mountains of hardbreaking sunsets, until ultimately they reach Cutchogue, Long Island.

Earlier in the season, Cutchogue was a vacation resort, one of the prides of Long Island North Fork. The prim town is resplendent with schools, churches and old homes. It also has a migrant labor camp.

Even back in June at the beginning of the season, the labor camp bore the scars of endless summers past. One of 89 camps in Suffolk County, it is considered better than most by local officials.

ANDERSON. Alright let's go.

NARRATOR. On his morning rounds, Andrew Anderson wakes up Charlie White, one of 21,000 migrant workers in New York State, whose circumstances are similar to a half million migrants throughout the United States.

Charlie White's weekly pay averages \$47.00. From this he must pay a weekly rent of five dollars, a fuel charge of two dollars and a blanket fee of five dollars.

Although there was a fire at this camp several years ago which took the lives of two workers, this room is not fire-proof. The New York State code requires fire-proofing for buildings housing at least fifteen men; only fourteen live in this area.

ANDERSON. Get up man. Get out and get this camp in shape.

NARRATOR. The multiple occupancy dorms labelled "bull pens" by the workers are claimed to be fire-resistant by the farmer owners.

As to actual living space, the New York State code says that if a double-deck bunk is used in such an area, there shall be at least twenty square feet of floor area for each man. For non-migrants, the code insists on eighty square feet. It goes on to say that every bunk, bed, cot, or bunk spring, mattress or pillow shall be in good condition, and every sheet and blanket shall be clean.

The men here pay the same as Charlie White for rent, fuel and blankets. Throughout the season, almost 100 men will use this bathroom facility. Suffolk County officials have managed to amend the State law to outlaw outhouses.

Later in the season, 38 men will have to use a single bathroom. The farmers were outraged by a County violation report. They claimed that only 25 men had to use it. All meals are served at the Dixie Belle Tavern. The centrally located restaurant. In charge of the food concession is Mrs. Andrew Anderson. Breakfast is eighty-five cents. Usually consisting of a sausage bowl, rice, hominy grits, and an occasional egg.

Since the workers rarely have cash on hand, every charge is on credit to be deducted from the paychecks at the end of the week.

The bus takes them into their field work every morning. Roundtrip is \$1.25, payable to Andrew Anderson, except when the farmers transport them in themselves, riding them out in pickup trucks; at six A.M. this bus is almost ready to roll.

ANDERSON. Dave Johnson, Louis Willy,

Richard Addison, Fromm, LeRoy Carter, Feeley, Antonio.

MAN. He's already up there.

ANDERSON. Who do I have in there?

NARRATOR. If the work is slow, as it frequently is, or if the men are not favorites of the crew chief, they stay behind incurring the debts of daily existence. The number three crop in Long Island is strawberries, harvested from June to August. The migrants make ten cents for every quart they pick.

The work is called stoop labor for obvious reasons.

Daily records are kept via paper chits. For every quart, a chit worth a dime to be returned at the end of the day, duly noted, paid at week's end.

The land belongs to one of the farmers who owns the labor camp. William Lindsay.

AUCTIONEER. . . . (unintelligible—auctioneering) How much?

NARRATOR. Farmer Lindsay's strawberries yield close to two hundred dollars on the auction block. The migrants who picked it earn a total of twelve dollars for their labor. Two dollars a piece for six men. For six hours of work.

ANDERSON. Time to get up now.

NARRATOR. Migrant worker Woodrow Wilson. He wants to go to nearby Riverhead today. The trip, if Anderson allows him to go and furnish his transportation, will cost three dollars.

ANDERSON. No, really, I can't let you go to Riverhead. I've got work here for the farmers. Okay.

MAN. Okay.

ANDERSON. If you don't make nothing today, I'll let you go to Riverhead, you here. Alright?

NARRATOR. No one is going to Riverhead this morning. Charlie White is ready to harvest stringbeans. So is Woodrow Wilson. Even though picking a hamper of beans pays only a dollar.

MAN. . . . (unintelligible) . . .

NARRATOR. Jackie Robinson. He's fourteen and says he's been trying to return to Arkansas to reenter school but hasn't been able to buy his way out.

MAN. . . . (singing) . . .

NARRATOR. These are the economics of migrant labor. Charlie White will pick stringbeans from six AM till twelve Noon. He will be paid one dollar a hamper.

Andrew Anderson will take fifteen cents on each dollar as he does on all field workers. For six hours work, Charlie White will earn one dollar and seventy cents.

MAN. . . . (singing) . . .

NARRATOR. Much of the fertile land of Suffolk County is owned by members of the Eastern Suffolk Co-operative, which owns and operates the Cutchogue labor camp, leasing it to Anderson.

For decades the land has been yielding abundant crops: potatoes, cauliflower, strawberries, and stringbeans.

NARRATOR. On some days, the farmers come to camp to pick up their workers.

Farmer William Chudiak is the President of the Eastern Suffolk Co-op. While he has some cauliflower and strawberry acreage, his principal investment is in potatoes. Seventy-five acres, estimated current value almost three thousand dollars an acre.

Another member of the co-op, Al Patrick, owns seventy-two acres of potatoes, also valued at close to three thousand dollars per acre.

WORKER. This is my first time.

INTERVIEWER. First time?

WORKER. Uh-huh. I don't like it so well, neither.

INTERVIEWER. You don't. What kind do you like?

WORKER. I'd like some kind of inside job or something like that. I'd rather be in Arkansas, I believe, than be here. Rather than be here.

INTERVIEWER. What's the difference between here and Arkansas? Give us some of the advantages of Arkansas.

WORKER. Well so far, you can have more pleasure in Arkansas than up here now. I don't know how it's going to be after awhile, but right now it's not so good.

INTERVIEWER. What made you decide to come up?

WORKER. Oh, I just said I'd try it once. I saw everybody else trying it, saying they liked it. And I decided I'd try it and see if I liked it.

INTERVIEWER. Well, did you think there was a chance to make some money or not?

WORKER. Yeah, I thought there was a chance to make some money. I thought the wages would be a little higher than they were in Arkansas, but I see that they ain't. Not here.

INTERVIEWER. What are you going to do after the crop?

WORKER. Well, I guess I'll go back home if I'm let. Go to Chicago.

WORKER. I'll go home and stay for a time. Someone come pick me up and I'll go to Florida.

INTERVIEWER. What do you work? The citrus crop?

WORKER. No, we do the same thing—potatoes.

INTERVIEWER. Florida potatoes?

WORKER. Yeah. That's right. We stay in Florida about six weeks. Leave Florida to come back to what's called Cape Charles, Virginia. We live in Cape Charles, Virginia and breed potatoes there for a month. We leave there and come back here to Cutchogue. The least long we're supposed to stay here is eight months. We come in in July. We stay from July until March.

We leave here in March, the first of April and go back to Florida. We just go back and forth.

INTERVIEWER. Where is your home?

WORKER. Well, my original home was—where I was raised was in Arkansas, but I was born in Oklahoma City. That's where I'm from. I went back to Arkansas last year and was there about eleven months. I've been a citizen of this State of ten and a half years.

I've been to Rochester, Buffalo, Syracuse, Watertown, Utica, Lockport. All those . . .

I've worked all in the northern parts.

WORKER. I don't want my children to be drifting like I have. Going to and fro, and I'm working by the help of God trying to make a better living, to get a better job, either to be in a place where I can be stationary, where I can get them through school, and try to give them a better living than I had in my life.

NARRATOR. It is July 4th, a paid vacation day to most Americans. And these are the strawberry fields of Farmer Lindsay.

Present are some tourists and friends of the Lindsays, who for a token fee can keep whatever they pick. For the tourists it is fun. For the migrants who are working the fields, it is survival at ten cents a quart.

YOUNG CHILD. I picked half a basket. Then we'll pull in another basket okay?

WOMAN. Okay.

YOUNG CHILD. John, how many baskets did you pull up?

WORKER. Unintelligible.

NARRATOR. Farmer Lindsay records the chits used in payment. He is not enamored of migrant help. They're not men at all, he says, but two-legged animals.

WORSHIPPING FARM FAMILY. And to you father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. May Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you your sins and bring you to life everlasting.

Amen.

WORSHIPPING FARMWORKERS. We thank thee heavenly father for life. We thank thee our father for the food that we ate this morning. Our father, thou who hast brought us thus far on life's journey, it is with a great deal of humility, and thanksgiving that we're here this morning. We pray heavenly father

that they would use our lives as instruments to reach others.

Amen.

Oh, God . . . (unintelligible) . . .

And your people will rejoice in you.

Tell us oh Lord your penance.

Grant us your salvation.

Oh Lord hear my prayer.

The Lord be with you.

GROUP. Singing . . .

FARMER. The labor situation is—it's terrible. No one wants to work. They are interested in what they can get out of you, but not what they can do for you.

You have some boys that are fair. And some of them—they're not interested in nothing but—I probably shouldn't even say it.

FARM WIFE. I'd say that they're okay. But it comes like on a Saturday morning with—when they have nobody to load the trucks if it wasn't for—

FARMER. They don't show up on the job.

FARM WIFE. And Monday mornings. So my husband is actually sick them two days. FARMER. I have some—like the Puerto Ricans—the same ones come back. But the migrants from the labor camp, I think they come from Arkansas and Mississippi. And quite a few of them has been the same ones. Which makes me feel halfway decent that they appreciate what I do for them.

NARRATOR. The farmers spend more money on tractor repair and fertilizer than they do on migrant housing, yet resent what they call outside do-gooders.

FARMER. There are too many people trying to do too much for the Negro, not knowing the problems the farmers have to face with them.

Nobody helped me. And—so I have nothing against them personally. I mean, they're human beings also. But some of them are so destructive and people that don't have any idea of what they're like are the ones that are doing all the fighting for them.

They ought to come down here to this camp and see what goes on here week-ends. They'd never believe what's going on.

Because I know, we put screen doors up, and we put windows in. We go back a couple of days later, and they're taken right out again. You gotta go back and put them back, and they take them out.

They're very destructive.

INTERVIEWER. Well, how do these problems actually affect your production?

FARMER. Well, they don't exactly hinder our production. When we come into camp and start talking to some of these fellows, they get them so confused that they don't know whether the farmer is giving them the fast run-around, or whether the people who are talking to them are giving them a fast run-around, and they won't believe Mr. Anderson.

They think that he's trying to give them a fast shuffle also. They get awful confused.

NARRATOR. But the only thing that the migrants are confused about is the way they get paid.

At a plant nursery where they receive \$1.35 per hour, they learn that another crew from the same camp working at a nursery down the road is being paid \$1.75 per hour.

As the men go out to work on this day, they will discuss going to crew chief Anderson and demanding to know why they are being paid less. But of the ten men, eight will decide against a direct confrontation. The remaining two will then feel that since they do not have the strength of numbers, it is just not worth it.

And so on this day, as on every day throughout the long season, the complaints against Andrew Anderson will go unposed, and unanswered.

WORKER. You won't have no help to fight it because everybody is scared to fight against it. They're scared they can't get back home the summer.

WORKER. Puts on a very show, a good show

with people that ain't never been no where with him. But it's all different when they get where they're going.

The way I was reading, the way he do's a man, you have to stay in debt. If you work at it, he'd going to possibly get a third of it, of your hours, regardless of what happens. Because they're ain't nobody even if you're out of debt with him, look what he done already beat you for.

WORKER. I left Arkansas to do better. I didn't leave Arkansas to do worse up here.

WORKER. You'll never get out of debt with him. You're in debt with him when you start, and you're in debt with him when you leave.

NARRATOR. The second crew recruited by Andrew Anderson in September is on its final leg of the journey from Forest City, Arkansas, to Cutchogue Long Island. Steady work, good wages, enough money for Santa Claus have been the promises.

Along the way a hitch-hiker has been given a lift. He has been going nowhere in particular. Andrew Anderson decides to recruit him for the camp.

ANDERSON. Well, my purpose on this trip is to recruit some labor so just sit right in, you know.

HITCHHIKER. As I say, I was out looking for a job. If it suits me, I'll go right along with you.

ANDERSON. How long can you work up there?

HITCHHIKER. Oh, well, I'll work about as long as you want me to.

ANDERSON. The contract ends the first of December.

HITCHHIKER. The first of December.

ANDERSON. I'll just find a place.

HITCHHIKER. Yes sir.

ANDERSON. I'll be coming right along down this same route.

HITCHHIKER. Good. I'd like to go with you and work right along with you. What does farm work pay?

ANDERSON. A dollar thirty-five to a dollar and a half an hour.

HITCHHIKER. That's fine. It sounds alright to me. I think it sounds very good.

MAN. Well, for farm work. It's alright for farm work.

ANDERSON. You can get in nine and ten hours a day.

MAN. Good. Oh, that's better you know. When you get in more hours, you get more pay.

NARRATOR. The bus known as "special" arrives at the camp in the midst of rain that has plagued the Island all season long.

The earlier June to September crew is there to receive them.

For Mrs. Anderson, there will be new customers at meal time. And there are now six new workers for whom the farmers will pay a bounty of sixty cents a head each day to Andrew Anderson.

In September the early harvesting of potatoes begins. The steel fingers of field combines disinter the earth and send the variety known as Katahdins bouncing up the chute, where migrants discard the vines and other unwanted natural debris.

Potatoes have made Suffolk one of the 100 richest counties in the nation in farm income. Despite the rainy weather all season, first harvest seems endless.

From the fields, the potatoes are trucked by farmers to grading sheds. In this next phase of marketing it is the processor who takes over. His role is to have the potatoes washed, graded, and packed by migrants, then shipped to New York City supermarkets and to other clients, including fashionable hotels and restaurants.

The processor here is one of the largest in the county and a member of the Eastern Suffolk Co-op, Steve J. Deroski.

DEROSKI. Well, you save me 150 for Philly. Okay. How much is it going to cost me? You mean to tell me you're holding me up for a dime? Boy, you fellows are something else. All right, we give it at two twenty.

NARRATOR. Lunch for the migrants arrives three hours late. They have been working since seven this morning. Again, all meals are from the concession belonging to the crew chief and his wife.

DEROSKI. Good enough to eat, Jed? Do you realize how much food that is?

WORKER. The potatoes are pretty well done.

DEROSKI. I don't eat that much.

WORKER. You don't do nothing but walk around.

DEROSKI. What do you mean, I don't do nothing but walk around? You must be joking.

WORKER. Huh.

DEROSKI. While you're working with your hands, I'm working with my mind.

WORKER. Mm-hm.

DEROSKI. Huh? That's right. My wheels are turning upstairs while—while your wheels are turning up here.

WORKER. That's right.

DEROSKI. Right?

WORKER. Right.

DEROSKI. Well, you got plenty to eat there. I believe—I don't know, you're going to be just too fat. You got to go on a diet if you eat that much food.

WORKER. Fat?

DEROSKI. Sure. How can you eat that much? Huh? I just had a little sandwich and I'm satisfied. You mean to tell me you can eat all that?

NARRATOR. The pay rate in the sheds is supposedly a dollar and sixty cents an hour. But it is the crew leader who determines the men's time, and it is the crew leader who deducts 25 cents from their hourly pay.

As in most sheds, whenever the machinery stops because of mechanical breakdown or an interval in the processing, the pay stops.

But many shed workers are bona fide members of a union.

WORKER. He say he 'long to a union, but I mean, the way I see it, I don't 'long to no union, because if you 'long to a union, if you get sick and lay off—I mean if you're sick the union s'pose to see that you get a third of your pay, right? Un' 'pose to see that your hospital bill, everything's taken care of. But dis union do not do dat.

Way I see it, point of view of . . . (unintelligible), all this union does is take your money.

NARRATOR. In 1960, in a contract signed between the workers and the Eastern Suffolk Cooperative, there was a guarantee of at least 160 hours of work a month—40 hours a week.

But in 1967, in a contract negotiated between the Teamsters Union, Local 202, and the potato processor, the work week guarantee was cut to 26 hours.

Within the same contract there is contained a no strike clause and a no lockout clause.

And the guarantee of transportation without charge back to the workers' destination.

Another clause in the contract talks of the existence of a shop steward, as well as the agreement that the contract shall be posted in a conspicuous place.

In those potato sheds visited by NET Journal, the contracts were nowhere to be seen.

One processor feels the responsibility for payment of unions is not his but that of the labor contractor, the crew leader.

PROCESSOR. You have good contractors and bad contractors, the same as you've got good employers and bad employers I mean, it's—you can't just say it's a case that takes place with migrants; it takes place all phases of labor.

As far as the people being exploited, I don't believe they're being exploited by the potato industry themselves. They're being exploited by their own kind. Not by the farmer and the processor.

NARRATOR. Pay day at the camp. One migrant called it "dust for blood."

When the men work a 40- or 50-hour week, their average pay check is \$47. 25 cents on

each hour is then deducted by the crew leader. Workers cash their checks with crew leader Anderson, because they have no transportation to the town bank. Besides, pay day is on Friday or Saturday evenings, after banking hours.

Room and board are deducted according to the crew leader's bookkeeping. Andrew Anderson says, however, he doesn't combine room and board, as do many other crew chiefs.

MAN. He pays for what he uses, and this is justice. And each worker will feel satisfied in paying for what he get.

NARRATOR. Pay day and wine are classic partners in this camp, for all the wrong reasons. In town a pint of Twister sells for 51 cents. At the camp it's a dollar.

For the men it is quick therapy. But it also fogs the memory concerning what was charged up and what was not.

One of the men somehow received and cashed his own check, and bought his Twister in town. Crew leader Anderson is not happy.

ANDERSON. You owe \$13 in the kitchen for food, you owe \$5 for rent, and another. . .

WORKER. No, sir, you're wrong. Last year was . . . (unintelligible)

ANDERSON. Come over here, Rucker, don't play with me now.

WORKER. I ain't got it tonight. I'll pay it directly. I ain't got it tonight.

ANDERSON. What happened?

WORKER. No, sir, I ain't got it, now, no stuff.

ANDERSON. Why you don't have it?

WORKER. \$20 kitchen for food?

ANDERSON. No, no, I didn't say that. You owe a total of \$20.

WORKER. No, I paid last Thursday night, last Friday night.

ANDERSON. You pay it every week.

WORKER. Well—I owe thirty—\$20 right now?

ANDERSON. Yeah. You owe a dollar 98 cents for kerosene.

WORKER. Who, me? I ain't got it . . . (unintelligible)

ANDERSON. Come on, now, I'm not playing.

WORKER. I ain't paying. You can whip me, you can knock me down, drag me. . .

ANDERSON. I'm gonna kill you. I mean, if you don't pay your bill, you'd be better off dead.

WORKER. Killing? Yeah, kill me. I . . .

ANDERSON. You know I won't. Come on, Woodrow.

WORKER. I ain't never beat you out of a dime this season.

ANDERSON. Okay. I get your money tomorrow, but your foreman, he going to pay your bill tomorrow.

WORKER. He'll fight. He'll fight. . . (unintelligible)

ANDERSON. See, I don't 'preciate this at all. Now, you going to pay cash for what you get from now on, too.

WORKER. Check. I got—you can say that again, pay you . . . (unintelligible)

ANDERSON. Come bringing \$9 on a \$20 bill.

WORKER. Check.

ANDERSON. I really feel I was doing better than this.

WORKER. 'Preciate.

ANDERSON. I don't 'preciate that, Woodrow.

WORKER. Fight yourself.

ANDERSON. I mean, your work is all right, but you shouldn't drink up your earnings.

That's what you get, you see. Actually, all the farmers s'pose to bring their checks in here. Your farmer slipped up.

WORKER. Heh, you know what it is? I . . .

ANDERSON. I'm not going to ask you about it no more, 'cause he's going to pay me tomorrow, hisself.

WORKER. Yeah. Yessir.

ANDERSON. I—I was doing this—cause the only . . .

MAN. Man . . . (unintelligible) ship.

ANDERSON. Well, see, there you have people that really don't have sense enough to even spend their own money. Now, any time

you go by the wine store and spend your money before you come . . .

WORKER. I wasn't in it. I . . .

ANDERSON. . . . before you come back to pay your bill . . .

WORKER. . . . was . . .

ANDERSON. Shut up.

WORKER. I'm going.

ANDERSON. Come on back here. Now, you shouldn't have went by the wine store first. You should have paid your food bill and your rent first, where you got to sleep and eat. And then went drinking it up. This is the reason why you don't have—and you're not supposed to get your own check.

This is—this is one of the reasons. But he—he gonna pay the rest of your bill. Now you—you—I don't know, you maybe go on and throw away the rest of your money; you don't care with it.

(Laughter)

ANDERSON. Tell Allie to discontinue Woodrow's credit over there.

NARRATOR. The humiliation, the being without, is to the worker the natural air he breathes every day.

(Song follows.)

NARRATOR. Reverend Arthur Bryant, Migrant Chairman, Suffolk County Human Relations Commission.

Rev. BRYANT. A—a crew chief is big daddy to all of his workers, and he inspires fear and he knows how to spank his people if they don't behave the way he wants them to.

Andrew Anderson is one of the more sophisticated crew leaders. He's convinced that what he's doing is probably for the good of his men. I talked to him recently about how he's able to recruit men for the kind of work that he brings them up to.

He told me that he can go down to Forest City, Arkansas, and recruit all the men that he wants. I said, "why?" "Well," he says, "you know in Arkansas the minimum wage rate is a dollar an hour." He says, "but a lot of the people down there are already exploited to the point where they receive 40 cents an hour for their work."

And he said that this is not publicly known. He says, "but I know it, and when I tell them about a dollar 35 or a dollar 50 an hour here, they feel that they're coming to Eldorado."

First year he tried to be a little bit more lenient and seemed to have gotten into a lot of financial difficulty as a result of that. Last couple of years he seems to have wised up to the system, and he claims to be making a good dollar, the kind of dollar that would probably multiply my income by four.

INTERVIEWER. We're talking specifically, what are we talking—

Rev. BRYANT. We're talking about \$40,000 a year for his family.

NARRATOR. Worker Charlie White is interviewed by NET's Morton Silverstein.

INTERVIEWER. Charges, what kind of monies did Andrew Anderson take out of a man's earnings? What were the specific charges?

CHARLIE WHITE. Well, I tell you this, tell you what he drew. (Unclear) Well, out of your pay is \$5, all right. Then you gotta eat. For eat you draw from 18, 19 dollars a week. All these your sodas, and your drinks like that, they run you around about—about 40-some dollars a week. They run right around about 40-some dollars a week. Then you don't have nothing then, 'cause he's got it all. You work hard and he got it all. I say, you can work hard every day, but he—he makes the money.

Like to us, we make it all right, but we don't get it.

WORKER. If I could only get enough money, I would go home tonight. But I been here for going on five months, and haven't never got enough money to go home.

INTERVIEWER. How do you expect to get home?

WORKER. Really, I've asked myself that question a hundred times within one night. And really, I wouldn't know.

NARRATOR. As the season drew to a close, camp manager Andrew Anderson was asked:

INTERVIEWER. Are you satisfied that you can look any man in the eye that has worked for you this season, and be at perfect ease with your own conscience?

ANDERSON. Oh, yeah, I can. I can say that, and I believe that I have been just, and I have treated every man, right down the line, like I would be—desire to be treated. And I don't believe that there's a man in my crew who would be able to say that he have been mistreated or cheated out of something that was due him.

I mean—I'm very concerned—in the worker, I'm—concerned in the fellow man, my fellow man. I pulls for him.

NARRATOR. Living conditions for migrant workers are the responsibility of the Chief of Housing and Camp Sanitation, Suffolk County Department of Health, Sidney Beckwith.

SIDNEY BECKWITH. This particular camp is not one of our better ones. It does have an oppressive look to it, but it is livable in that when we issue the permit it meets the—the minimum code requirements. But I think as bad as it is, we've been told by visitors that have been touring the camps throughout the state that it is better than the average New York State farm labor camp.

There's been a history of inadequate maintenance, inadequate cleanliness, which is considered to be housekeeping; and I would certainly have to add that there's been, because of this, inadequate supervision.

I think these three items are the serious problems that we find in this camp.

From time to time the Department has recommended that this camp be torn down, and that they would start from scratch and build a modern camp. And as a matter of fact, in 1966 they applied for federal funds in the form of a federal grant. It didn't come through. And so they scrapped their plan.

NARRATOR. Mr. Beckwith was asked if he felt the farmers would be willing to spend their own money to rebuild the camp.

BECKWITH. Well, I would—in my opinion, I don't believe they're interested in doing it in that way.

NARRATOR. Mr. Beckwith admits codes are minimal, enforcement methods ineffectual; that farmers delay in correcting violations; and that going to court is futile.

BECKWITH. The camp is closed and it's a little more difficult to get convictions when you no longer have the violation.

NARRATOR. In late November the potato land was plowed out. The farmers moaned it was their worst season in years, that they got \$1.50 per hundredweight as opposed to a \$2.25 break-even price.

Suffolk County urged them to use seasonal labor. The farmers said there was none. The county said, "mechanize." The farmers said, "too expensive."

The board of directors at the Eastern Suffolk Co-op, composed of these farmers, was asked if it was satisfied that migrants were receiving decent living and working conditions.

BOARD MEMBER. I think for—for what we get from the worker, I think wages are prevailing. And our conditions meet the requirements of the local Department of Health. Occasionally we run into a violation or two, but that's—that's quickly corrected. Our problem is to get satisfactory workers.

BOARD MEMBER. There's never a word spoken about the farmer. Everything is for the help. I mean, why—why doesn't somebody come out and guarantee us a price for our produce.

BOARD MEMBER. That is right.

BOARD MEMBER. . . . year in and year out? But they don't.

BOARD MEMBER. That's right.

BOARD MEMBER. The strawberries are begging to be picked. So we get out there at 8:30, 7 in the morning. At 10 o'clock, 10:30, our laborer comes over to you, says, I got a backache, boss, I want you to take me back

to the camp. He cares less about my crop, about what he makes.

What am I, a fool to grow this thing? What am I, being crucified for it? Forget it. I will not grow it.

REV. BRYANT. These men are—are a sort of a product of their own environment. You have to go back maybe about 30, 35 years, and you find that the exploited farm laborer of that time was a Polish immigrant, who was brought over by members of his own family.

Before that, these people who were exploiting their family members were exploited by good yankee farmers.

There's an old Greek motto that says there's no worse taskmaster than a former slave.

BOARD MEMBER. I think Reverend Bryant is a very sick man.

BOARD MEMBER. I'll go along with Frank on that idea. He doesn't—he does not know the farmers' problems. He just going around taking stuff out of the—out of the wind and expressing himself in the papers. I mean, his facts, he has—to me, he has no facts.

REV. BRYANT. I know, for instance, the first year we had VISTA Volunteers, I received a call that the plumbing was all clogged up. And for a hundred men there are approximately—I think it's six—Johns available. The Johns were clogged up for four days. Nobody did anything about it.

So I went into the Health Department offices in Riverhead and sat on a fellow's desk until they sent a man out to fix it. The complaint at the camp by the farmers was that the men had broken the system down by stuffing these Johns with beer cans. What we found outside was that the toilet facilities were ruined because a pipe leading under the road was broken, and that the men had stuffed these cans and anything they could think into the—these things out of just pure frustration and anger.

BOARD MEMBER. The conditions which— which exist are done by the residents. And I think it is very unfair for us as board members to be nursemaids to those people, as they wish to live in filth, not wash, and go to the bathroom in their own living quarters, well, there's no way I can stop it if I'm home in my own clean, lily-white sheets, which I change weekly.

INTERVIEWER. If I may sum up, gentlemen, then I think what you're saying is it's not the migrant worker who is being exploited; it's the farmer. Is that correct?

BOARD MEMBERS. By all means.

Very much so.

By all means.

We're the fall guy.

Who cares about us any more?

Who cares?

That is right.

Who cares about us? We're the forgotten people.

REV. BRYANT. If we're going to say that the health of an industry is more important than the value of the human life, this sort of thing can catch on and eventually encompass all of us. We have to be concerned about him, because he is us.

NARRATOR. At the camp itself, one worker expresses hope. Another, outrage.

WORKER. And I just got to go, because I don't want to be drug down like this. Gotta go. Because it hurts you inside, when you get insulted, because half of the time you're being insulted, see, for no reason at all, and you—if you—if you got to insult a person, you should have something to insult him for, and thenfor—therefore you're never supposed to insult anyone. But that's the whole idea.

WORKER. But you know what I—what I really think? You know what I really think? I really think that one day the world will be great. I really believe the world gonna be great one day.

NARRATOR. The season which began in the vast darkness of night and soul is now ending

the same way. Tomorrow the men will break camp.

On the last day, this legacy, these odors, these noises, these silences. Three men pack to go home. They have worked for almost six months on the fields of Eden, and are irrevocably mired in debt.

Others who leave with money leave with five or ten dollars. The bus trip back to Arkansas will now cost \$15, which they will try to work off when Andrew Anderson takes them on to Florida, to the citrus crop.

Eight years ago, in a memorable CBS documentary, "Harvest of Shame," the late Edward R. Murrow urged wage, health, and housing reforms for migrant workers. Eight years later, the migrant condition is still the shame of the nation.

The migrant field worker's minimum wage of a dollar and 15 cents an hour, when he can find work, is far below the national standard. The availability of medical services to him is often lacking. His death rate by tuberculosis alone is more than double that of most other American workers.

His living conditions too often do not respect his sanctity as a man. For the most part he does not have effective union protection.

The shame of the migrant condition must be shared by all of us. For as Reverend Bryant has said, the migrant is us.

Today the season vanishes like the migratory bird. What harvest for the reaper?

Hard Lesson From Communism

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the surprise attacks on oriental New Year throughout South Vietnam when the Vietcong Communies surfaced a band of suicidal terrorists carries with it a hard lesson for us Americans and all of the free world.

If the Communists—through deceit and false information—are able to infiltrate deep into the heartland of a country at war, imagine what they can achieve in a sleeping country where the people are apathetic to the threat.

What the Reds have done in South Vietnam, they most certainly can accomplish right here in the United States.

They have been constantly on the move behind emotional peace moves and tear-jerking fronts, moving in hordes of Soviet Russian and Red Chinese agents, spies, sympathizers, and dupes—far too many planted and unidentified to the American people in strategic locations around the United States.

When and if these Communist fronts come to the surface, I fear we can expect far more damage and loss of life than the Vietcong delivered in Saigon and elsewhere last week.

Think what would have happened to the South Vietnamese had they have had an antigun law. Can this be why some push so hard for antigun laws in the United States?

The objective of the Communist international conspiracy—the Bolshevik apparatus—has been and remains the overthrow of the United States, including peace by death to those who resist and slavery to those who submit and appease. And the Red China/Soviet rift is, at most, a propaganda smokescreen to

conceal from the unwary the announced final objective of both.

The bloody murder of civilians, missionaries, and our fighting men in South Vietnam should teach our people to turn a questioning ear to the promises and look instead to their actions—their threats, their overall objectives.

We must suffer under the lesson—bought at a bloody price—that our leaders and patriotic citizens must hunt down and expose all “American Vietcong” wherever they may be. Action must be taken to shore up the breaches in our national security caused by the unconscionable decisions handed down by a hostile Supreme Court and we must be militarily ready against every aggressive action by every Communist front.

Mr. Speaker, I place a recent editorial from the New York Daily News of similar purpose at this point:

SYMBOLISM IN SAIGON

Climaxing their lunar New Year (Tet) surprise attacks throughout South Vietnam, the Viet Cong Reds surfaced a flock of terrorists Tuesday in Saigon itself, capital city of South Vietnam.

These fanatics got into the U.S. Embassy compound, put up a bloody six-hour fight, and at last were wiped out by our paratroopers and other forces.

The performance was symbolic.

By that, we mean that a lot—a growing lot—of Soviet Russian and Red Chinese spies, sympathizers, dupes, et al., planted in strategic spots around the United States, hope to surface some day in this country and do far more damage than the Viet Cong did in Saigon Tuesday.

Their objective is to take over the American people and make slaves of those who submit and kill those who resist. This, in cooperation with attacking forces from Russia or Red China or both—more likely both, we would guess, despite the dear-sirs-you-curs compliments currently flying back and forth between Peking and Moscow.

Forewarned is forearmed—meaning this Saigon melodrama should inspire all patriotic Americans and their government to hunt down for prosecution domestic Reds wherever they may be, and to maintain armed preparedness against all Red nations.

As for British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's current claim that very little lies between war and U.S.-Red North Vietnam peace talks—well, Harold never was much of a prophet, and this Saigon eruption has made him look sillier as a prophet than ever.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in 1776, a 30-year-old Polish engineer and soldier arrived in America and began a 6-year tour of duty with the Continental Army that was to win him the praise of Thomas Jefferson and the sobriquet “the purest spirit of liberty” from the great President. Thaddeus Kosciuszko served two nations, the United States of America and Poland, but he had only one master, and that was freedom. In his 71 years, he never let flag his burning devotion for freedom or his commitment to the securing of liberty for Poland. It is fitting that his birthday, February 12, has become a national holiday for the Polish people

who still wear the bonds of oppression and that the spirit of Kosciuszko has become a symbol of independence.

Among the many contributions of this great statesman were the suggestion that a military academy be founded at West Point in New York, a site he defended in the Revolutionary War. His will, left in the care of Thomas Jefferson, directed that his estate be used for the freeing of slaves. He was at once a military strategist and a humanitarian.

Kosciuszko returned to Poland in 1784 and led the reform movement that was sweeping his native land in those trying years. In 1794, he led the peasant troops against the superior Russian Army while wearing a homespun coat that told the Poles, the Russians, and the world that he was a general of the people and not just another seeker of power. A few years later, he refused a title from Napoleon because he could see that the French leader wanted to create an empire and not a free Poland. Kosciuszko died in Switzerland in 1817, never having realized his dream of a free Poland but firm in the knowledge that his service in America had contributed to the liberty that we all enjoy today.

It is an honor to salute a great soldier and a great statesman on this anniversary of his birth and to remember the debt owed to Thaddeus Kosciuszko by a grateful United States.

National Gypsum Co. Aids Cape Kennedy

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the great English statesman, Winston Churchill, once observed that one of the major reasons democracy had so long endured in England was that no matter how great the internal difficulties were, when Britain was faced with a threat from without, they forgot their differences and united to meet the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, on February 5, an excellent example of this ability to unite occurred and passed almost unnoticed.

On that day, the National Gypsum Co. sent a 118-foot collapsible aerial tower to Cape Kennedy. It appears that the only other tower of its kind had been in use at Cape Kennedy where it was employed to service missiles. Early in January, that tower broke down and faced the entire missile complex with serious delays if a replacement were not found.

Cape Kennedy was soon on the phone to the tower manufacturer who informed them that the only similar piece belonged to National Gypsum's Kimballton, Va., lime plant.

Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of it, I know that the gypsum industry is one of our Nation's most competitive. Any slight delay or any slight cost increase in any phase of production can cost a company thousands of dollars in orders. But in spite of this, National Gypsum felt that the public interest was better served by taking this aerial tower out of

its mine and sending it to Cape Kennedy to forestall a slowdown in the space program.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action is excellent testimony to Mr. Churchill's remarks; and I highly commend National Gypsum for this generous and patriotic gesture. The fact that I am a former National Gypsum employee should in no way detract from the commendation the Buffalo company so richly deserves.

Scandinavia: Socialist Setbacks

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dallas, Tex., Times Herald of January 29, 1968:

SCANDINAVIA: SOCIALIST SETBACKS

(By Frank Langston)

The Socialists have suffered their third setback in Scandinavia.

This could mark a political trend.

And it could mean that more people now are looking at the price tag as well as the benefits from socialism.

The Scandinavian countries, of course, were the first in the West to adopt socialism and the principles of the welfare state. Now they appear to be having some second thoughts on the subject.

In Denmark last week voters defeated the Social Democratic party, which had been in power for the past 15 years.

Norway had ousted its socialist government in 1965 after 30 years of rule.

Socialist Democrat Premier Tage Erlander remains in power in Sweden. But his party suffered its worst setback in 30 years in municipal elections last year.

CLOSER LOOK

All this does not necessarily mean that the Scandinavian countries are going to throw out socialism entirely in the immediate future. But it does mean that they are taking a closer look at the things that go with socialism.

In itself, the welfare state was not an issue in any of the three Scandinavian elections.

And, as a matter of fact, the welfare state concept is not limited to socialist countries, as can be seen from the growing list of social benefits promoted by both the executive and the legislative branches of the U.S. government.

In this country, as elsewhere, the effort to expand cradle-to-the-grave protection to the people apparently can be expected to continue.

COST TOO HIGH

In Norway, Sweden and Denmark the voter rebellion was not against the welfare state itself but against the high cost of paying for it.

In Denmark, the voters were protesting steadily rising taxes and the cost of services. Prices have increased more than 40 per cent in the past seven years and unemployment is on the rise.

In Norway, labor leadership lost its influence amid growing white-collar middle class which voted for right and center parties. These parties promised no reduction in the welfare state but did promise a reduction in taxes, a broadening of opportunities, more housing and better education.

EASY TO PROMISE

This, of course, is painless socialism—welfare state without paying for it. It is easier to promise than to achieve.

Some 30 per cent of Sweden's total government expenditure goes into social welfare, including old age pensions and children's allowances. This now is approaching \$2 billion a year.

The Swedish people until last year had shown themselves willing to accept heavy taxation as the cost of security. But in late 1966, as in Norway a year earlier, the voters rebelled against high prices, high taxes, inflation and a severe shortage of housing.

Foreign policies have been major issues in many countries in recent years. But in all three Scandinavian elections they were of only minor importance.

Both Denmark and Norway are members of NATO. Sweden, a neutral, is not.

CRASH OF BOMBER

In Denmark, moreover, political observers saw little indication that voters were greatly influenced by the crash of a U.S. nuclear bomber off Danish-owned Greenland.

This inevitably brings the discussion back to the real cause of the political turn. The Scandinavian countries, which have been Socialist for years, apparently want to continue under the welfare state concept.

But the question now is: Are they willing to pay the price.

The costs go right along with security.

The Scandinavians apparently want to eat their cake and have it, too. But, faced with the fact that they can't do both, they apparently are weighing the benefits of socialism against the cost.

The Work of the General Accounting Office

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make note of the recent annual report of the General Accounting Office which serves the Congress of the United States in investigative matters. The work of this important Office, which carried out 2,203 audits and reviews in the United States and overseas during the fiscal year 1967, is to be highly commended. The efficiency and responsibility of the members of the staff and the Director of the General Accounting Office, the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, is remarkable.

Nearly 1,000 reports were issued by GAO to the Congress, to our committees, officers, and Members and 600 to various Federal departments and agencies. Under the mandate of Congress to assist the House and the Senate, its committees and Members in carrying out their responsibilities, it has become evident in my own work and that relating to my city of Cleveland that GAO works with fairness and consistently high standards to assure that the information we receive is trustworthy and of current interest. We can account in this year alone to over \$190 million in savings directly attributable to the work of the staff and director of GAO.

I wish again to commend highly Mr. Staats and his highly competent staff for all of their assistance in the past year to my office and to Congress generally.

Violence in American Society—A Problem of Critical Concern

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, 130 years ago, Abraham Lincoln spoke of "the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country" and warned that "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

These were the words of the young lawyer, later to become one of the most respected and honored Presidents of these United States, and are found in the prefacing written remarks of another great American, J. Edgar Hoover, writing on "Violence in American Society—A Problem of Critical Concern" for the *George Washington Law Review*.

J. Edgar Hoover, now in his 44th year as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one of the most knowledgeable authorities in the fields of law enforcement and subversive activities, builds upon these simple words with a forceful commentary on the fate that lies in store lest we develop men and women who have "a reverence for the Constitution and laws." With the profoundness and insight of one who has had long years of experience, Mr. Hoover develops the psychology of lawlessness and the menace of violence "inextricably interwoven in the fabric of America's 20th century life." The role of government is well stated in his own words:

Government must be a means for men to control themselves, taking into account their personal weaknesses, passions, violence and conflicting aims, yet providing the machinery whereby their common interests can be promoted both as individuals and as a group.

Mr. Speaker, the concluding statements of Mr. Hoover represent both a challenge and an appeal:

Our approach must be positive. Remedial steps must be taken to eliminate the causes of riots, to cut down on crime, to make less attractive the appeals of ideological groups. Ultimately, the answer must be the development of a sensitive citizen, obedient to the law, but also conscious of the needs of his fellow man.

He alludes again to the wisdom of Lincoln's words in baring the issue at stake, which is nothing less than "the perpetuation of our political institutions."

Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than ever before we share the grave responsibility to focus our attention and energies on the crisis of violence in our society and to take positive and responsible action. I urge you most earnestly to study the full text of Mr. Hoover's commentary which follows:

VIOLENCE IN AMERICAN SOCIETY—A PROBLEM OF CRITICAL CONCERN

(By J. Edgar Hoover*)

On January 27, 1838, Abraham Lincoln, then a young lawyer, made a highly significant speech before the Young Men's Lyceum in Springfield, Illinois on "the perpetuation of our political institutions."¹ In this speech, America's future President spoke about cer-

tain things of "ill-omen amongst us." "I mean," he said, "the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions, in lieu of the sober judgment of Courts; and the worse than savage mobs, for the executive ministers of justice."²

Lincoln was appalled by accounts of violence from many areas of the country. "Accounts of outrages committed by mobs, form the everyday news of the times. They have pervaded the country, from New England to Louisiana . . ." Such mob action, he told the audience, injured the country. "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."⁴ "Thus, then, by the operation of this mobocratic spirit, which all must admit, is now abroad in the land, the strongest bulwark of any Government, and particularly of those constituted like ours, may effectually be broken down and destroyed—I mean the *attachment of the People*."⁵

The antidote to this "mobocratic spirit," and basic to the nation's welfare, was "a strict observance of all the laws."

Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country; and never to tolerate their violation by others. . . . Let reverence for the laws, be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe, that prattles on her lap—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges;—let it be written in Primers, spelling books, and in Almanacs;—let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the *political religion* of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.⁶

Some of the violence and lawlessness of the 1830's, Lincoln recognized, stemmed from individuals who disliked and hence disobeyed "bad laws," for he points out:

When I so pressingly urge a strict observance of all the laws, let me not be understood as saying there are no bad laws, nor that grievances may not arise, for the redress of which, no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing. But I do mean to say, that, although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed.⁷

In his closing remarks, Lincoln considered the potential impact of lawlessness on the survival of our political institutions and the need for individual responsibility to insure their perpetuation. The men of the Revolution, who fought and died to create this new nation scarcely five decades before, he said, were passing away through "the silent artillery of time."

They are gone. They were a forest of giant oaks; but the all-resistless hurricane has swept over them, and left only, here and there, a lonely trunk, despoiled of its verdure, shorn of its foliage; unshading and unshaded, to murmur in a few more gentle breezes, and to combat with its mutilated limbs, a few more ruder storms, then to sink, and be no more.

They were the pillars of the temple of liberty . . . now, that they have crumbled away, that temple must fall, unless we, their descendants, supply their places with other pillars, hewn from the solid quarry of sober reason.⁸

This means, among other things, Lincoln said, developing men and women who have "a reverence for the constitution and laws."⁹

Seldom has a great statesman of the past spoken so directly, candidly and poignantly to the America of today—a nation whose

Footnotes at end of article.

political institutions are currently under the assault of violence, lawlessness and the "mobocratic spirit." As Lincoln said 130 years ago, "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide."¹⁰

VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Recent happenings, such as the riots of last summer (and in previous years), the increasing crime rate, and the existence of organizations which espouse hatred and contempt, reflect that violence is a dangerous reality in our society today. Every indicator available to the FBI, from its investigative responsibilities in both the criminal and the security fields, emphasizes that violence is a rapidly growing malady in our national life.

There are some who claim that America at heart is a land of violence. They cite past wars, the Western frontier of the 19th century, the assassination of Presidents, the anarchist bombings of a generation ago. Violence, they assert, is part and parcel of the American character. Admittedly, American history is replete with tragic instances of violence. All too often violence has prevailed over reason in the settlement of problems. Mobs, riots, even a terrible Civil War brought death, injury and bitter rancor. No intelligent observer will deny the role violence has played in our national history or, for that matter, in the history of mankind. Yet, in America we have prided ourselves for developing what Theodore Roosevelt called "an experiment . . . of administering the affairs of a continent under the forms of a Democratic republic."¹¹ Our Constitution, laws and legal system are designed to provide an effective means by which men of varying interests, backgrounds and desires can live in peace and harmony. Over the years, America's constitutional system has been one of its most noble accomplishments. Wisely, the Founding Fathers understood the true inner nature of man; they realized that a system of government based on law subject to change by the consent of the governed was man's best protection against himself.

It may be a reflection on human nature that such devices (as checks and balances) should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflection on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. . . . In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. . . .¹²

Government must be a means for men to control themselves, taking into account their personal weaknesses, passions, violence and conflicting aims, yet providing the machinery whereby their common interests can be promoted both as individuals and as a group. Therefore, a public acceptance and respect for law has grown in America since 1789. This is reflected in thousands of ways, large and small: citizens obey traffic regulations, pay their taxes, respect their neighbor's property. There will be exceptions, but they are dealt with through our judicial system. The important point is that the overwhelming majority of Americans respect, obey, and uphold the law. If they did not, our government would disintegrate. People realize that only by this method can their personal security and the safety of the community be assured.

Violence can destroy the harmonious functioning of government. Any individual or group which resorts to violence can negate the validity of our system of government. Here is the death knell for peace and security for all members of the community.

The violence erupting in America today should cause each of us, particularly members of the legal profession, to ask many questions. Is America a nation of perma-

nently increasing violence? Is violence such an integral part of its culture that it is destined in one way or another to alter future political institutions? What can be done about violence?

Violence is a growing menace in terms of human lives lost, property destroyed and personal anguish and injury incurred. More important, however, it inculcates a psychology of lawlessness—a concept that law and order are not ultimately to be trusted, that only by handling the matter outside the law can a favorable decision be obtained. This view promotes fear, hostility and hatred, often erupting into a blind, nihilistic, sadistic violence whose only purpose is to destroy for the sake of destruction.

This psychology of lawlessness is reflected in myriad ways in our society. For example, there are crimes of violence (murders, crazed gunmen spraying inhabited areas with bullets, physical assaults). Gang fights, underworld crime, and forcible rapes form part of the picture of violence—often abetted by lax procedures of judicial leniency such as parole and probation. Recent urban riots show violence on a massive scale. In the nation today there are many incendiary ingredients which made—or can make—for violence.

But violence in our society cannot be measured alone by overt eruptions such as crime and riots. There are a number of organizations, some ideological in nature, whose main tenets are ultimate appeals to force and violence. Some of these groups would like to see guerrilla-style warfare in the United States. They preach a doctrine of violence. In addition, there are various hate groups whose aims are promoted not by appeal to constitutional methods but to the base passions of man. In summary, in our society today there are many seeds of violence, often lying deep and ill detected. As in a witch's cauldron, these ingredients can foment a poisonous brew for the nation; they must be identified, and their potential as well as actual danger appreciated.

Crimes of violence

A major ingredient of violence in America today stems from the field of crime. According to the Uniform Crime Reports of the FBI,¹³ crime in the United States increased 11 per cent in 1966 over the previous year. Crime is increasing roughly seven times more rapidly than population. During 1966, almost 3¼ million serious crimes were reported. This meant, therefore, that six serious crimes were committed in 1966 every minute, day and night, every day of the year.¹⁴

A large proportion of these crimes are of violence. Actually, the Uniform Crime Reporting program employs seven crime classifications to establish an index to measure the trend and distribution of crime in the United States. These crimes are: murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assaults, burglary, larceny \$50 and over in value, and auto theft. They were selected for use in the Crime Index because they represent the most common law enforcement problem; all are serious crimes, either by their nature or in their volume.

Four of the seven major crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—can be categorized as crimes of violence. Of the total number of crimes in the Crime Index in 1966, 87 per cent are crimes against property, that is, burglarly, larceny \$50 and over in value, and auto theft. This means that violent crimes as a group represent 13 per cent of the total. Thirteen percent of 3¼ million serious crimes, however, represent a total of over 420,000 murders, forcible rapes, robberies and aggravated assaults in 1966—a serious epidemic of continuing violence in our society. Not only is the total volume alarming, but also the trend. During the period 1960 to 1966, crimes of violence rose 49 per cent.¹⁵ This trend continues. For the

first nine months of 1967, for example, as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year, the following increases were recorded: murder, 16 percent; robbery, 27 per cent; forcible rape, 7 per cent; aggravated assault, 9 per cent.¹⁶

For most citizens, crime is synonymous with violence. To have a house burglarized or merchandise stolen from an automobile is a serious violation, but it normally does not place life in jeopardy. The rapist, the mugger, or the street hoodlum, however, bring fear into the hearts of citizens, making them afraid to venture forth on the streets at night or even during the day. Individuals not only lose their lives from crimes of violence, but personal anguish is experienced by the victim, his family, friends and acquaintances. Never can we accurately determine the damage done to both society and individual human lives by the loss of an eye, the paralysis of the body or injuries suffered by multiple stabbings. Countless Americans, without question, have moved their residences, changed the patterns of their lives and taken other preventive steps to avoid becoming victims.

Violence, moreover, is an ingredient of life which often leaves indelible marks even though the intended victim escapes. What psychological effects are left on a child or young person who endures a harrowing experience with a hardened criminal? What tensions are generated in an individual, adult or juvenile, who narrowly escapes being a victim of violent crime? The fear of footsteps following you on a dark street is a nightmare remembered for many years. Nothing erodes the human personality more quickly than fear of physical assault, especially an assault which strikes from unexpected places without reason or purpose.

Careers in crime

The growing role of criminal violence is also reflected in the FBI's Careers in Crime study. In January, 1963, we initiated a study of criminal careers made possible by the cooperative exchange of criminal fingerprint data among local, state and Federal law enforcement agencies. Fingerprint cards were used to obtain each offender's criminal history. Individuals were initially selected because they had become involved in the Federal process by arrest or release, were serious state violators arrested as fugitives under the Fugitive Felon Act, or were District of Columbia violators. Specifically excluded from this study and resulting tabulations were the fingerprints of chronic violators of the immigration laws and fingerprints submitted by the military. At the end of 1966, a total of 160,310 criminal histories of individual offenders had been incorporated into the program.

This study has reflected many pertinent trends in current criminal behavior. For example, this data documents the existence of the persistent or hard-core offender; the study disclosed that 55 per cent of offenders released to the street in 1963 were rearrested within two and one-half years. Obviously, rehabilitation methods have not been very successful with this type of criminal behavior. Of key interest, however, is that the study showed a tendency toward the commission of more violent crimes by repeaters. For those persons released in 1963 and then rearrested, a large proportion of their criminal repeating was in the property crimes of burglary, larceny and auto theft; however, 19 per cent of the rearrests for the property crime offenders were for the more serious crimes of violence. Primarily the result of this escalation, violent crime offenses on rearrest were more than double those in 1963. This trend in the Careers in Crime study is a harbinger of deep trouble; if it continues, violence in crime will be a growing problem.

Footnotes at end of article.

Violence directed against law enforcement officers

Law enforcement officers in particular feel the violence of the criminal. In 1966, a total of 57 officers were killed while performing their official duties. For the seven year period beginning with 1960, a total of 335 officers have met tragic deaths because of criminal action. Over a third of the 1966 deaths, 37 per cent, occurred while officers were effecting arrests and handling prisoners. Nearly a quarter of the deaths (23 per cent) occurred when the officers answered disturbance-type calls, such as family disputes or a man brandishing a weapon. Another 18 per cent were killings by persons whom the officers had stopped for questioning or investigation. Murders by robbers either caught in the act or fleeing the scene accounted for 16 per cent of the total.¹⁷

Criminal violence can strike the officer at any time. In 1966, 35 of the officers who lost their lives were on car patrol. During the seven year period 1960-1966, more officers were murdered on Friday than any other day of the week. As for the hours of greatest personal risk, they were 10 p.m. to 3 a.m.—with 130 murders occurring during this 300 minute period.

Of the 442 persons involved as offenders in the 335 police murders since 1960, 76 per cent had been arrested on some criminal charge before becoming involved in the police killing. Over one-half of those with prior criminal arrests had been previously taken into custody for an assault-type crime such as murder, rape, robbery, assault with a deadly weapon and assault with intent to kill. During the 1960-1966 period, a total of 11 police murderers had been charged with the offense of murder on some prior occasion. Revealingly, three of every 10 of the murderers were on parole or probation when they murdered a police officer.

Death is the only part of the story of violence directed against the police officer. A news item tells another facet:

"You cops won't make it out of here alive!" More than 35 persons mauled the four officers, shouting, "kill them . . . punch them . . . grab their guns!" It took 15 more policemen to break up the taproom brawl. . . .¹⁸

In recent years, as is well known, the number of physical assaults against officers has been on the increase. In 1966, there was a nationwide increase of 13 per cent in the rate of assaults on law enforcement officers. Nationally, statistics reflect 12.2 assaults per 100 officers in 1966, up from 10.8 in 1965. This increase was recorded in every geographical area of the nation. In 38 of every 100 assaults in 1966 physical harm resulted to the officer victim.

A recent study in the FBI's Law Enforcement Bulletin¹⁹ on the rising number of physical assaults on officers comments:

Any individual who attacks a law enforcement officer has to be characterized as vicious, whether or not the attack results in the officer's death. Any attack on an officer is an absolute disregard of and disrespect for constituted authority and reflects positive action taken by the attacker against such authority.²⁰

The streak of disrespect for law is also manifested by what might be called verbal violence. More and more officers are being subjected to bitter verbal abuse, scorn and ridicule by citizens. They are called vile names, accused (in most cases unjustly) of "brutality," and vilified in the press. Law enforcement does not consider itself above criticism nor does it attempt to operate beyond the domain of public opinion. But to abuse an officer verbally with catcalls, slanderous names and obscenity is to give vent to attitudes which can only undermine respect for law and order. Increasingly, citizens are refusing to aid officers or to provide vital information on their possession necessary to solve a criminal case. Citizen contempt, fear of personal involvement and lack

of interest in police problems are unwitting allies of violence in our society.

Firearms in crime

Firearms play a preponderant role in criminal violence. For example, 60 per cent of the murders in 1966 resulted from firearms. Roughly one out of every five aggravated assaults that year (19 per cent) involved firearms. During the three year period, 1964-1966, assaults with firearms jumped an alarming 36 per cent. In the robbery category, armed perpetrators were responsible for committing 58 per cent of the 1966 offenses. The dreary story goes on *ad nauseam*.

In cases involving the murder of police officers, firearms continue to be the major instrument of death. In 1966, 55 of the 57 law enforcement officers killed while performing their duties died from wounds inflicted by firearms. Since 1960, firearms have been used as the murder weapons in 9 per cent of the police killings.

Actually, the time has come when the nation must understand that the ready availability of firearms, of all types, has greatly enlarged the area of violence in our society. In 1966 alone, more citizens were killed or assaulted with guns in American streets and homes than were killed in battle during the entire Korean conflict. We know too well the tragic story of snipers during urban riots, of crazed gunmen (with complete arsenals of weapons) shooting innocent people, of individuals angered in an argument running home for a gun. In a Northern area a city official described a arms cache seized by police:

"The seized weapons included 45 rifles, seven shotguns, 14 hand guns, 18 sticks of dynamite, two cans holding 50 rounds of black powder, one anti-tank gun, one sub-machine gun, a gun hidden in a cane, three hand grenades, 103 high power blasting caps, one plastic bomb, 12 hunting knives, one machete and 250,000 rounds of live ammunition for . . . guns."²¹

A newspaper commented about last summer's urban riots: "Almost every urban riot this summer has witnessed snipers perched in windows and on rooftops sending a fusillade upon police, firemen and others—with weapons that could be purchased in any sporting goods store merely by putting down the necessary cash."²²

Better control of firearms is not only desirable, but necessary for the public's safety. In my opinion, mail-order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled and local registration of weapons required and enforced. The chief responsibility is local, but Federal assistance must strongly complement state gun legislation.

Organized crime

In the area of organized crime, violence is the hallmark of daily life. The major syndicate of organized crime, known as La Cosa Nostra, is the modern outgrowth of the prohibition days, when gang wars, murders and torture were common occurrences in many sections of the country. It is a criminal fraternity which has committed virtually every known type of crime. Broken down into groups, geographically or by population areas, each group is referred to as a "family." Each "family" is headed by a "boss," whose authority is virtually unlimited. A ruthless discipline is enforced by violence and terror. The "boss" needs merely to indicate that a Cosa Nostra member, or another individual, is "unwanted" and his death is a *fait accompli*.

The ordinary citizen probably does not appreciate the extent and parasitic nature of La Cosa Nostra's influence on our national life. This group of criminals (employing today high-priced legal talent and endeavoring to operate under legitimate fronts) utilizes violence in enforcing control over corrupt labor unions, in collecting on gambling debts, in fighting competition in such fields

as the jukebox industry, in coercing legitimate business to pay tribute, or in blackmailing through usurious loans. Millions of dollars illegally make their way into the pockets of La Cosa Nostra.

Some citizens may say: "A bunch of gangsters. Let them kill themselves off. It's no worry of mine." This viewpoint is categorically wrong. La Cosa Nostra, aside from the financial drain it extorts from the public, injects violence, in many forms, into our body politic. It is virtually a state within a state, with its own laws and discipline, bitterly contemptuous of our concepts of law and order. By the very nature of La Cosa Nostra operations, murders are perpetrated in ways which make the investigative tasks of law enforcement officials most difficult. For example, bodies of murdered individuals have been secretly buried in rural hideouts owned by gang members or weighted down in barrels dropped at sea.

Organized crime pollutes our society. Time after time, using violence or threats of violence (often threats are enough to achieve the syndicate's aims since the intended victim knows the threat will be carried out), La Cosa Nostra has attempted to impede, subvert or nullify the machinery of legitimate government, especially its judicial processes.

Any syndicate member believed to have furnished information to law enforcement officials places himself in physical jeopardy. If a labor leader, businessman, newspaper reporter or other citizen becomes a possible witness in court against the syndicate, he may find himself the object of physical harassment or hoodlum assault. The syndicate will not hesitate to intimidate jurors, use bribery or other types of pressure if they will achieve the desired purposes. Violence begets violence; violence pollutes the society in which it exists. La Cosa Nostra is living proof of this present—and growing—danger.

Riots

Riots, or other types of civil disturbances, suddenly bring violence to the eruption point. People are killed or injured, property destroyed, law and order subverted. Law enforcement responsibility relative to riots is basically local in nature. The FBI's responsibility is to develop and disseminate intelligence information while remaining alert to any violations of Federal law within its investigative jurisdiction. The FBI does not have jurisdiction for either protecting property or persons, or for policing riotous situations.

Riots can be of many types. In recent years, we have seen a variety of riots involving young people, especially at beach resorts. These student riots bring about vandalism, physical violence and mass hysteria.²³ Such actions are justified by some people as "pranks" or "good time fun." Nothing, however, could be more wrong. When mobs, student or otherwise, wantonly destroy property, disobey police regulations and injure people, firm steps must be taken. So-called thrill violence is an earmark of individual and communal disorder.

On occasions violence stems from labor disputes, sports events, demonstrations, picket lines or wherever passions run high on controversial topics. Often a minor incident—an arrest by an officer, a demagogic speech, a fight between two individuals—will ignite a conflagration. Over the years we have had instances of sabotage of many types. Sabotage, especially if committed by trained, fanatical individuals or groups, can be deleterious.

The recent urban riots, as in Newark and Detroit, illustrate the intensity which violence can attain—and the damage which can be wreaked in a few short hours in an urban, highly populated neighborhood. Virtual guerrilla warfare quickly erupts with snipers playing a primary role. Law enforcement officers, unfortunately, find themselves the

special target of violence. Law and order break down completely.

What do these civil disturbances show? Relative to violence, they tell us that the passions of men flare quickly. No community in our society can feel immune from a sudden, irrational breakdown of law and order. Violence is never completely predictable. Moreover, it often betrays the "beast" in man. "Good people," those who are good citizens, may suddenly be caught up by the passions of the moment, and become involved in violence or counterviolence. Undoubtedly, many students who participate in beach riots, after returning to their schools, feel chagrined over their disgraceful personal behavior. Some adults in urban or other types of riots may feel the same way, but this does not condone their actions. Moreover, riotous situations attract the criminal element. Violence erupts—and almost immediately looting, burglaries and robberies occur. A high percentage of individuals arrested in the recent urban riots had prior criminal records.

Ideological violence

The twentieth century has popularized the term "ideological." In America today we have a number of groups, ideological in type, which are based on principles advocating force and violence. They strive in every possible way to disrupt law and order, to inculcate hatred and bigotry and to subvert the institutions of free society. These organizations are of foreign origin and inspiration, small in number, but highly organized; their ultimate loyalties are to foreign nations and anti-democratic philosophies.

Ideological violence has left deep stains of blood and hatred in the world since World War I. The ideologies associated with Hitler, Mussolini and lesser despots linger, while those associated with Lenin and Stalin have continuing vitality. Ideological violence is particularly cruel, bestial and fanatical (as the concentration camps of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia testify), since reason is dethroned, myth supplants the truth, and law becomes what the ruling clique says it is. The individual exists only for the benefit of the state. Often, as in Nazism, an individual's blood, race or nationality is the determinative factor for personal survival.

History of Ideological Groups in America.—Although America has been spared the ravages of influential ideological parties, the end of World War I saw the planting of ideologies from abroad in our country. In 1919, the Communist Party, USA,²⁴ which, loyal to the doctrines of Marx, Engels and Lenin, regarded force as the ultimate determiner of the future, was formed. In the absence of strength sufficient to generate such force, its tactics called for encouraging discontent and hatred, and utilizing unrest, caused, for example, by civil disturbances, to hasten the accomplishment of its own purposes.

Soon Communist splinter groups appeared, reflecting the ideological divergences developing in the international movement. The Socialist Workers Party²⁵ based its ideology on the communist revolutionary teachings of Leon Trotsky, and attempted to subvert United States domestic and foreign policies either through its own activities or through the agitation and propaganda work of its Young Socialist Alliance. These groups were followed by pro-Axis groups associated with Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists.

Since 1945, such ideologically oriented groups have continued to pose security problems for the nation through direct activity, through fear generated by their potential for violence, and through the possibility of their infiltration of riots or demonstrations. Moreover, the Communist Party has attempted to enlist the support of students and younger working people through youth fronts such as the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of

America.²⁶ Recently, the Progressive Labor Party, the aggressive spokesman for the Mao Tse-tung government, has attempted to arouse a revolutionary consciousness in the United States and has participated in a number of demonstrations, picket lines and marches.²⁷

Impact of Ideological Groups.—In this country ideological violence has not meant overt displays of force. We have had no attempted coup d'etats, putsches or storm troopers (though the pre-World War II American Nazis attempted military formations). Ideological groups which operate from definitive revolutionary blueprints realize they are a numerical minority; hence, they hesitate, for tactical reasons, to be implicated in any acts of violence, especially if they might trigger investigations by law enforcement authorities and generate hostile public opinion. This tactic of restraint does not arise from any basic disbelief in violence by the group. The Communist Party's ideology, for example, is anchored on the premise of violence ("Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one," said Karl Marx).²⁸ Its leaders, however, being realistic interpreters of our society, know that acts of violence would do their cause more injury than good.

Therefore, ideological violence in this country has largely been implicit, rather than explicit; a matter of future threat, rather than immediate preoccupation. The nation's security problem arises from what organizations such as the Communist Party could do, from both present and future strength, to injure this country by acting on their avowed principles of violence. The FBI's responsibility, pursuant to acts of Congress and Presidential directives, is both to gather and disseminate intelligence information and to be alert to any violations of Federal law.

The whole problem of potential ideological violence becomes more serious since the most potent organization, the Communist Party, has mastered the technique of camouflaging its advocacy of force and violence, providing a cover behind which it can develop new strength, both in membership and influence, which may enable it to attain sufficient potency to seize state power. In communism this technique is called "Aesopian language," that is, the use of roundabout or elusive words to conceal the Party's real intentions of violence—words which the "initiated" fully understand in their Marxist-Leninist meanings while the general public is fooled. Hence, the Party is able to operate "fronts," form alliances with noncommunist groups, and encourage citizens to drop their fear of communism. Under the cover of "Aesopian language," the Party is able to draw money, talent and influence for its cause from noncommunist elements of society. The paradoxical situation arises that noncommunists, who actually have no sympathy with communism, are manipulated to support its objectives, enabling the Party to accumulate power for future strikes against our society. We must make no mistake that the Communist Party, despite its "Aesopian language," depends ultimately on the use of force and violence to attain a qualitative change in our society. If ever the conditions of society, through internal chaos or disintegration, permitted the Communist Party freedom of action, it would move to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

Terrorist violence

A rising problem is posed by groups emphasizing terrorist or hoodlum violence. In addition to ideological groups, there are a number of organizations which are basically terrorist and hoodlum by nature. Some, such as the Revolutionary Action Movement and the American Nazi Party, may claim to espouse a type of ideology, but they are not truly ideological since they neither owe allegiance to a preconceived blueprint of principles nor are they integral parts of an

international movement. They are chiefly interested in creating disruption, chaos and trouble.

These groups are chiefly of a hate or "anti" variety—anti-Negro, anti-white, anti-Semitic or anti-minority group; their common denominator is a distrust for law and order and a belief in force and violence. They are purveyors of hate, bigotry and prejudice, eager to stir up discontent, fear and unrest. Some of the groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan,²⁹ were organized many years ago. Others, such as the American Nazi Party,³⁰ the Revolutionary Action Movement,³¹ and the Minutemen,³² are recent in origin. Terrorist violence, as in the case of the Klan, is a matter of record. Murder, arson, or bombings have been perpetrated in many areas by the Klan. This violence has a primary purpose of spreading fear; while they stress a policy of nonviolence, it is in reality hypocritical semantics. Through violence, the Klan has usurped and defiled the law. Overt violence, however, does not tell the full story of terror of these groups. A sinister danger lies in the potential for violence inherent in their fanatical appeals to bigotry, irrationality and fear. At hooded Klan meetings, racial violence is preached in frenzied tones. Similarly, the American Nazi Party can deliver a violent anti-Negro, anti-Semitic harangue and suggest the necessary tools for action in a Nazi "kit" which includes such odious items as "selected rocks carefully balanced and weighted for breaking out school windows" and "switchblade knife lightning fast, extra-long blade for stabbing students." The latent violence in these meetings has a potential for realization since these groups attract a variety of misfits, failures and dropouts from society—men who already bear personal hatreds and grudges and are desperately looking for scapegoats. In addition, there are other groups which espouse hatred and look with favor on the use of violence. For example, Nation of Islam (NOI)³³ espouses hatred of the white race, government, law and law enforcement. NOI counsels Negroes not to serve in the armed services and has developed a belligerent black nationalist policy. They present a danger which we as a nation must not overlook.

The whole problem of violence in American society has been accentuated by the recent emphasis on "black power," as interpreted by such individuals as Stokely Carmichael, former chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). To Carmichael and others of his thinking, "black power" means terror and violence directed against the white community. Many of his statements are highly inflammatory;³⁴ and at a rally in Washington, D.C., he exhorted his listeners to "burn down this city" if they did not get the vote. The danger is not only the threat of immediate violence, when individuals take these words at face value; there is also the danger of seeds being planted which may cause individuals to take violent actions at a later date.

Inflammatory statements about "black power" inevitably bring forth calls for "white power." "White power," meaning reliance on force and violence, also is repugnant. Both concepts, black and white power, mean denial of law and order and reliance on the barbarian tactics of brute force. Far too many young people, in particular, of both races are thinking in terms of power outside the law to solve the problems of society. The proliferation of this type of thinking can only mean trouble ahead.

Civil disobedience

A problem related to the rise of violence is civil disobedience, a pernicious doctrine which is becoming more widespread with tragic consequences for the observance of law and order. Proponents of this theory assert that civil disobedience is justifiable if the acts are open, not violent, respectful of the

Footnotes at end of article.

rights of others, and have the purpose of focusing attention on significant moral issues of the day.

To individuals caught up in righteous indignation about problems in current society, the appeal of civil disobedience may seem great. To "gently" break the law, so to speak, for the purposes of your group or cause seems such a "minor" infraction. But suppose every group or individual who honestly believed he had a valid or righteous cause did the same? Chaos would result. Law and order would break down. Society would disintegrate.

What today is peaceful civil disobedience may tomorrow mushroom into open violence. What starts out as a planned, controlled incident of disobedience may infect large numbers and turn into mass violations of the law. What today is a legitimate cause with a moral foundation, justifying civil disobedience to some, may fall into unscrupulous and hoodlum hands with tragic results. In such cases, decisions in society would be made on streets, behind barricades and through gunfire, not by ballot, rational discussion or courts of law.

The new left

A contributory factor in the assessment of potential violence in our society is the rise of a student movement called the New Left, with its basic attitudes of bitter hostility, hatred and opposition to democratic values and the principles of free government. The New Left actually is difficult to define. Chiefly student oriented, it is not so much an organization as a point of view, an attitude, a way of viewing society. Its mood is not one of support for America and its values; rather it is one of hostility, defiance and opposition to our government. The New Left's chief passion is to destroy—our government, our democratic values, our American way of life. In a nauseating air of self-righteousness, it criticizes, belittles, mocks. Contemporary society (contemptuously called the "Establishment") is treated with disdain. New Leftist heroes are Castro, Che Guevara, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh. It counsels evasion of the draft, attempts to disrupt the legitimate operations of Universities, and catcalls at government officials on campus. Some New Leftists are "beatniks," with sandals, long hair, and old clothes. Other are hippies living in a drug-induced world to evade the problems of life. Still others are sincere idealists who are badly misguided.

Our nation needs young people who ask questions, who probe into the questions of life. But strict negativism, cynicism, and pessimism are self-defeating. The New Left, though disliking our society, offers nothing constructive in return. Its aim is to destroy, not to build. A key word of New Leftism is resistance. In recent months, the movement has been moving from protest to resistance. Vague talk is heard about "revolution," creating "a revolutionary movement and socialist political party able to take power in America."

Inevitably, this mood of anarchism and nihilism moves toward violence. In their distorted view of society, feeling personally frustrated and alienated, some of these young people are talking about violence. "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," said one top New Leftist.³⁵ "We are actively organizing sedition."³⁶ "I think violence is necessary, and it frightens me,"³⁷ are other comments.

What if this mood spreads? What if more young people (who will be our leaders tomorrow) become motivated by this anarchism, negativism, and nihilism? Will disrespect for law be enhanced? What about the potentialities for violence in the years ahead?

CONCLUSION

Violence and the potential for violence are current realities in our national life. Violence springs from many sources and displays many faces. No simple explanation or formulation of its origins, motivations or ultimate consequences can be given. The whole problem of violence is inextricably interwoven in the fabric of America's twentieth century life.

That is why the best minds of our nation—the doctor, the psychiatrist, the sociologist, the political scientist, the historian, the attorney, the law enforcement officer—must lend their talents to this problem. If the present trend toward increasing violence continues, the institutions of our society will be gravely imperiled.

As we have seen, violence comes from many sources. Its actuality has been extensive (crime, riots, terrorist groups); its potential for future acts great. It is a feature of contemporary society which needs attention now. Yet our approach must be intelligent and rational, based on sound principles of study and action. Too often emotion, fear, and misunderstanding intrude into the analysis of such national problems. Fear breeds fear; violence begets counterviolence. So-called "power" of one type militates "power" of other types. The end result could actually be an increase instead of a decrease in the potentialities of violence. Therefore our approach must be positive. Remedial steps must be taken to eliminate the causes of riots, to cut down on crime, to make less attractive the appeals of ideological groups. Ultimately, the answer must be the development of a sensitive citizen, obedient to the law, but also conscious of the needs of his fellow man. Now, as in 1838 when Abraham Lincoln spoke at Springfield, Illinois, the issue at stake is nothing less than "the perpetuation of our political institutions."

FOOTNOTES

*Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice.

¹ Lincoln, *The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions*, in *I The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* 108 (Basler ed. 1953).

² *Id.* at 109.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.* at 113.

⁵ *Id.* at 111.

⁶ *Id.* at 112.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.* at 115.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.* at 109.

¹¹ The Inaugural Addresses of the American Presidents 186 (Lott ed. 1961).

¹² The Federalist No. 50, at 285 (Colonial Press rev. ed. 1901) (Hamilton). Other compilations attribute this essay to Madison *E.g.*, The Federalist No. 51, at 356 (Belknap Press, Wright ed. 1961) (Madison) (same essay but given different number).

¹³ The Uniform Crime Reporting Program is a nationwide, voluntary effort by law enforcement agencies directed toward the collection, analysis, interpretation and publication of crime figures for the United States. The FBI, as the national clearinghouse, compiles these statistics and publishes them in an annual bulletin. This publication, Uniform Crime Reports, provides data on crime trends and rates by state, geographic division and population group. In addition, supplemental data is furnished on a current basis with statistical releases showing crime trends quarterly. These trends are based on a Crime Index which provides the only nationwide measure of the volume and type of criminal activity.

¹⁴ In January, 1967, the FBI National Crime Information Center (NCIC) was instituted at FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C. The NCIC is designed as the hub of a computerized information network which will serve as a rapid means of processing, storing, retrieving and instantly transmitting vital police data throughout the country in a matter of seconds. NCIC-programmed services include files on stolen vehicles, vehicles used in the commission of felonies, stolen engines and

transmissions, stolen or missing license plates when all plates issued for a specific vehicle are missing, stolen guns, other items of stolen property which are serially identifiable, and wanted persons. As the Center expands, other applications will be added. At present the NCIC links law enforcement agencies coast to coast and it is hoped that eventually all law enforcement, local, state and national, will be coordinated by this center. The NCIC represents the entrance of law enforcement into the computer age.

¹⁵ These figures, taken from 1966 Uniform Crime Reports 3-4, represent urban, rural and suburban areas.

¹⁶ Uniform Crime Report Statistics, FBI Press Release, Dec. 11, 1967.

¹⁷ 1966 Uniform Crime Reports.

¹⁸ FBI, *Police Officers Killed in the Line of Duty*, April Law Enforcement Bulletin 25 (1966). The Bulletin is a monthly professional journal published especially for persons associated with or interested in law enforcement and is not available to the general public.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 26.

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ Wash. Post, Aug. 24, 1967, § A, at A3, cols. 1 & 2.

²² N.Y. Times, Aug. 27, 1967, § 4 (Magazine), at 4E.

²³ A ranking law enforcement officer describes a Labor Day weekend riot at Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: "Troopers were faced with bricks, bottles, beer cans filled with sand, rocks, and pieces of plate glass hurled at them from shoulder height." Then the student rioters started to throw Molotov cocktails which caused several small fires. "Firemen trying to extinguish the blazes were under constant attack by the mob," and one fireman was stabbed in the leg.

Student misbehavior at a 1967 Fort Lauderdale, Florida, beach riot is set forth as follows: "A soft drink truck, which had been caught in the traffic tie up, and a bakery truck were looted by the rampaging students. Some students started to hurl soft drink bottles at the officers who were attempting to quell the disturbance. . . . Two blocks north of the main trouble area, students tried to tip over a large bus but were dispersed by a squad of officers."

²⁴ Current officers include Henry Winston, National Chairman, and Gus Hall, General Secretary.

²⁵ Minor splinter groups from the Socialist Workers Party include the Workers World Party, the American Committee for the Fourth International and the Revolutionary Committee of the Fourth International.

²⁶ This organization was founded at a convention in San Francisco, California in June, 1964.

²⁷ In one demonstration, a PLP leader told a crowd: "We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally. We're going to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of the judges, and we'll have to go against the army."

²⁸ Marx, *Das Kapital* 776 (Int'l Publishers ed. 1939).

²⁹ The origin of the Ku Klux Klan was in the Civil War South. In the 1920's the Klan reached a peak membership of some four million members, but has experienced long periods of relative inactivity. It is currently experiencing a resurgence, dating from the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

At the present time, there are 14 active Klan-type organizations in the United States. Membership is estimated as approximately 14,000, exclusive of thousands of sympathizers. The largest Klan group, the United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, has headquarters in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Led by Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton, this group accounts for over two-thirds of the total Klan membership.

³⁰ The Virginia-based group, comprising fewer than 100 members and having only a

fabricated connection to the Hitler regime, is violently anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. The assassination of George Lincoln Rockwell in August, 1967, leaves the current status of the Party in doubt.

³¹ Currently composed of about 50 members, RAM was organized in 1963 by Negroes who favor the concept of organized violence. RAM would like to bring about a communist-oriented society along Red Chinese lines. The key figure is Robert Franklin Williams, who fled the United States in 1961 to Cuba, and then to Red China, to avoid a Federal warrant issued for his arrest on a charge of kidnapping a white couple during a racial disturbance in North Carolina.

Their basic tenet, as expressed in their "Manifesto," is:

When massive violence comes, the USA will become a bedlam of confusion and chaos. . . . Stores will be destroyed and looted. Property will be damaged and expensive buildings will be reduced to ashes. Essential pipe lines will be severed and blown up and all manner of sabotage will occur. Violence and terror will spread like a firestorm. RAM Manifesto.

³² The Minutemen is an extremist guerrilla warfare group, headed by Robert Bollivar DePugh, with headquarters in Norborne, Missouri. Formed in 1960, this group of vigilante superpatriots believes that a communist take-over will occur in the United States and that guerrilla warfare must be waged against the communist conquerors. The Patriotic Party is the political arm of the Minutemen. It is designed to spread the group's propaganda and obtain financial assistance. Total membership is estimated at fewer than 200.

DePugh and four cohorts were indicted and arrested in August, 1966, in Kansas City, Missouri, on charges of conspiracy to violate the National Firearms Act. DePugh and two others were found guilty and given prison sentences. All remain free on bond pending an appeal.

³³ NOI is an all Negro group, with a highly disciplined membership of over 5,000.

³⁴ "When you talk of black power, you talk of bringing this country to its knees. When you talk of black power, you talk of building a movement that will smash everything western civilization has created." Cleveland Press, Aug. 6, 1966, at 4, col. 1.

³⁵ N.Y. Times, May 7, 1967, at 1, col. 3.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.* at 74, col. 1.

Distinguished Flying Cross Awarded to Native of Baltimore

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Army WO Robert S. Miskimon, a native of Baltimore, has received the Distinguished Flying Cross Medal for heroism during a recent tour as a helicopter pilot in South Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery by including the following article in the RECORD:

AWARD DFC TO CITY MAN

U.S. Army Warrant Officer Robert S. Miskimon, a native of Baltimore, has received the Distinguished Flying Cross medal for heroism during a recent tour as a helicopter pilot in South Vietnam.

Miskimon, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carroll T. Miskimon of 4804 Hamilton Ave., also holds two Purple Heart medals, 31 Air Medals and the U.S. Army Commendation Medal for valor.

A 1964 graduate of Mount St. Joseph's High School, Miskimon is now stationed at Fort Wolters, Tex., serving as an instructor in the U.S. Army's Primary Helicopter Center.

While supporting ground operations of the U.S. Army's 25th Division in Vietnam, he brought a damaged helicopter to its base and then returned to the battle area a second time to assist in medical evacuations.

Introduction of a Joint Resolution To Direct the Federal Communications Commission To Study the Ways in Which Commercial Broadcasters Can Be Required To Provide Financial Support to Nonprofit Public Educational Broadcasters

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a sense of the Congress resolution which would put the Congress on record supporting the view that commercial television and radio broadcasters should contribute substantially to the long range financing of educational television and radio. This resolution would further call on the Federal Communication Commission to study the means by which commercial broadcasters can be required to provide financial assistance to nonprofit educational broadcasting companies and to report back to Congress its recommendations for administrative actions and legislative enactment no later than January 1, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of financing is basic to the long-range independence and scope of educational broadcasting. The success of our democratic institution depends ultimately upon the informed judgment of our citizens. This is one of the important issues of our times. I believe the Congress should go on record now favoring financial support by commercial broadcasters for this public effort.

Last year, the Congress passed the Public Broadcasting Act creating a nonprofit corporation and authorizing \$9 million in program funds for fiscal 1968. The act contained no provision though, for the long-range financing of educational stations beyond 1968. I believe a well-financed and well-directed educational television and radio system should be brought into being in order to fully serve the needs of the American public.

Mr. Speaker, during the floor debate on the Public Broadcasting Act, I introduced an amendment dealing with this issue. Although it drew much favorable comment from my colleagues in the House, it was narrowly defeated.

I am, therefore, introducing a resolution aimed solely at putting the Congress on record on this important issue and calling for the FCC to undertake a study. It is my hope that the Members of Congress will consider this resolution in light of the single issue on which it focuses. Basically, this resolution is a declaration of policy. It makes it clearly understood

that commercial broadcasters have an obligation to contribute toward the cost of educational television and radio. It does not call upon the Congress to determine, at this time, what or how this contribution should be made, but rather is aimed at providing for a thorough study on which Congress can judge that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the President recently stressed the importance of a long-range financing plan, "which would insure that public broadcasting would be vigorous, independent and free from political interference or control." However, he did not focus on the issue of commercial broadcasters providing part of this financial assistance. My resolution is aimed at insuring that this private obligation is studied and that a report is made.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress declared when it created the Educational Broadcasting Corporation "that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television." I offer this resolution as a further congressional initiative toward that end.

Problems of the Narcotics Addict and the Alcoholic

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the President has ably pointed out the importance of new methods of meeting the problems of the narcotics addict and the alcoholic. I earnestly urge the adoption of his proposed amendments to the Community Mental Health Center Act. They are important moves against two of this country's pervading and crippling problems: narcotic addiction and alcoholism.

These amendments will greatly strengthen the hands of those who must design the community programs to treat, control, and prevent narcotic addiction and alcoholism. Each represents the most practical and sensible means of helping our States and localities provide services as a part of or an affiliation with the highly successful community mental health centers program.

One of the proposed amendments deals with the need for special services in our communities for those who suffer from alcoholism. Because some courts have upheld the medical view that alcoholism is a disease and not a crime, we must seriously consider the need for adding to our community mental health legislation, support for the construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of specialized facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. The best method to administer the prevention and treatment of alcoholism is under the community mental health centers program.

The other amendment, to transfer the authorities granted under section 402 of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to the community mental health cen-

ters program is clearly logical. We would avoid duplication and fragmentation of services by placing this Federal support solidly in the community mental health program we have repeatedly voted to strengthen on behalf of all citizens.

I ask the prompt and favorable consideration of the bill by the committee and this body.

The "Pueblo" Incident

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the lack of confidence in the statements of the administration, and unfortunately even the President himself, has reached alarming proportions as White House and Defense Department spokesmen trip over each other while discussing the *Pueblo* incident. A Chicago Tribune editorial in this morning's edition and a Copley News Service editorial, which appeared in Copley newspapers in Illinois and California, on February 6, articulately observe grassroots American sentiment as they interpret the confusing administration statements.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 8, 1968]

THE ADMINISTRATION "COOLS IT"

It is now two weeks and two days since a boarding party from North Korea communist patrol boats seized the navy intelligence ship *Pueblo*. At the time, Secretary of State Rusk said that the action could be termed "an act of war" and advised the North Koreans to "cool it."

We haven't seen any evidence that the Communists have responded to this advice, but certainly the Johnson administration has been following Mr. Rusk's counsel. It has confined itself to talking at the United Nations and to secretly negotiating with North Korea at meetings of the military armistice commission at Panmunjom.

Meanwhile the administration has shifted its story so many times that nobody knows what to believe. Its original account was that the *Pueblo* was in international waters, 25 miles off the North Korean coast, when it was seized, and that the vessel had radioed that it had used no weapons before it was hauled into the communist port of Wonsan.

The Communists disputed this version of nonresistance at the first meeting at Panmunjom after the hijacking. They said the *Pueblo* had fired on their patrol boats and that one American crewman was killed and four others injured in retaliatory fire or during the boarding.

The Washington columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott have now openly asserted that the Johnson administration has not been leveling with the people and that it fostered an impression of cowardice on the part of the *Pueblo*'s officers and men when the truth was that the ship was taken only after they had made a heroic resistance.

Allen and Scott say that the message sent from the ship to the national security agency's communications center near Washington related that North Korean boarding parties were twice repulsed during a battle of an hour and 45 minutes, that three members of the crew were wounded by enemy gunfire, and that the ship was boarded only on a third attempt, after its two .50-caliber machine guns were put out of action. A fourth crew member was reported seriously injured

when he attempted to blow up the ship's most secret equipment. The columnists say:

"These and other still-secret details of the battle waged by the *Pueblo* crew are being suppressed on direct orders of the President to keep public opinion from being further inflamed. An administration insider says the President is deeply concerned that, if the full story of the crew's valiant resistance were to be made known now, it could trigger nationwide demands that military rather than diplomatic methods be used to try to obtain the return of the ship and its personnel."

Sen. Dirksen has added, "There was some monitoring done and there are some tapes. I think 'most everything was known.'"

To the grave charge that the President is playing politics with the incident there has not been one word of rejoinder from the White House.

Further evidence of administration dissembling is to be found in Secretary Rusk's television appearance Sunday, when he began backtracking from the original unqualified assertion that the *Pueblo* was in international waters. His revision was that the United States could not be "1,000 per cent certain" of the position of the ship until the crew was released and could be interrogated.

This is being taken by Congress as preparation before submitting to North Korean demands that the United States admit the *Pueblo* intruded into its territorial waters and that an apology be made in return for release of the crew.

This is the administration's technique of "cooling it" by resort to cover-up, fabrication, and outright lying.

EDITORIAL IN COPLEYPAPERS IN ILLINOIS AND CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 6, 1968

Credibility of the United States of America suffered an incalculable setback with the admission of the administration that the U.S.S. *Pueblo* could have violated the territorial waters of North Korea.

Who can believe us now?

On the day after the U.S. *Pueblo* was seized Jan. 23, Secretary of State Dean Rusk called the piracy—correctly—one which was tantamount to an "act of war."

Now he says it is possibly not.

At the United Nations, Jan. 26, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg correctly labeled the North Korean action a "warlike act" and went to great lengths to prove the U.S. vessel was 15.3 nautical miles from the nearest North Korean land.

Now what can he tell the United Nations?

And the President of the United States declared to the Nation Jan. 26: "This week North Koreans committed yet another wanton and aggressive act by seizing an American ship and its crew in international waters. Clearly this cannot be accepted."

What can he tell the American people now—that it has been accepted?

Can the United States now be believed when it tells the more than 40 nations with which we have treaties that we will defend them firmly against aggressors?

Can one now blame the South Koreans, who have given us staunch support in South Vietnam, if they bitterly complain about being "sold out"? They are not even given the courtesy of being present during negotiations with their implacable enemy, the Communist aggressors.

What can we tell the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*? That we believe they disobeyed orders and went into North Korean waters?

We do not think the men of the *Pueblo* would want their release at the expense of national honor and integrity for which they willingly worked as members of the Armed Forces. Would these courageous men of the United States Navy want to live a lie?

And now that we are retreating before the propaganda of North Korea, how can we prevent future incidents of the *Pueblo* type

from any puny upstart? Must we retreat from the high seas as a maritime nation?

The *Pueblo* capture was stated, of course, as a diversionary tactic to draw attention from the new Communist aggression in Vietnam, can South Vietnam now believe, in view of the diplomatic retreat about the *Pueblo*, that we will not sell them out to obtain the release of more than 800 airmen held by North Vietnam? And if we lie about the *Pueblo*, what rationale can we use to tell North Vietnam we are all they claim if this will obtain the release of our men?

The answer of course is national security, integrity and honor. This is why we are fighting in Vietnam. This is why the gallant *Pueblo* took risks off Korea and this is why we maintain a defense posture.

That posture should not be used to perpetrate a lie even for ultimately good motives such as the release of prisoners.

Once we resort to the lie as a national policy we are no different from the enemy we are fighting. We will have lost our national integrity.

Mrs. Carlos Romulo

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we were deeply saddened recently to learn of the passing of one of America's warmest friends, Mrs. Carlos P. Romulo.

Mrs. Romulo exemplified the noblest traditions of womanhood as a wife, a mother, and a talented, well-educated, warmhearted, gracious lady. We remember Mrs. Romulo most pleasantly during her years in Washington when her husband served as Philippine Ambassador to the United States. When living in New York while General Romulo served as President of the United Nations General Assembly, Mrs. Romulo continued a tradition of service begun many years before in the Philippines. She will be greatly missed by all who knew her, and her circle of friends extends the world over.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in deepest sympathy to General Romulo and their three sons, Gregorio, Ricardo, and Roberto.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the following article about Mrs. Romulo which appeared in the Washington Post:

MRS. ROMULO DIES IN MANILA—WIFE OF EX-AMBASSADOR HERE

Virginia Llamas Romulo, 62, wife of the long-time Philippine Ambassador to the United States and former president of the United Nation's General Assembly, died of leukemia yesterday in Manila.

A petite island beauty queen, she and her husband, now President of the University of the Philippines, were one of Washington's most popular diplomatic couples during the more than eight years they lived here.

The daughter of a prominent Philippine family, Mrs. Romulo attended convent schools and at 16 won the islands' carnival beauty queen contest. The king chosen to rule beside her was Carlos P. Romulo, a young editor who had recently returned from Columbia University. They were married a short time later.

During World War II, while her husband

was serving as aide-de-camp to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Mrs. Romulo and her four children hid in the hills and jungles of Luzon.

With a price put on her head by the Japanese, Mrs. Romulo and her children kept changing identities, which Mrs. Romulo said was dangerous and confusing for her children, the youngest of whom, Bobby, was only 3. Bobby thought up his own answer when Japanese troops asked him "Who is your father?" Mrs. Romulo said, "He would just say 'Daddy,'" she recalled.

After the war the Romulos were reunited and came to the United States. Brig. Gen. Romulo was then resident commissioner of the Philippines. He became U.N. General Assembly president in 1949, and served at the U.N. until 1954 when he was named Ambassador to the United States.

The Romulos owned a house on Garfield Street nw. for many years, renting it while they lived at the Embassy from 1954 to 1962. Mrs. Romulo created a Philippine room in the house, tiled like a Manila patio and filled with rattan furniture, Philippine carvings and her own paintings.

The Romulos returned to Manila in 1962, when the Ambassador became president of the Philippine University. They returned briefly to Washington in 1964 for a visit.

Besides her husband, Mrs. Romulo is survived by three sons, Gregorio, Ricardo and Roberto. A fourth son, Carlos Jr., was killed several years ago in a plane crash.

Serbian Independence

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 we will join Serbians throughout the world in commemorating the revolt for independence from the Turks which was led by the famed Karageorge. Unfortunately, the Serbian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden in their homeland by their present dictator, Tito.

On this historic day we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Serbia and all the other captives of communism.

The great Serbian leader, Karageorge, offered his life and fortune to rid Serbia of the oppressive rule of the Turks and the Serbians were victorious in their fight for independence and freedom. Serbia achieved international recognition when the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in 1812 and secured a limited autonomy.

We must not only observe historic events such as the Serbian fight for independence in words, but in deeds as well. I urge, therefore, that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established to study the present conditions of oppression under which the Serbians and other captive peoples are suffering.

It is especially important, Mr. Speaker, that we note the consistent cooperation of the Tito government with the Soviet intrusion into the Mediterranean and the growing menace to world peace that stems from this Soviet imperialistic policy.

Our Space Program

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of questions which I asked of the Honorable James Webb, Administrator of NASA, on February 7, 1968, together with Mr. Webb's replies:

QUESTIONS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO ADMINISTRATOR JAMES WEBB, OF NASA, FOR AUTHORIZATION HEARINGS, FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Question I: What is the relative status and progress of our national space program compared to the Soviet space program? Are we ahead or behind? In what areas?

Answer: The Soviet space program has consistently utilized larger boosters than were currently available to the U.S. In the coming year, still larger Soviet boosters will be coming into use. During 1968, or shortly thereafter, they will have available a booster with over ten million pounds of thrust.

The success of the Soviet Venus 4 and the ejection of a sensor capsule into the Venusian atmosphere during its encounter with the planet prove that the Soviets have made great progress in spacecraft command, control, communications, and guidance.

The Venus 4 mission was only one of an impressive list of Soviet firsts, which includes the first satellite in earth orbit, the first lunar orbit, the first pictures of the far side of the moon, the first soft landing on the moon, the first man in space and the first multimanned space vehicle.

Planned Soviet manned space activity has been delayed following the failure of the Soyuz-1 mission last spring. However, automatic rendezvous and docking was accomplished by the Cosmos 186 and 188 vehicles. This rendezvous and docking capability now opens the way for the Soviets to proceed with their announced program of large earth orbiting space stations and further exploration of the moon and planets. We believe they have the capability to do a flyby of the moon with some form of life, which some believe could be man. That the Soviets will soon resume manned space operations is indicated by the public announcement of the addition of nine ships to the expeditionary fleet of the Soviet Academy of Sciences for the purpose of research work associated "with observations of space objects in the areas of the Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea."

The Soviets continue to launch, within their Cosmo series, important scientific satellites and others which are recovered within one to eight days. Sixty-one (61) Cosmo satellites were launched in 1967 of which 35 were recovered. Three of the Cosmo vehicles were meteorological satellites. Three Molniya communication satellites, the 5th, 6th and 7th in this program, were launched in 1967.

The Soviet research and development effort in aeronautics continues to increase with indications that its supersonic transport will be flying early next year. Last October, the International Aeronautical Federation was requested to certify a world altitude record of 98,461 feet carrying a 4,400 pound payload. A more recent Soviet news release claims a world speed record of 1817 mph over a 500 km. closed circuit. Both were accomplished with the Soviet E-266 aircraft.

In summary, there were 66 launches in the Soviet space program during 1967. This compares with 42 launches in 1966 and 64

launches in 1965, the previous Soviet peak year.

There are no signs that the Soviets are cutting back their space program as we are. New test and launch facilities are steadily added to expand their resource base and a number of space-flight systems more advanced than any heretofore used are nearing completion. They will soon be in a position to utilize a booster with greater thrust than the Saturn V. They continue to move toward a resumption of manned space flights. There is little doubt that they will endeavor to land instrument packages on Mars in 1969 and again in 1971.

In terms of scientific advances and in applications of space systems to economic use, such as meteorological and communications systems, our program has achieved a more advanced state than theirs. But in terms of capability to use large launch vehicles and in the rate of advance toward future greater capabilities, they are and will remain ahead at the 1969 budget level which we are presenting. The hard fact we now face is that just as we have begun to catch up in large-scale booster operations—as shown by the flights of Apollo 4 and 5—we are sharply reducing our program while they continue to advance.

Question II. Last year, I asked NASA what would be the effect of a reduction of several hundreds of millions of dollars in the Fiscal Year 1968 budget request. The reply was to the effect that the program would experience serious and critical setbacks. Such a cut was eventually made before the appropriation was passed into law. How has it been possible for the space program to maintain its pace in the light of these reductions?

Answer: It has not been possible to maintain the pace of the U.S. space program.

The President's Fiscal Year 1968 budget request included funds to continue to advance in space and to augment our aeronautics effort. It also requested funds to begin a limited number of programs significant for the next decade, including NERVA II; Voyager to be used for scientific missions to Mars in 1973 and 1975 utilizing orbiting vehicles and automated landing laboratories; a Mariner flight to Mars in 1971; and Sunblazer, a small interplanetary probe to increase our knowledge of the Sun. In addition, the President's 1968 request would have maintained production of our largest boosters, the uprated Saturn I and the Saturn V, at four of each per year, with spacecraft to use these boosters for Apollo application missions, beginning as early as this year—1968.

Except for the Mariner-Mars 1971 mission, authorization for each of these programs was approved by Congress, but at reduced levels. The FY 1968 authorization totaled \$4.866 billion—\$234 million below the budget request. The appropriation at \$4.59 billion was \$511 million below the budget request and \$277 million below the authorization.

Thus, for FY 1968 we are operating under appropriations in which—

Research and Development funds, other than for Apollo are 20 percent below the budget request;

Funds for Construction of Facilities are less than one-half of the budget request; and

Funds for Administrative Operations were reduced to \$628 million. This has necessitated a reduction in Civil Service personnel by about 5% and total administrative costs by about 7%.

In the Apollo program, no more than nine Saturn V flights can take place by the end of 1969. These nine flights mark a reduction from the 13 which we proposed at the beginning of last year and the 11 which we still hoped for last spring.

In the Apollo Applications Program, there has been a complete revision of the mission content. Hardware delivery schedules have

been stretched out and planned production rates reduced to two Saturn V's and two Saturn IB's per year beginning in Calendar Year 1970. Apollo Applications flight IA has now been dropped, as has the second Apollo Applications cluster of a Saturn I Workshop and Apollo Telescope Mount. Since no funding was provided for Manned Space Flight Advanced Mission Studies, and FY 1967 funds are limited, a considerable reduction has been made in the amount of study effort needed to insure soundly-based decisions as to future manned missions. All these steps represent a sharp decrease in the planned rate of acquisition of manned space flight experience and consequently a sharp decrease in our national capability for space operations.

In the Physics and Astronomy program, it has been necessary to cancel the Pilgrim Project and to delay Sunblazer.

The Lunar and Planetary Program was re-directed with increased emphasis on technology development to retain a base of competent personnel in a period when no flight mission were to be undertaken. The Voyager program was eliminated. Launch Vehicle Procurement funding was adjusted downward. The GOES D and E missions were dropped, and the ATS F and G and Nimbus E and F schedules were delayed. The broad effect of these reductions is to slow down the return of scientific information about the solar system and to delay the application of advances in space science and technology.

In our Advanced Research and Technology programs, the level of effort in Electronic Systems, Space Vehicle Systems, Basic Research, Space Power and Electrical Propulsion Systems, and Chemical Propulsion has been reduced. The NERVA I nuclear engine has been substituted for the NERVA II engine. In our ability to meet future aeronautics and space needs, the effects of these cutbacks will be felt for years to come.

Reductions in funding for Tracking and Data Acquisition has reduced support of a number of satellites still in orbit and still transmitting useful scientific and technical data. In the Sustaining University Program, facility grants to universities have been all but eliminated and a sharp reduction has been made in the number of new graduate students supported. Reduction in the Technology Utilization program has meant a lessening of our efforts to identify, evaluate and disseminate new technology resulting from NASA programs.

The 50% reduction in Construction of Facilities appropriations required deletion or deferral of most construction projects, most notably the test facilities for the proposed NERVA II Nuclear Rocket and the Sunblazer antenna.

Finally, Civil Service personnel are being reduced by over 1700. We have reduced paid overtime by 35%, travel by 15%, and other costs by 17%.

We can conduct a viable and useful program at these lower levels, as we will indicate in presenting the President's FY 1969 budget, but it will be a sharply reduced one.

Question III: The President's Budget Message (see page 874, Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1969) states, in part,

"In calendar year 1969, five manned flights of the Saturn V are planned. Plans call for all of these flights to be conducted with complete lunar landing systems. The mission plans for the first four will be primarily aimed at development and operational testing. It is planned that the lunar landing will be made using a Saturn V in calendar year 1969."

In view of the reductions made in Fiscal Year 1968 and the reduced budget level of the Fiscal Year 1969 request, is this estimated date for the lunar landing as firm as is implied?

Answer: In the last seven fiscal years, the President's budget requests for NASA have been reduced by over \$1.5 billion. The kind of readjustments required by NASA and its

contractors have caused grave problems and delays. Notwithstanding this, and such setbacks as the Apollo 204 fire last year, we have developed a system that has continued to move forward with the work required, to meet the nation's needs in space. The first all-up Saturn V, flight tested all of its stages, the Service Module propulsion system and qualified the Apollo heat shield at lunar return speed. The recent Apollo 5 tested the Lunar Module and its descent and ascent engines. We are continuing to move rapidly. The President's Fiscal Year 1969 budget request, if approved by Congress, will permit NASA to proceed on a testing, checkout and launch schedule which, barring a major setback, should enable us to fly the ninth Saturn V by the end of calendar year 1969. However, where we have had in previous years some flexibility to work around major problems, we now have almost none. Even in the light of these factors, we believe that we still have the possibility of making the lunar landing before 1970.

Equitable Development of a National Resource

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to insure that resources developed by the public are not used for the exclusive benefit of a few private utility companies. This bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN of Vermont.

Nuclear powerplants have quickly changed from an interesting idea to an established fact. Fifteen nuclear powerplants are presently in operation in the United States. Many more nuclear plants with much greater capacity are planned. It is estimated that by 1980 some 150,000 megawatts of nuclear power capacity will have been built. This will represent over one-third of the Nation's total generating capacity.

Public expenditures contributed substantially to the present technological and economic feasibility of nuclear generating plants. It now appears, however, that private utilities are seeking a monopolistic control over these plants. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 does not contain adequate guidelines for the issuance of licenses for the operation of nuclear plants. It does not insure that the public and cooperative systems will share in the benefits derived from nuclear power. The record is replete with examples of private utilities refusing to cooperate with municipalities and cooperative systems. This record suggests what will happen in the future if adequate safeguards are not established now.

The bill I am introducing today will attempt to insure that a reasonable opportunity exists for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power. The bill amends chapter 10 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide that no person shall be issued a license to construct and operate a nuclear powerplant unless he has granted to other persons engaged in the distribution, transmission, or production of

electric energy an opportunity to participate in the ownership of the facility. Also the bill would require the applicant for the license to make available the electric energy on fair and nondiscriminatory terms to all persons. These provisions will loosen the private utilities' monopolistic grip on nuclear power.

Unfortunately many promising scientific and technological developments pose a threat to our natural resources. Most atomic powerplants are planned to be located near fresh water. The operation of these plants, without water-cooling equipment, will substantially increase the temperature of fresh water. Conservationists, sportsmen, and all interested in the preservation of our natural resources should be concerned about this form of water pollution. To guard against the possible loss of fresh water, the bill would require the Atomic Energy Commission to consult with the Water Resources Council before issuing a license.

The bill will also try to insure that there is an adequate supply of electric energy for all parts of the Nation. The natural requirements for electricity are increasing rapidly. To meet this need, there must be an orderly and varied development of the electrical capabilities and potential of this country.

The most effective and economic use of nuclear generation of electricity can be achieved only with the production by other means of peaking power. The integrated power systems of tomorrow will utilize hydroelectric power for handling the peak loads, leaving the constant base loads to be carried by thermal generation.

This bill is not an attempt to hamper any one industry, but to seek the equitable development of a national resource.

Consumer Protection in Service

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the service industry to the American consumer cannot be exaggerated. Most of our durable goods depend on some kind of service to maintain their value and usefulness. Whether we need resetting of a stone in a treasured ring, or adjustment on our car's brakes or repairs for a television set, we are all dependent on the services implicit in manufactured goods and concerned about their availability, economy, and reliability.

Merchandising Week, in its first publication of this year, devoted a special section to the increasing demand for consumer protection, including the need for better servicing.

This important article follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN SERVICE

The consumer, dropping down from the exhilarating high of buying in unprecedented quantity, has finally discovered that sooner or later (unhappily, too often sooner), everything that moves also breaks down.

Her attraction to convenience-oriented products has led her to the point where she needs a serviceman, a copy of her guarantee, and, ultimately, a drink.

According to Betty Furness, inadequate, overpriced, and often unavailable service facilities have become the consumer's primary complaint. They could become the consumer protectionist's next primary concern. Already, two bills have been proposed before the Senate regarding full disclosure of warranty and guarantee provisions (MW, 18 Dec. 67, p. 1). Both bills are aimed at saving the consumer from shouldering the service burden herself. And, as some Congress-watchers indicate, this is only a beginning.

Consumers would be kept aware of all provisions and conditions of a guarantee under a bill introduced by Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. Disclosure would include the name and address of the guarantor, details of exactly what is covered, the length of the guarantee, who can file a claim under it and the conditions he must fulfill, what portion of the cost must be paid by the person making the claim, when and how the guarantor will fulfill his obligations, and what parts and types of damages are not covered. The Magnuson bill also calls for the establishment of an advisory council on guarantee and servicing problems.

A second disclosure bill, under the aegis of Sen. Carl Hayden (D-Ariz.), chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would require manufacturers to meet certain product standards established by the Secretary of Commerce, to provide consumers with deception-free warranties, and to provide for enforcement of these warranties.

To help the repairman, the Hayden bill would also require the manufacturer to pay its service representatives for all services rendered in conjunction with its warranties.

A controversial section of this bill is a clause requiring manufacturers involved in interstate commerce to set up service facilities or representative according to rules set up by the Secretary of Commerce. Also, no manufacturer would be allowed to enter any franchise agreement unless the agreement includes a provision that the franchise holder serve as service representative of the manufacturer.

The two major villains in the service picture are quality control and lack of manpower. If manufacturers worked harder to improve product standards, the inevitable breakdown might at least be postponed. And if there were enough people willing and qualified by training to fill the available service jobs, the consumer might be able to get her appliance repaired more easily when the breakdown does occur.

The lack of service personnel—whether in the small independent repair shop or the larger manufacturer service organization—has grown acute. Insiders like Frank Moch, executive director of the National Alliance of Television and Electronic Service Assns., put the blame on the temptations—in terms of money and employee benefits—placed in the way of the prospective serviceman by other branches of the industry. Some repairmen themselves define the problem as a question of image: they say prospective recruits are reluctant to try to buck the low-prestige stereotype of the dishonest repairman.

Attempts at solutions to the manpower problem have been made by manufacturers, who often operate training programs to keep repairmen up-to-date on the changing technology of the modern appliance. High school and adult education courses are also offered to help bring new blood into the repair industry, and apprenticeship programs are increasingly being found important to the success of any proposed repairman-licensing bill.

New blood, however, does not necessarily mean good blood. To uphold standards of

quality and honesty in the home electronics repair industry, several state and local governing bodies have been turning to licensing—for home electronics repairmen at least—as a solution to some of the consumer's service complaints.

The licensing question has gained prominence in recent months, as several new proposals have been made to protect the consumer by enforcing a specialized kind of "quality control" over repairmen. Spurred on by so-called "controlled malfunction" checks, in which purposely bugged sets are taken to repair shops and left to be fixed, often to the tune of exorbitant charges and unneeded parts replacements, legislative groups are realizing that licensing measures would help protect the honest repairman from his brother, the crook, along with protecting Mrs. Consumer.

Existing licensing measures in California and Louisiana have been proved effective in reducing repair-job frauds. Now other states—notably New York, where two licensing measures have recently been introduced to the state legislature by New York City Mayor John Lindsay and state Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz—are beginning to discern the value of similar measures.

Most licensing programs call for a specified amount of practical experience and/or specialized technical training before a repairman can be licensed. For the consumer, such measures protect her to a greater or lesser extent—depending on the location, the provisions of the licensing bill, and her own gullibility—from the fly-by-night operator who decides that this week he'll call himself a tv repairman, or the dishonest technician who figures what she doesn't know won't hurt his bill-padding.

Service reliability can be somewhat ensured by licensing. Service availability can be helped, perhaps, by using the resources of the federally organized manpower development program to supply people to fill the empty slots in the repair industry.

Such a solution has been proposed by both Miss Furness and Secretary of Commerce Alexander Trowbridge; both feel the manpower program should be tapped to fill the need for more qualified appliance repairmen. And better quality control on the part of the manufacturer can help minimize the consumer's servicing needs to begin with.

With licensing, improved quality control, increased manpower, and the warranty-disclosure bills, the consumer need no longer feel that a washing-machine breakdown is automatically a catastrophe.

Broadcasting Network Control

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, broadcasting networks, particularly the three largest such organizations, should be placed under effective regulation by the Federal Communications Commission. Joined by Congressmen Moss and ORTINGER, I am today introducing legislation to accomplish this purpose.

The Federal Government now permits a most valuable natural resource—the public airwaves—to be controlled by a few, possibly only three, powerful men in New York City. Three men, as a natural outgrowth of our economic system, necessarily have a primary interest in maximizing profits. This primary interest may, and I believe often does, conflict

with the obligation to adequately serve the public interest.

These few men in New York City make the determination as to what most of the people of this country see most of the time on their television sets.

When you consider that there are more television sets in the United States than telephones and that the television set in the average home is turned on for almost 6 hours each day, you can appreciate the influence of the medium.

By the time a child has graduated from high school, he has spent more time in front of a television set than in a classroom.

More than 60 percent of all the fare presented on commercial television is determined by the networks. Virtually all the fare seen in the choice, so-called prime-time hours—when the vast bulk of viewers have the opportunity to watch television—is controlled by networks.

Yet, these networks, using a valuable public resource, are not regulated by guardians of the public interest. Stations are regulated; networks are not.

Those in control of the television networks today are in a position similar to that of petroleum tycoons of a half-century and more ago. The tycoons first gained control of the means of moving petroleum from the great oilfields. They then obtained control of refining facilities. They took over distribution facilities. They formed huge trusts which gave scant attention indeed to the public interest. It took the Federal Government more than 50 years to break up these trusts and bring a measure of protection to the consumer.

Similarly, today the broadcasting networks own electronic pipelines into the homes of 56 million American families. They, too, seek growth. They, too, are taking over increasing control of the actual production of the fare that is being seen. They, too, are ready to move instantly into whatever new form of distribution may open up. For example, the Columbia Broadcasting System only recently set aside \$20 million for the acquisition of community antenna television systems.

Using the enormous profits gained from their control of public airwaves, the networks are branching out into a variety of other business endeavors. CBS purchased the New York Yankees because according to some financial sources, the network had so much cash on hand that it had to find some use for the money. NBC recently paid \$15 million for only part of golfer Arnold Palmer's business enterprises. ABC owns an ice show.

Networks own publishing companies and toy companies and companies manufacturing musical recordings and companies manufacturing musical instruments.

According to the last financial information supplied by the Federal Communications Commission, the three networks in 1966 made pretax profits of \$78.8 million on revenues of \$906.9 million, a percentage ratio of 8.7 percent.

But there is another side to this financial coin. Each network is permitted to own five VHF television stations. Now, those 15 network-owned stations in 1966

had profits of \$108.1 million on \$262.4 million in revenues. That is a profit ratio of 41.2 percent.

It is not at all unusual for a well-run television station to return substantially more than 100 percent each year on its initial investment.

Television can be a fantastically lucrative business. The managers of 593 stations which are not owned by the networks made \$206.1 million in pretax profits during 1966, or almost 30 percent of their revenues.

Moreover, the networks are increasingly gaining control of the actual production facilities.

The networks are squeezing out the independent producers by setting up their own large film studios, mostly in Hollywood.

The fact of the matter is that you cannot get a series on television today unless you cut a network in for a share of the production action and a sizable portion of the resulting profits. In some business endeavors, this is called a kickback; I am not sure what the networks call it.

The power of networks is so great that even large business firms are helpless to fight the system. Procter & Gamble, the broadcast industry's largest advertiser, once tried to get a series on the air, after having paid to produce a sample of the show. It could not. It had to take another series, one produced with network involvement in the production expenses and, later, the profits.

General Foods once tried to get a series on the air, made with General Foods advertising money at no expense to the networks. No one would take it. General Foods was forced to take a series in which the network had a financial stake.

The Xerox corporation has produced some superb documentaries through independent companies. No network would touch them. Xerox was forced to place its documentaries on separate, individual stations, creating its own minor-league network for the occasion.

The networks are clearly monopolies. They control the performing talent. They control production facilities. They control the distribution. They control the schedules.

There is nothing wrong with making money but the problem arises when the power of an entity becomes so great that it can act to the detriment of the public. Important priorities get out of balance here.

One of the most astute observers of the television scene, Fred Friendly, wrote in his book, "Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control," that the order of priorities in network television goes like this:

- First. The ratings.
- Second. The effect of these ratings on advertisers.
- Third. The effect of these ratings on the company's expected earnings, and their effect on the stock market.
- Then, far down the list, No. 4. The company's corporate image as reflected in the press, by the leadership of the community and at the FCC—in that order.
- And finally, at the very bottom, No. 5. Responsibility for true public service

and personal taste in entertainment and cultural programs.

Friendly's point about the network emphasis on profits has been dramatized recently. The networks currently are suffering a decline in profits. The stock shareholder equity in CBS increased by 485 percent from 1951 to 1964. Its chairman, William Paley, made \$40 million on his personal stock in CBS in a few months not too many years back. At the time, he owned 1 million shares and the price went from \$40 a share to \$80 a share on the New York Stock Exchange.

But then came a temporary drop in profits at CBS and what did the network do?

The first thing it did was to close down a news bureau in Washington, D.C., which had been set up to serve the five television stations CBS owns elsewhere in the country. This news bureau sent special coverage back to stations in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and St. Louis.

Next, CBS ordered those stations to tighten the financial belt on local news productions in the five cities.

Then, it expanded its sales department at New York network headquarters.

Those five stations are licensed by the FCC, although the network is not. Yet, when the network felt financial pressure, it immediately expanded its unregulated sales department and cut back on the one function that best serves the public interest in cities served by regulated network-owned stations—news and public affairs.

The profit levels of CBS justified continuation of its public service endeavors at the same level.

Local stations fail to fight the system whereby the networks dominate program decisions. With only a few token exceptions, the fact is that the networks determine what most viewers in this country see.

Whatever happened to the American dream of diversity, of open marketplaces, of choices?

With network domination, the entertainment programs on American television have fallen to low estate and low esteem—an outpouring of pat formulas and poor imitations. The formula is to copy past successes and to reach always for the highest ratings. The process squeezes many shows off the air which should be made available to the public. There is just so much really prime time to be filled. If the networks are going to fill that time with an outpouring of slick comedies, westerns and action shows, then there simply is not any time left for more diverse and enriching fare.

A stranger to America, seeing the product of network television, might assume the Nation has only one network, not three. They are all the same, using the same formulas and motivated by the same goal—an ever-increasing accumulation of higher profits. Such a visitor might well conclude we are a nation of idiots from that programing.

In the area of children's programs, the network record is a disgrace. Basically, network children's programs are an outpouring of loud, raucous cartoons which may amuse the child but which add abso-

lutely nothing to his eager mind or its thirst for knowledge about the world in which he is growing. The cartoons sell breakfast cereals and toys in season. To the networks, it appears the sales are more important than what goes into a child's mind.

In the area of public affairs, we are subjected to an outpouring of documentaries which one network producer has called, off the record, "safe controversy."

The world painted by television is unreal, with little relationship to conditions as they really exist.

But this is what happens from undue accumulations of power. Concentration of important decisions in the hands of as few as three men can lead to a most unpleasant situation unless strictly controlled.

Meanwhile, at the Federal Communications Commission, that congressionally appointed guardian of the public interest, we have established an agency which is undermanned and overworked and which we have financed with the not very bountiful amount of less than \$20 million a year to oversee a complex industry involving billions of dollars and thousands of radio-TV station operators.

The staff of the FCC has gone on record as advocating that the agency be given the power to regulate the huge television networks as well as individual stations. The recommendations came after massive research. An Office of Network Study was established for the purpose.

For the last 2 years, that office has been idle. Now it is going to be abolished. The FCC, except for an occasional blistering dissent from a lonely Commissioner, has gone on record as saying it does not feel its function is to restructure the broadcast industry.

Yet, the industry is being restructured by the networks themselves, to the detriment of the public.

Having gained control of the electronic pipeline, the networks gained control of the program schedule. Having gained control of program schedules, the networks are gaining control of production facilities. They are closing off competition. What next? Movies, for one thing. The networks now are going into the business of producing feature films. Community antenna systems for another. This means that the networks may assume control of 20 channels—soon to be expanded to 40 channels—into the Nation's homes.

The FCC has certain "duopoly" rules that prohibit ownership of more than one television station in a market. If networks are permitted to own and operate community antenna television systems, the duopoly rule could become meaningless.

Will it happen? There is excellent reason to think it might.

Our fundamental legislation, the Communications Act of 1934, was designed for an age of canal boats, not space communications. It is outdated, outmoded and insufficient to handle the current technology and economic explosions in broadcasting.

We do know that the networks are

ready to take advantage of whatever profitmaking situation may exist while the guardian of the public interest, the FCC, is concerning itself with relatively trivial matters based on patchwork rules and regulations which are becoming increasingly meaningless.

Aircraft Noise Abatement

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, for years, those of us who live near major airports and who represent airport neighbors have been seeking legislation to curb the problem of aircraft noise. We have felt like voices crying in the wilderness. I assume that we have failed to capture the imagination and assistance of our colleagues because they do not have the problem and cannot believe that the noise problem is as great as we have pictured it. I can assure each of you that we do not exaggerate. I can also assure you that, as the jet fleet enlarges and the planes increase in size and power, more and more of you will find yourselves faced with this problem.

The responsibility for aircraft noise abatement has been passed from one agency to another, including local agencies—it has been a classic example of passing the buck.

President Johnson has called for action in this area, and our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held some hearings on H.R. 3400 and related bills, including my bill H.R. 7266. I urge my colleagues on this committee to expedite this legislation.

The National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council has been one forum where all segments of the air transportation industry have been members, a meeting-place, so to speak, where all viewpoints might be considered. Now, it appears that this is breaking down. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in today's edition of the New York Times which reports on the withdrawal from the council of the Airport Operators Council International and further substantiates our demands and claims:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1968]

AIRPORTS FORSAKE ANTINOISE GROUP: ASSAIL MANUFACTURERS AND LINES—ASK U.S. ACTION

(By Evert Clark)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The nation's airport operators have withdrawn from an industry-wide anti-noise council, denouncing airlines and aircraft manufacturers for laying "a smokescreen" over the problem of jet noise.

The action brought to light other evidence of dissatisfaction with the anti-noise council and is likely to stir interest in Congress, where the airport operators have helped lead the attack on aircraft noise.

The antinoise group, called the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, was formed nine years ago. It has been the principal industry antinoise group and the in-

dustry's chief liaison with the Federal Government on noise problems.

Its members include airlines, manufacturers, pilots and, until now, the airport operators. But it became known today that the Air Line Pilots Association ended its financial support of the antinoise group about a month ago and now offers only technical advice.

One pilot source said that many pilots considered the antinoise council "a hoax on the public" because it attempted to gloss over noise problems.

The withdrawal of the Airport Operators Council International was voted by that group directors in San Diego yesterday and was explained today in statements issued here at the group's headquarters. The group, which claims to represent airports handling 86 per cent of the airline business in the nation, said that further membership would be "futile."

CALLED A FEDERAL MATTER

"We of the airport segment of the aviation industry are tired of being the scapegoat for the airlines and manufacturers," James R. Mettler, president of the airport group, said in a statement issued here today. He went on.

"As operators of airports, we can exercise no control over types of aircraft being built for the airlines. We have no control over flight patterns or air routes or air schedules.

"In brief, this is a Federal matter and the sooner we achieve the necessary legislation, the sooner the public can be assured of noise relief."

The airport operators are the most frequent targets of the numerous antinoise suits brought by citizens across the country. The airlines generally take the stand that they fly planes built by someone else along flight patterns set by the Federal Government and are not primarily responsible for the noise the planes make over any given community.

UNITY EFFORT LAGS

In the last few years the Federal Government has taken the lead in trying to unite all segments of the industry in an attack on jet noise, but there has been little noticeable progress.

Although the Federal Aviation Administration has asked Congress for noise control legislation and at least 30 Congressmen have introduced such bills, no bills have been passed.

Many governmental experts, including some in aviation agency, insist that the agency could impose noise controls now, without waiting for new laws. It is understood that the Attorney General's office wrote an opinion to that effect more than a year ago.

But the aviation agency and its parent Department of Transportation take the view that they need a new mandate from Congress before they begin taking actions that could make the Government financially liable in noise damage suits.

The argument is that once the Government assumes the responsibility for controlling noise, it also assumes liability if noise gets out of control.

Critics of the agency charge that the proposed noise control law, as well as interagency antinoise programs, are "a joke" and "a crutch" that simply delay Federal action.

"As long as you can sit back and say you don't have a law, you don't have to do anything about noise," one critic said.

The antinoise council's board of directors accepted the airport operators' resignation today "with regret."

The airport operators urged immediate refitting of planes with quieter engines, faster research into still quieter engines, and "total support" for antinoise legislation. They also asked Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, for representation at all levels of the Federal interagency noise abatement program.

A Tribute to Abraham Lincoln and Carl Sandburg

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, on February 12, people throughout the world will observe the birthdate of the man whom many regard as our greater American—Abraham Lincoln. I therefore believe it to be particularly fitting to call attention at this time to the life and works of another very great American—one whose own life became inextricably involved and interwoven with that of Lincoln. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the biographer of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg.

Poet, historian, and troubadour, Carl Sandburg will be forever remembered for his superb biography of Lincoln and his paean to America, *The People, Yes*.

Carl Sandburg's integrity and intellectual honesty, his literary attainments and his rich voice will make his life and works a source of inspiration for generations to come.

Carl Sandburg died on July 22, 1967 at the age of 89. Throughout the country various memorial services and exhibitions of his works have been held—and are now being held—to commemorate this extraordinary American. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that a Sandburg exhibition consisting of various manuscripts, correspondence, phonograph recordings and other memorabilia is now on display at the Library of Congress. The exhibition will be open daily to the public until February 18, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I know that one of my most thrilling experiences since coming to Congress was the opportunity, on February 12, 1959, to hear Mr. Sandburg address a joint session of Congress in commemoration of the 150th birthday anniversary of Lincoln—a session presided over by our late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. I am sure that all of us who sat in spellbound silence to hear Mr. Sandburg's address will never forget it.

In past generations, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sandburg's magnificent voice would have been lost to the world. Fortunately, that voice has been preserved for future generations in a unique collection of more than 165 tape recordings of Mr. Sandburg, assembled by Mr. Leo Orso, president of Orsonic Recording Services of Washington, D.C., and a personal friend of Mr. Sandburg.

This remarkable collection of Sandburg recordings is now housed at Wayne State University in Detroit, Mich. The university obtained the collection through the generosity of five of America's outstanding labor unions, the International Labor Press Association, the United Automobile Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the United Steelworkers of America, and the Amalgamated Meat Cutters of North America, all of the AFL-CIO. As a tribute to Carl Sandburg—for his many long years of effort in advancing the cause of social justice

for American working men and women—these unions donated the tapes to Wayne State University.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Orso and these labor organizations are to be highly commended for their part in assembling and preserving these Sandburg recordings. I am sure that these tapes will bring inspiration and enrichment to generations far into the future.

Included in the collection are such speeches as the address to Congress to which I have referred, news programs, press conferences, readings from Mr. Sandburg's own books, critical evaluations of the arts and current affairs, and a rich heritage of Mr. Sandburg's own philosophy. Of special interest to future historians and scholars are two bound volumes of a typed verbatim transcript of more than 1,200 pages covering the tape contents.

Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Mr. Sandburg's historic appearance before the joint session of Congress on February 12, 1959, and in observance of the birthdate of Abraham Lincoln, I insert at this point in the RECORD Carl Sandburg's address on that occasion:

INTRODUCTION BY SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER. And now it becomes my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to be able to present to you the man who in all probability knows more about the life, the times, the hopes, and the aspirations of Abraham Lincoln than any other human being. He has studied and has put on paper his conceptions of the towering figure of this great and this good man. I take pleasure and I deem it an honor to be able to present to you this great writer, this great historian, Carl Sandburg.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY CARL SANDBURG, FEBRUARY 12, 1959, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. SANDBURG. Before beginning this prepared address, I must make the remark that this introduction, this reception here calls for humility rather than pride. I am well aware of that.

Not often in the story of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect. Here and there across centuries come reports of men alleged to have these contrasts. And the incomparable Abraham Lincoln born 150 years ago this day, is an approach if not a perfect realization of this character. In the time of the April lilacs in the year 1865, on his death, the casket with his body was carried north and west a thousand miles; and the American people wept as never before; bells sobbed, cities wore crepe; people stood in tears and with hats off as the railroad burial car paused in leading cities of seven States ending its journey at Springfield, Ill., the hometown. During the 4 years he was President he at times, especially in the first 3 months, took to himself the powers of a dictator; he commanded the most powerful armies till then assembled in modern warfare; he enforced conscription of soldiers for the first time in American history; under imperative necessity he abolished the right of habeas corpus; he directed politically and spiritually the wild, massive turbulent forces let loose in civil war; he argued and pleaded for compensated emancipation of the slaves. The slaves were property, they were on the tax-books along with horses and cattle, the valuation of each slave written next to his name on the tax assessor's books. Falling to

get action on compensated emancipation, as a Chief Executive having war powers he issued the paper by which he declared the slaves to be free under military necessity. In the end nearly \$4 million worth of property was taken away from those who were legal owners of it, property confiscated, wiped out as by fire and turned to ashes, at his instigation and executive direction. Chattel property recognized and lawful for 300 years was expropriated, seized without payment.

In the month the war began he told his secretary, John Hay:

"My policy is to have no policy."

Three years later in a letter to a Kentucky friend made public, he confessed plainly:

"I have been controlled by events."

His words at Gettysburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar:

"We cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far beyond our poor power to add or detract."

He could have said "the brave Union men." Did he have a purpose in omitting the word "Union?" Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation? Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there? We do not know, of a certainty. Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over the double grave, "God knows which was right?" We do not know. His changing policies from time to time aimed at saving the Union. In the end his armies won and his Nation became a world power. In August of 1864 he wrote a memorandum that he expected in view of the national situation, to lose the next November election. That month of August was so dark. Sudden military victory brought the tide his way; the vote was 2,200,000 for him and 1,800,000 against him. Among his bitter opponents were such figures as Samuel F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, and Cyrus H. McCormick, inventor of the farm reaper. In all its essential propositions the southern Confederacy had the moral support of powerful, respectable elements throughout the North, probably more than a million voters believing in the justice of the southern cause. While the war winds howled he insisted that the Mississippi was one river meant to belong to one country, that railroad connection from coast to coast must be pushed through and the Union Pacific Railroad made a reality. While the luck of war wavered and broke and came again, as generals failed and campaigns were lost, he held enough forces of the north together to raise new armies and supply them, until generals were found who made war as victorious war has always been made, with terror, frightfulness, destruction, and on both sides, North and South, valor and sacrifice past words of man to tell. In the mixed shame and blame of the immense wrongs of two crashing civilizations, often with nothing to say, he said nothing, slept not at all, and on occasions he was seen to weep in a way that made weeping appropriate, decent, majestic. As he rode alone on horseback near Soldiers Home on the edge of Washington one night his hat was shot off; a son he loved died as he watched at the bed; his wife was accused of betraying information to the enemy, until denials from him were necessary. An Indiana man at the White House heard him say, "Voorhees, don't it seem strange to you that I, who could never so much as cut off the head of a chicken, should be elected, or selected, into the midst of all this blood?" He tried to guide Gen-

eral Nathaniel Prentiss Banks, a Democrat, three times Governor of Massachusetts, in the governing of some 17 of the 48 parishes of Louisiana controlled by the Union armies, an area holding a fourth of the slaves of Louisiana. He would like to see the State recognize the emancipation proclamation:

"And while she is at it, I think it would not be objectionable for her to adopt some practical system by which the two races could gradually live themselves out of their old relation to each other, and both come out better prepared for the new. Education for the young blacks should be included in the plan."

To Gov. Michel Hahn, elected in 1864 by a majority of the 11,000 white male voters who had taken the oath of allegiance to the Union, Lincoln wrote:

"Now you are about to have a convention which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise, I barely suggest for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in—as for instance, the very intelligent and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks."

Among the million words in the Lincoln utterance record, he interprets himself with a more keen precision than someone else offering to explain him. His simple opening of the "house divided" speech in 1858 serves for today:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

To his Kentucky friend, Joshua F. Speed, he wrote in 1855:

"Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty."

Infinitely tender was his word from a White House balcony to a crowd on the White House lawn:

"I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom."

Or to a military Governor:

"I shall do nothing through malice; what I deal with is too vast for malice."

He wrote for Congress to read on December 1, 1862:

"In times like the present men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

Like an ancient psalmist he warned Congress:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

Wanting Congress to break and forget past traditions his words came keen and flashing:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for this stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenfranchise ourselves."

They are the sort of words that actuated the mind and will of the men who created and navigated that marvel of the sea, the *Nautilus*, and her voyage from Pearl Harbor and under the North Pole icecap.

The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own. He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. "Look where he came from—don't he know all us strugglers and wasn't he a kind of tough struggler all his life right up to the finish?" Something like that you can hear in any nearby neighborhood and across the seas. Millions there are who take him as a personal treas-

ure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world. Democracy? We cannot say exactly what it is, but he had it. In his blood and bones he carried it. In the breath of his speeches and writings it is there. Popular government? Republican institutions? Government where the people have the say—so, one way or another telling their elected leaders what they want? He had the idea. It is there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a mystery that can be lived but never fully spoken in words.

Our good friend, the poet and playwright Mark Van Doren, tells us:

"To me, Lincoln seems, in some ways, the most interesting man who ever lived. He was gentle but this gentleness was combined with a terrific toughness, an iron strength."

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? Something of it is in this present occasion, the atmosphere of this room. His beloved friend, Representative Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, had died in May of 1864, and friends wrote to Lincoln and he replied that the pressure of duties kept him from joining them in efforts for a marble monument to Lovejoy, the last sentence of Lincoln's letter, saying:

"Let him have the marble monument along with the well-secured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men."

Today we may say, perhaps, that the well-secured and most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there, today, tomorrow, and for a long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of lovers of liberty, men and women—this country has always had them in crises—men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

I thank you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The Public Safety

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post in its edition of February 8 editorialized about the President's crime message. It supports his Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PUBLIC SAFETY

The special Message proposing measures to meet the challenge of crime, sent to the Congress by President Johnson on Wednesday, reads like an indictment—a true bill charging the Congress, state legislatures and municipal governments all over the country with tragic and terrible neglect of the public safety. The indictment is all the more searing because it is now a familiar one. Its substance was presented to Congress by the President a year ago, and in another Message sent a year before that. The shocking conditions it depicts were documented by the detailed report of the National Crime Commission. And so were the remedies which the President has repeatedly urged.

But Congress has done nothing—literally nothing—about the President's recommendations. The House played politics with them in a frivolous, reckless way, passing a bill last year that warped them into a kind of pork barrel. In the Senate, a cabal has obstinately tried to require a sacrifice of the right to privacy as the price of protecting public safety. And all the while constructive action has been at a standstill.

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act

has not been enacted. The Right to Privacy Act, also recommended by the President, has been virtually disregarded. The firearms control legislation, for which the President has pleaded again and again, has been cynically pigeonholed at the behest of a lobby content to let Americans be shot down by the thousands like varmints in order to protect the dangerous prerogatives of constituents it calls "sportsmen."

Mr. Johnson takes a thoroughly realistic view of the crime problem. He knows that it is essentially a local matter. "Under our constitutional system," as he says, "the prevention and punishment of crime in the streets is committed to state and local governments. It is essentially the task of mayors and local police, supported by their governors."

It is becoming more and more evident all the time that crime is a social sickness growing in large measure out of neglect and corruption of the country's youth. When we face the figures cited by the President—that three out of four of those arrested for larceny, burglary and auto theft and half of those arrested for homicide, rape, robbery and assault were under 24 years of age, we can hardly blame them or their Creator for their criminality. The President is quite right: "No child is born a criminal." It is the environment in which he lives that makes him one.

The President proposes to have the Federal Government help local governments deal with juvenile delinquency and drug addiction and alcoholism and the proliferation of firearms and other crime-breeding social ills. And he proposes to do it by measures which respect the civil liberties which are this country's glory. It is more than time for Congress to support him in a practical approach to this most pressing of all domestic problems.

A Drive for Unity in Greece

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an article on the editorial page of the February 5 New York Times reports on an effort by Greek exiles "to forge a united democratic front to force the military junta from power in Athens." The article, which documents part of the extensive terror and oppression that have existed in Greece since the junta took over last April, follows:

GREEK EXILES SEEK UNITY AGAINST THE JUNTA

(By Graham Hovey)

Prominent Greek exiles of differing political backgrounds have launched an effort to forge a united democratic front to force the military junta from power in Athens. Some of them say that, if they fail, the United States and the other NATO allies may eventually face "another Vietnam" in Greece.

They are convinced that the junta intends to cling to power indefinitely, with a Constitution rigged to that end, but that its oppressive policies will eventually ignite a popular explosion. Unless the democratic forces can unite, they say, the Communists will dominate the emergent resistance movement.

Many of them believe, however, that a solid democratic front, if supported by the United States and other allies, could still force the junta to leave peacefully. In any event, they see this effort as the only alternative to a civil war that could easily become a wider, big-power conflict.

American pressure is so important for their objective that these Greeks were dismayed two weeks ago, when Washington announced resumption of "normal diplomatic contacts" with the Athens regime. They felt this was a concession that should have been considered only after specific moves by the junta toward democratic, constitutional government. They would regard it a disaster if Washington followed its initial action by resuming the regular military aid suspended after the coup of last April.

Some who have come from Greece recently fear Washington is not yet fully sensitive to the extremist character of the regime or the drastic nature of its purges. They reject the argument that arms aid must be resumed in the overall NATO interest because they say the purge of nearly every experienced high-ranking officer has divided and bewildered the armed forces and made them a liability for the Atlantic Alliance.

THE JUNTA'S PURGE

The junta began by concentrating on persecution of leftists and politicians of George Papandreu's Center Union, but gradually extended its purge into the very citadels of Greece's "Establishment." In the last month alone it has removed 56 university professors; four leading bankers, including the governor of the Bank of Greece; four ambassadors and other senior diplomats, and an additional 79 army officers. It has brought the arraignment of the former Primate of Greece and the Bishop of Salonika. Over a longer period the junta has purged the staggering total of 115,000 mayors and municipal council members.

Greek democrats fear that the extent of the purge and police terror has been obscured abroad by such junta gestures as the freeing of Andreas Papandreu and the dropping of charges against the publisher, Mrs. Helen Vlachos.

They believe the purge of left and right alike indicates that the junta plans to take Greece on a dangerous new course. In this connection they speak of the possibility of a grim future choice between a Nasser-type regime under the colonels or a Communist take-over. This specter gives urgency and a note of panic to their drive for a democratic front, anchored on the Papandreu's Center Union and the rival National Radical Union.

Success will depend heavily on attitudes of the three most prominent exiles: King Constantine, Andreas Papandreu and former Premier Constantine Carmanlis. They fought bitterly in the past and may still differ radically.

Even exiles long critical of the royal family believe the King, despite his failure to oust the junta in December, must now be the symbol for uniting all democrats. It is doubtful that Andreas Papandreu, still bitter over Constantine's ouster of his father as Premier in 1965, will agree. He has told Newsweek that the King is "the wrong symbol for the revolution against the junta," though he does not oppose a constitutional monarchy.

Mr. Papandreu believes the King should stay out of Greece until democratic institutions are restored. The King says he will return if the junta meets conditions that include publication of a new Constitution, fixing a date for a vote on it, free parliamentary elections and a free press. It will take delicate negotiations to bring the two men together.

CARMANLIS IN THE WINGS

With Mr. Carmanlis, whose governments brought Greece its greatest postwar stability and growth, the problem is mostly hurt pride. He has waited in Paris four years for a popular call home that has not come. He demanded in November that the junta quit but has not spoken out since the King's counter-coup.

Greeks working for a democratic front do not discount the obstacles, but they are con-

ident that their effort will arouse positive response inside Greece. They take heart from the fact that Andreas Papandreu, never the most conciliatory of Greeks, said after his arrival in Paris: "All disputes must be laid to rest. I did not come out of Greece to re-vitalize old quarrels."

Rich Man's Peace Corps

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective U.S. foreign assistance programs in existence today is being carried out by an organization fondly known as the "Rich Man's Peace Corps." This private organization, officially known as the International Executive Service Corps, recruits topflight retired U.S. businessmen to advise local private enterprise in less developed countries. The result has often been a significant increase in local industrial productivity as these men have helped local businessmen solve a multitude of managerial and technical problems.

Financially, not one of these men have anything to gain from tackling the often complex problems of industrial development. But they are justly rewarded in the personal satisfaction derived from knowing that their talents are needed. We as a nation are rewarded by the positive example these men leave behind in these developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have long argued that the retired population in this country represents an unusually potent source of talent for public service. I can think of no better illustration of this "elder power" than the International Executive Service Corps. I wish to insert into the RECORD an article from a leading U.S. newspaper which describes the success of this program. I know my colleagues in the House will find this article informative. It follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 28, 1968]

BRAINS YIELD BIG PROFITS IN "RICH MAN'S PEACE CORPS"

The International Executive Service corps, better known as the "Rich Man's Peace Corps," has had an impact around the world—an impact far out of proportion to its numbers and budget. In South America the retired businessmen of the corps have increased productivity, helped create jobs and brought the experience of years to specific industrial problems.

This is the way it works:

A manufacturing plant—perhaps in Brazil's great industrial complex in São Paulo—asks for assistance. The corps checks its background carefully. Is it an important, essential plant? Will its success help in the economic growth of the developing country? Will the management co-operate and make modest financial contribution to the cost of the corps' project? If the answers are yes, the corps turns to its list of available American executives, most of them retired, who might be able to help.

"What it comes down to," says an official "is that these firms get some of the best business and industrial brains in America—men with years of experience who might have been earning \$1,000 a day when they retired. "One man came here to help a luggage

manufacturer. When he left a few months later he gave them five patents for new designs, complete with specifications. They can use them only in Brazil, but it has meant a great deal to the firm. They want him to come back."

The International Executive Service corps originally was a David Rockefeller project. Now, it receives some aid funds, but it is run as a private and independent organization. Scores of American firms are sponsor members and there is foundation help in addition to the fee for the executive adviser paid by the firm he assists.

"The beauty of it," says an official, "is that the men who come here to help are exactly the type needed for the job. Most of them have the kind of experience that goes 'way back. They remember what it was like when they started as young men and what industrial conditions were like then. Sometimes you have the same problem in industries in the developing countries."

"A young engineer might come down here and say, 'You've got to buy a million dollars worth of new equipment to make this thing work right.' But these people can't always do that. One of our retired executives may look around the plant and say, 'You can make a big improvement here with a longer conveyor belt.' That might cost a hundred dollars.

"Another thing is that these men don't threaten anyone's job. All the local executives know that he'll be there only a few months. His experience and knowledge are used, but he's not about to move anybody out. And he's not taking a big salary, even for the short time he's there. For the corpsman and his wife, it's a great adventure. For the company he helps, it's a gesture from an American done purely out of good will."

Anyone can volunteer for the I. E. S. C. which has its headquarters in New York, although most of the men are executives who have recently retired or are about to retire. Man who can get a leave of absence from their companies for a few months also are eligible.

The I. E. S. C., of course, screens the applicants carefully. In developing nations many industries are family affairs and in certain areas, notably Latin America, a sense of pride makes some reluctant to ask for assistance. The corps can't use the type who would throw his weight around, order people about and insist they do it his way. That would do more harm than good.

The "Rich Man's Peace Corps," is one of those inspired ideas that really works. For a little money an industry in an underdeveloped nation can hire some of the best brains and experience available anywhere—talent that couldn't be bought in the United States at any price. The hope now is to expand the concept in other fields of need.

Support Grows for Amendment to Surplus Property Act

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, nearly half the States of this Nation have indicated their support of H.R. 10189, my bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes.

The explosive population growth in our metropolitan areas, particularly in the suburban areas, is devouring land at a tremendous rate, and the resulting

physical expansion has been so rapid as to make the preservation of some remaining land for parks, playgrounds, and recreation areas, increasingly difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to act swiftly on this bill as every day increased population places more pressure on available land and demands added recreational facilities.

I am pleased that so many States support this bill, and I have unanimous consent that these letters of support be printed in the RECORD. They are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Honolulu, Hawaii, June 10, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you very much for your letter and transmittal of June 5, 1967, informing us of your introduction of H.R. 10189. As the State Liaison Officer to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in implementing the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964 in Hawaii, I am very pleased to learn of your strong interest in outdoor recreation and your key action.

Your remarks on the problems of preserving lands for open space and recreation, and the need for the Federal Government to more positively ensure their availability to local governments, are most eloquent. We are in full accord with your proposal and wish to hereby indicate our support for H.R. 10189.

Sincerely,

SHELLEY M. MARK.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Your remarks made in the House of Representatives concerning H.R. 10189 clearly describe the problem we face in providing needed recreation areas in our urban communities. As the official planning agency for the State of Illinois, the Department of Business and Economic Development strongly endorses your position in this matter, and supports your bill which would provide for donation of certain surplus Federal properties to the states and their subdivisions for recreational use.

The number of applications for Federal assistance toward the acquisition of urban recreation areas in Illinois communities is growing. The funds available for such assistance are insufficient to meet community needs. H.R. 10189 is not only consistent with the Federal outdoor recreation program and the recreation program in the State of Illinois, it is a logical and timely proposal which will contribute to the solution of one or our most pressing developmental problems.

Sincerely,

GENE H. GRAVES.

STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
Des Moines, Iowa, June 9, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: We are in receipt of your communication dated June 5, 1967, in which you bring to our attention legislation tabbed H.R. 10189, which would in effect amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944. It is our understanding that your amendment would also allow certain surplus federal properties to be donated to the states and their subdivisions for the purpose of creating parks and recreational areas.

Please rest assured that it is our intent to

lend our assistance in gaining favorable consideration of H.R. 10189.

It is pleasant to note that consideration for acquisition of such property is given to both state government and their subdivisions. In the formulation of overall recreation plans for the benefit of the entire state, it would seem wise to us to incorporate solidly a procedure which would allow state government the number one priority in agencies acquiring such lands.

Thank you for your consideration in forwarding this information regarding H.R. 10189 to my office.

Very truly yours,

E. B. SPEAKER,
Director.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,
Frankfort, July 11, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Commissioner Joyner referred your letter of June 5 and a copy of your legislation amending the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to me for review and comment. I am directly involved in the administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in Kentucky and have had the opportunity to become acquainted with the problems facing state and local agencies in attempting to acquire recreation land.

As you stated in your remarks accompanying the bill, local agencies are finding it nearly impossible to acquire recreation lands when competing with industrial and residential developers and the state agencies have to pay increasingly higher prices for necessary land.

Even though the receipts from the sale of surplus Federal lands make up a portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it seems to me that more facilities could be provided for more people by conveying surplus land with no monetary consideration. This would allow the state and local agencies to use funds, originally needed to purchase such land, for development of facilities and the acquisition of additional open space.

Your amendment is certainly reasonable, particularly in the light of the Federal government's programs to provide recreation space and we feel it would be beneficial to Kentucky.

Sincerely,

TED BRADSHAW,
Assistant to Commissioner.

STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Baton Rouge, La., June 14, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter and attachments in regard to the proposed legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, allowing surplus Federal properties to be donated to the States and their subdivisions for parks and recreation areas.

In view of the escalation of land values and the outdoor recreational need, we concur with your proposal.

Yours very truly,

LAMAR GIRSON,
Director-Liaison Officer.
CLYDE FUNDERBURK,
Executive Assistant.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Boston, June 28, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Thank you for your letter of June 5 and the material for-

warded therewith. I am in favor of the objective of H.R. 10189, and will be delighted to do whatever possible to insure favorable consideration of this legislation.

As you are aware, land acquisition in such states of high population density and small land area, such as Massachusetts, is presenting an increasingly difficult problem.

It seems incongruous to me that certain surplus properties should be made available to the states for hunting and fishing purposes at no cost, while we are obliged to pay substantial sums to acquire similar properties for other recreational purposes.

The Commonwealth has acquired recently a portion of the Cohasset Annex of the former Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot at a cost in excess of \$300,000. This is a most desirable property for recreation purposes as it lies within the Boston metropolitan area with a population in excess of 2,000,000.

It seems to me that the cause of outdoor recreation would have been far better served had we been able to acquire this area without charge and had used the money received for the purchase cost for development purposes.

With assurance of my support for this legislation, I remain

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. YASI,
Commissioner.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Lansing, June 19, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for your letter of June 5, 1967, and the copy of H.R. 10189. We appreciate receiving this and your remarks to the Congress on your amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Please be assured that the Michigan Department of Conservation heartily endorses your amendment to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes.

Your remarks to Congress are very indicative of the situation in southern Michigan. Over 88 per cent of our population resides in the southern one-third of our state. Yet the vast majority of our public land ownership lies in the upper portion of the state. The urgency for more open space near and within our cities is appropriately mentioned in your remarks.

As you may be aware, Michigan submitted a \$378 million dollar outdoor recreation program to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The majority of this program will benefit the urban centers of southern Michigan. Within this area there undoubtedly is land that will someday be declared surplus that could be used for park and recreational purposes.

Again let me express our support and offer to assist you in the adoption of H.R. 10189.

Sincerely,

RALPH A. MACMULLAN,
Director.

STATE PARK SYSTEM,
Jackson, Miss., June 22, 1967.
Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Thank you very much for your letter of June 5, informing us of the introduction of H.R. Bill 10189, which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to permit the donation of surplus Federal properties to states and their political subdivisions for parks and recreational areas.

We are very much in accord with this amendment and feel that it will be a great boon to recreational development. It is apparent that you have a real grasp of the need for conserving our land resources for recreational development, and we wish for you every success in your endeavor.

We shall certainly contact our Congressmen and ask their support for your bill.

Sincerely,

R. E. FOSTER,
Comptroller.

STATE OF MONTANA,
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
Helena, June 23, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: We were most pleased to receive copies of your proposed legislation, H.R. 10189, with your nice letter of June 5th.

As official recreation agency for the State of Montana, we feel that your bill which would allow certain surplus federal properties to be donated to the states and their subdivisions for the purpose of parks and recreation agencies, would be most beneficial to these important programs.

Very sincerely,

FRANK H. DUNKLE,
State Fish and Game Director.
By: ROBERT F. COONEY,
State Liaison Officer.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
July 10, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Thank you for your recent communique relative to H.R. 10189 which was introduced by you in the House of Representatives on May 22, 1967.

I have had an opportunity to review the bill and the copy of your remarks on the Floor of the House at the time it was introduced and, in all due candor, I can state that I am in full accord with your observations and your concrete proposal to assist the States and the local levels of government in connection with this problem.

I note that this bill, which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. I would appreciate your keeping me apprised as to the progress of this legislation.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. ROE,
Commissioner.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, June 16, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Your bill, HR 10189, which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to improve the present plan for disposal of surplus property, should be a great service to our states and subdivisions in regard to parks and recreational areas.

I appreciate your sending me a copy of this bill for my comments.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

DAN MOORE.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
STATE PLANNING OFFICE,
Santa Fe, June 13, 1967.

MR. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Thank you for your letter of June 5, advising me that you had introduced H.R. 10189. The State Planning Office of New Mexico is in complete accord with the purpose of this bill.

As you pointed out in your remarks on the Floor of the House, enclosed with your letter and a copy of H.R. 10189, the needs

for lands for park and recreation purposes are mounting daily. The beneficial effects of such uses of lands are, at least, equal to the benefits to be obtained from the uses of surplus properties for which no monetary consideration is required now.

It is only proper that the Surplus Property Act of 1944 be amended, as you have proposed, to recognize the importance of providing adequate public parks and recreation areas for the people.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR L. ORTIZ,
State Planning Officer.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Albany, June 26, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: I am in receipt of your letter of June 5, 1967 together with a copy of H.R. 10189, introduced by you in the House, and your statement in support thereof.

Inasmuch as there is a considerable amount of Federally owned property within the State of New York which could eventually be declared surplus, we strongly support the intent and spirit of this bill. However, we feel that conveyances for any purpose directed toward conservation or recreation should be without cost to the State, political subdivision or municipality. We would prefer that the various specific categories in present law be deleted and more general terms, such as "conservation or recreation purposes", be substituted.

I wish to express to you our sincere appreciation for an opportunity to comment on this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

R. STEWART KILBORNE,
Commissioner.

STATE OF OHIO, DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Columbus, July 5, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for your letter enclosing a copy of your amendment proposal to H.R. 10189, along with your introductory comments on the Floor of the House.

I am sure that this proposal will receive the support of park and recreation agencies at all levels of government as the means of acquiring lands for recreational purposes that could not otherwise be obtained.

We, as one agency, very much appreciate your efforts to give the park and recreation program impetus throughout the nation. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources will support the measure at every opportunity.

Sincerely,

FRED E. MORR,
Director.

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Salem, June 22, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Thank you for your letter and materials of June 5 regarding H.R. 10189, your proposal to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Our primary concern is in regard to the Bill's potential effect on income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The sale of surplus federal property has been a major source of revenue to the Land and Water Conservation Fund during its initial years, and we do not wish to support significant erosion of such sources. H.R. 10189, however, appears to assist recreational development

and if adopted as written should be of considerable assistance in that field.

While state and local agencies in Oregon have not secured large acreages of surplus federal lands in years past, this may become more important in the years ahead as recreation pressures increase and properly located lands become increasingly hard to find.

We appreciate your sending us the materials on the proposed legislation.

Very truly yours,

FORREST COOPER,
State Highway Engineer.

SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE RE-
SOURCES DEPARTMENT,
Columbia, June 8, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Your letter concerning H.R. 10189 has been referred to me. I would like to state that I favor it very much and will be delighted to write the South Carolina Congressmen urging their support of this legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. MAY,
Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME, FISH, AND
PARKS,

Pierre S. Dak., June 21, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Thank you for informing me of the provisions of H.R. 10189.

The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks endorses H.R. 10189.

I am not presently aware of any surplus federal lands in South Dakota which are readily adapted to park use. However, I cannot think of any better use for such lands wherever they may exist.

Sincerely,

R. A. HODGINS,
Director.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT
OF CONSERVATION,
Nashville, June 12, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on your bill HR-10189, legislation which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to allow certain surplus federal properties to be donated to the states and their sub-divisions for the purpose of parks and recreational areas.

This is a proposal which I can wholeheartedly endorse. We are involved in a greatly expanded program of park and recreation area development in Tennessee at both the State and local levels and the availability of surplus federal properties to us without monetary consideration would be most beneficial. It is my understanding that educational institutions may receive such properties at the present time without monetary consideration and we believe it proper that park and recreation functions of governmental agencies be given the same consideration.

I am taking the liberty of mailing a copy of this reply to each member of the Tennessee congressional delegation and urge that they support HR-10189.

Sincerely,

E. BOYD GARRETT.

WASHINGTON STATE,
PARKS ASSOCIATION,
Bremerton, Wash, June 15, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: We were pleased to read that you have introduced a bill to permit

the government to donate surplus holdings to cities, counties, and state for park or recreational use. At our 18th annual Washington State Parks Association convention (October 1965) a resolution was adopted to give support to any bill which would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so that government surplus lands can be made available to public park or public recreation agencies at up to 100 per cent public benefit allowance.

Mr. Pelly, the Washington State Parks Association will give your bill all the support we can muster and also encourage other organizations to do likewise. In our next Association newsletter I would like to mention this bill and would be pleased if you would give me the number of your bill and any other information which could be used in our newsletter to inform our member organizations. I also would appreciate any suggestions you may have for us in supporting your bill. We deeply appreciate your interest in helping parks and recreation.

Yours truly,

S. P. "PAT" CAREY,
Vice President.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, June 12, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your letter of June 5 calling my attention to H.R. 10189. This amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944 is most timely.

The federal, state and local units of government are presently struggling to acquire the needed open space and park lands. As you are aware, many states have passed sizable bond issues and other special taxes designed for this purpose. The population growth and the land price escalation coupled with the citizens' desire for outdoor recreation make it most difficult to acquire the needed acres.

The value to the nation in having open space and park lands where its citizens can pause and recreate and restructure their thinking cannot be minimized. Your bill H.R. 10189 can greatly contribute to the fulfillment of this need.

May I wish you success in its final passage.

Very truly yours,

L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

WYOMING RECREATION COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, July 3, 1967.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for the information concerning your H.R. 10189. We in Wyoming are certainly quite aware that your amendment would aid our State Parks and Recreation Program tremendously.

I am preparing a letter of endorsement of the amendment to our Wyoming Congressional Delegation and enclose a copy of the correspondence for your files.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. RODERMEL,
Director.

JUNE 23, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRISON: The Wyoming Recreation Commission is vitally interested in Representative Thomas M. Pelly's H.R. 10189, which amends the Surplus Property Act of 1944. The amendment would allow certain surplus Federal properties to be donated to the states and their subdivisions for the purpose of parks and recreational areas.

Our state appropriation has been extremely small over the past years to the State Parks Commission. Now that the State Parks Commission has been combined with the Land and Water Conservation Commission, we must pinch our purse strings even tighter.

Should surplus properties become available to us, you can rest assured that we stand to profit. Your support of the amendment would be most helpful to us.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. RODERMEL,
Director.

The above letter also sent to Senator GALE McGEE and Senator HANSEN.

Mallory Decision Blocks Justice Again

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Supreme Court handed down a decision which freed a guilty rapist. Known as the Mallory case, the action was based purely upon a technicality—that of requiring a suspect to be immediately arraigned before a magistrate following arrest. Already that strange decision has forced the release of a number of desperate criminals. The Nation's Capitol has been shocked by the recent release of a self-confessed killer, not because of any mistreatment of the criminal, or any claim he was denied his legitimate rights ordinarily required during an investigation and trial, but only because of a slight delay in arraignment of the guilty man.

It will be recalled that the House of Representatives on two occasions, several years ago, approved legislation designed to correct the Court's error. But in each instance the House action was blocked in the Senate. Recently we succeeded in getting some language approved in an anticrime bill which is applicable to the District of Columbia. We can only hope this effort will not be knocked down when it is tested before the Supreme Court.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the February 6, 1968, edition of the Evening Star. That editorial follows:

UNPUNISHED MURDER

With obvious reluctance, a District judge last week freed the self-confessed killer of the widow of James F. Mitchell, a prominent Washington physician.

What this miscarriage of justice puts before us is a shocking example of the Mallory Rule at work—the rule which, to the dismay of this community's "liberal" element, has been modified to some extent by Title III of the new District crime law.

Mrs. Mitchell was suffocated in her Dupont Circle home two years ago by Harry Gross in a dispute over money. Gross, a handyman, confessed after lie detector tests had pointed to him as the guilty party. Now, there was no claim that any third degree tactics had been used by the police, no contention that the confession was not voluntary. And, of course, there was nothing at all to indicate that the jury had found an innocent man guilty of this murder.

The police, however, had waited four hours after the lie detector tests before taking Gross to a magistrate for arraignment. And this delay, under the blindly mechanical operation of the Mallory Rule, was held by

the Court of Appeals to necessitate reversal of the conviction and, eventually, the release of the killer. The appellate judges probably were right, yet nothing could more clearly illustrate the wrong-headedness of the Mallory Rule—a rule concerned with a matter of procedure and not with the question of whether justice has been done.

Judge John J. Sirica said that he ordered the release of Gross "with reluctance," and that "if the new crime bill had been in effect when this man confessed he would not be set free today."

We hope that the moaners and the groaners will give a little thought to this—especially those who say, although they must know better, that Title III revives "arrests for investigation." It does nothing of the sort. Since Mallory had nothing whatever to do with any constitutional issue, we would also like to think that we have heard the last of the contention that Title III will be held unconstitutional "in the light of the Mallory Rule." This probably is a vain hope, however, since any such claim must spring not from deliberate misrepresentation but from total ignorance.

Title III may have its imperfections and if so Congress can correct them as experience demonstrates the fact. Meanwhile, we would rather take our chances with this new law than with a judicial rule which frees a confessed killer or a confessed rapist (Mallory) to walk the streets of this city.

C. Austin Barker and the Real Issues in the Gold Cover Question

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to remove the gold cover for Federal Reserve notes—see state of the Union message, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, page 143—raises serious questions of fiscal responsibility.

Better to understand the significance of this proposal, I have read the explanation by C. Austin Barker, a partner in the firm of Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes, and economist for that firm.

I commend to my colleagues for their consideration, Mr. Barker's concise yet comprehensive analysis, which follows:

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF 25-PERCENT GOLD COVER FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

In the President's State of the Union message on January 17th, one of his key recommendations was that having assured the world that America's full gold stock stood behind its commitment to maintain the price of gold at \$35 an ounce, it must back up this commitment "by legislating now to free our gold reserves". The president undoubtedly is referring to the fact that U.S. Treasury gold stock declined in recent months to \$11.984 billion, the lowest level in 30 years. Current estimates are that we lost about \$1 billion for the entire year. Of this total gold stock, about \$10.2 billion was to be held as backing for the Federal Reserve notes. Thus there is now less than \$2 billion of so-called "free gold", not counting a gold obligation of \$1 billion to the IMF.

Last year, there were bills prepared in the Senate and House to remove the gold cover but they were not pushed. In the new Congress bills already have been introduced in the House and Senate to remove the gold backing requirement for Federal Reserve notes. The announcement of one bill called

it "a necessary first step to ease the balance-of-payments problems" and further, that its removal would give the U.S. an additional \$10 billion to meet foreign demand for gold.

There is much misunderstanding of and misinformation on what the "gold cover" law really means. There have been numerous statements by government officials, Congressmen and others that we must repeal the gold cover law to free up our gold reserves so the entire gold stock stands behind the effort to hold down the price of gold to \$35 an ounce. For example, at various times when there has been a loss of confidence in the dollar or the pound, there arises a strong demand for gold in lieu of currencies and the U.S. is forced to dump its Treasury gold on the open market like a surplus commodity to prevent the price of gold from rising above \$35 an ounce. In the Bretton Woods agreement, the U.S. agreed to maintain the price of gold either by buying it at \$35 an ounce on the open market or by selling it at the same price. However, in view of our 17 years of balance-of-payments deficits since 1949 we have been forced to sell over \$12 billion of our Treasury gold to hold the price down and have been able to do very little buying. Such gold as we did buy was usually supplied by friendly nations as a good neighbor gesture.

Our gold cover law does not prevent the sale of gold by the U.S. but if such sale violates the 25% statutory reserve requirement, there are disciplinary measures which become mandatory and in themselves could correct the payments deficits by penalty taxes and penalty interest rate increases. These decisions must be followed by the U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve. What the gold cover removal advocates are saying by implication is that they do not wish to accept the disciplinary measures that are mandatory for balancing. This is the real policy issue that should be brought before the public so let us examine it.

The entire \$11.984 billion of U.S. monetary gold is already available for sale because the present gold cover law permits temporary and repeated suspensions of its application by the Fed in case the gold drops below the 25% limit. A previous Congress provided penalties in the gold cover requirement law if gold dropped below 25%. These penalties could be painful but were provided as a discipline to force future Administrations and Congress to actually eliminate the payments deficit. If the deficits become so serious that they would cause a drain on U.S. gold to a level below the statutory reserve requirement of 25% of outstanding Federal Reserve notes (our national paper currency), the penalties would become mandatory.

For example, if the gold drops below 25% to 20%, there is a mandatory requirement that the Fed charge a tax of not more than 1% against the Federal Reserve system and the Fed must add that percentage to its rediscount rate. Another stiffer tax and interest penalty follows if it drops below 20% to 17½%. In the latter case, there is a tax of 1½% and it is mandatory that a like percentage be added to the rediscount rate also. If the gold reserve drops from 17½% to 15%, another 1½% tax must be followed by another 1½% increase in the rediscount rate.

There is about \$41 billion of Federal Reserve notes outstanding. If the gold stock drained away to 20%, or \$8.2 billion, the first penalties operate. If it drains down to about \$7.2 billion (17½%), the second penalty steps operate and if it drains down to \$6.1 billion (15%), the third step of penalties operates. For example, if the Treasury taxes the Fed, say ½%, in this first step, this percentage would also be added to the rediscount rate of the Fed which is now 4½%. Thus the first change in rediscount rate would be to 4%. The second percentage rate added to the rediscount rate would bring it to 6½% and the third 1½% percentage points added to the rediscount rate

would bring it to 7½%. This would indeed induce monetary discipline on the entire economy and the high interest rates could either force Congress to cut back enough foreign aid and non-Vietnam military expenditures abroad to eliminate the payments deficit or, in themselves, bring a flow of capital in from abroad which would get our payments into balance (with some pain to foreign countries and a possible downturn in the U.S. economy if money rates alone had to do the job).

However, the imbedded discipline power in the present cover law is obviously not wanted by the Administration. A removal of the gold cover is not a necessary first step to ease the balance-of-payments problems. In itself, it will do nothing to help the payments deficit and may even cause harm through a further loss in confidence because its removal is considered a sign of weakness. Nor is its removal needed to assure the world that we will maintain the price of gold at \$35 an ounce because we can do that under the present gold cover system. The government is still spending enormous sums on foreign aid and military commitments abroad and is proposing further penalties on U.S. corporations' foreign subsidiaries, on bankers who lend abroad (trade credits) and on American travelers abroad in hopes of offsetting this military and foreign aid spending.

Our 1967 balance-of-payments deficit is not official yet but is hinted to be around \$4 billion. It would be more except for official arrangements whereby foreign official short-term assets in the U.S. were converted into "long-term" investments (investments of more than one year are statistically treated as capital inflow). Moreover, I suspect that some of the year-end rush of outflow may fall into calendar year 1968 so that the payments deficit probably is greater than has been reported to date and its economic effect is based on actualities, not statistics.

According to the latest official estimate available, a few months ago, the U.S. short-term liabilities to foreigners totaled \$35 billion (including the \$4.8 billion U.S. dollar holdings of the IMF). Moreover, the Fed had \$5 billion of currency "swap" credit last summer of which only \$800 million was used to stabilize gold and the dollar because of the Arab-Israeli War. By November 30, 1967, it had to apply for another \$1.75 billion of swap credit, following Britain's devaluation. A large proportion must have been used up in the British devaluation crisis and such U.S. swaps become due in six months.

We live in a world of exchange controls, IET, "voluntary programs" etc., and now many expect further controls which are not a remedy and only weaken confidence in the dollar and pit protectionism against free world trade. Thus, some who request the repeal of the gold cover law, by implication do not want this discipline of balancing to become mandatory. Some others who ask for its repeal simply do not like gold or our gold-exchange standard. Yet the latter have not devised a non-gold international (flat) money that will be acceptable in world trade or avoid worldwide inflation without excessive controls over people and money.

These are the real issues behind the gold cover drama.

Concurrent Resolution Introduced

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the amendment yesterday to the bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to prevent any Communist-

bloc country who supplies strategic materials to North Vietnam to obtain credit is an indication that the people of this Nation no longer intend to provide economic benefits to those nations who aid North Vietnam's war machine.

I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which, I think, will go further in stating this mood of the Congress and the American people.

The resolution expresses the sense of Congress "that the Government of the United States should not consider further expansions of trade and credit with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites unless there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Southeast Asia have been redirected toward insuring peace and an honorable settlement and unless there is demonstrable evidence that they agree to abandon their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation."

In the past, the Soviet Union has continued to turn to the United States for trade—particularly in industrial equipment and machinery, technological innovations, synthetics, lightweight metals—to overcome their own economic and technological gaps.

The Soviets have admitted that it is cheaper to buy such items here than to engage in the research, development and production themselves.

We increasingly today hear talk of detente and "building bridges," and President Johnson in his recent state of the Union address broached the idea of undertaking educational and cultural exchanges with China. He also mentioned the possibility of talk on exchange of basic food crop materials.

While there is a fashionable ring lately to words like detente and building bridges, we as a nation must never forget that we are at war. We must remember that we have more than 500,000 American men in Vietnam, and we are spending over \$25 billion a year—that is about \$70 million a day—in the fight there against the Communist aggressors.

We also must not lose sight of the fact that the Soviet Union supplies more than 80 percent of the war needs of our adversary. The Kremlin, then, holds a key to the solution of peace in Southeast Asia. For if, in the spirit of detente and Glassboro, the Kremlin stopped its aid to Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese would be forced to the conference tables.

Has our "bridge building" in the past year been successful? Indeed, the Soviets have increased their aid to North Vietnam and have refused to use their considerable influence to bring about a peace in Asia. They continue to pour money and material into Cuba and supply the guerrilla forces in Latin America. They were openly involved in the beginnings of the Arab-Israel war last June, and are now rebuilding the Arab Nations' war machine.

Certainly, all of us desire a relaxation of East-West tensions, a cooperative world of nations building bridges to peace. But there can be no peace until there is a peaceful solution in Vietnam.

Let us tell the Soviet Union and the Communist-bloc nations that peace is the price of trade with the United States. Let us say to the Kremlin that until there is a clear demonstration that they want

peace in Asia, not war, and are willing to work to that end, our storehouses and credit facilities are closed to them.

Some spokesmen will immediately point out that the Soviets only purchase items such as ballpoint pens and permanent press material. However, Bernard Baruch once said there was no such thing as a nonstrategic item in time of war.

The purchase of cheap, good quality ballpoint pens or whatever nonstrategic item it may be enables the Soviets to concentrate its resources and manpower on building SAM rockets, rifles, radars, and trucks for use in Vietnam.

Without the steady flow of material from other Communist countries, North Vietnam would be forced to the bargaining tables. If we continue to help the nations of the Communist bloc, we are seriously undercutting our own national efforts and those efforts of our fighting men in South Vietnam.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing this concurrent resolution, the text of which follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress recognizes the value of trade with other nations when there is maximum mutual benefit; and

Whereas it is also the policy of the Congress and the desire of the people of the United States to secure a just and honorable peace in South Vietnam; and

Whereas the Soviet Union and its East European satellites, by providing a vast majority of the materials of war furnished to North Vietnam to prosecute aggression against its neighbor, are in a position to exert influence to effect a peace in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas the Soviet Union and its East European satellites are evidently pursuing a policy designed to increase trade and expand credit with the United States; and

Whereas commerce is a powerful instrument not only for promoting international peace and good will but also as recognized weapons for preventing or prosecuting war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should not consider further expansions of trade and credit with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites unless there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Southeast Asia have been redirected toward insuring peace and an honorable settlement and unless there is demonstrable evidence that they agree to abandon their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation.

Time To Do What's Necessary: Nation Must Unshackle Military

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego, Calif., Union of February 1, 1968:

TIME TO DO WHAT IS NECESSARY: NATION MUST UNSHACKLE MILITARY

Is there an American whose blood is not boiling today; who does not think that American honor has been demeaned?

Several weeks ago the President of the United States of America said the allies were winning the war in South Vietnam.

The Communist contempt and response was instantaneous and unmistakable. Puny, primitive North Korea with no navy worthy of the name captured a highly important vessel of the United States and is holding the crew and ship while we impotently dance the diplomatic minuet.

Only a few American ships have been captured in history—none during the major world wars. And in each case the United States' retaliation was swift, sure and effective to prevent future piracy.

Now in another direct slap at our president and our nation, plainly labeled as such by the enemy, the North Vietnamese have launched their biggest offensive of the war in Southeast Asia on two battle fronts—the countryside and the cities.

They attacked the headquarters of the military commander in Vietnam. They besieged our embassy in Saigon for six hours and sent Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker into hiding. They attacked billets for military men, killed military personnel and civilians in the streets of all major cities in South Vietnam; destroyed millions of dollars worth of aircraft, attacked the presidential palace and raised the North Vietnamese flag in key areas.

For years our military men have been asking for the go-ahead signal in Vietnam to bring sure victory. We have the power to do it, the commanders to direct it and the resources to support it.

The determination to win our wars is woven into the tradition of America. We lost it in Korea in 1953, not on the battlefield, but at the diplomatic tables where the peace was half concluded.

We paid the price of that appeasement in the capture of the USS Pueblo by North Korea which can be interpreted as one of the reasons for intensification of Communist aggression today in South Vietnam.

Unless we alter the restraint policy on the military we will pay a far greater price. Already the pacification program for the countryside has been inestimably lengthened by the Viet Cong attacks in the cities. What farmer can believe he is safe from terrorism when his cousin in the city is not?

We will now have a harder time convincing our allies that we are not bogged down interminably in Vietnam at the expense of our other world responsibilities.

How will we be able to convince the world we are winning when our own embassy in Saigon is besieged? And think of the propaganda Ho Chi Minh now is beaming at Communist revolutionists!

This, however, is not the time to cry over spilt milk. It is time for men in government with the attitudes of Washington, Lincoln, Stephen Decatur, Theodore Roosevelt and John Paul Jones.

This is the time for men with the instinct for victory, the courage to do what must be done by ourselves for ourselves; and for men of wisdom who will listen to the military commanders who have been saying all along how best to do it.

Jet Noise Fight in the Open

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on more than 20 previous occasions I have addressed my colleagues in the House on the subject of aircraft noise—a menace which disrupts the lives of thousands of

our residents who live in the shadow of our Nation's airports.

I have repeatedly maintained that jet noise is a national problem which can only be reduced by Federal action. In August of 1965 I requested the President to appoint a White House Commission to study the problem and recommend Federal action. I commend the President for his immediate response and for his recognition of the problem. In February 1966, in his transportation message to the Congress, the President announced the appointment of a White House task force to "draft an action program to attack this problem."

As a result of the task force study and report the administration has requested passage of H.R. 3400, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum aircraft noise standards for use in certifying aircraft. Hearings were held on this legislation at the close of the first session of the 90th Congress. In addition I have introduced broader legislation, H.R. 1398, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish regulations on modifications of airports and of aircraft, to reduce noise and to encourage compatible land use planning programs at the local level to create noise buffer zones.

On January 17, 1968, I introduced H.R. 14677, a bill to create an airport-airway trust fund to finance airport development and aircraft noise research through the imposition of new taxes on aircraft fuel and to increase the aircraft passenger tax from 5 to 10 percent.

In testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, I expressed the view that the major obstacle to progress in reducing jet noise was the cost factor. I believe that American industry—the airlines and the aircraft engine manufacturers have the skill and know how to produce a quieter jet engine. This would admittedly be a costly project but it could bring relief—by reducing noise by 10 to 15 percent.

Last year I was advised that at least one or two of the largest aircraft engine manufacturers had already constructed prototypes of a quieter jet engine. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has started a 5-year, \$50 million program to develop a prototype. It seems to me that we could accelerate our effort to reduce jet noise by establishing noise standards now—to be applicable at a given date in the future and by making it crystal clear to the airplane manufacturers that unless the specifications are met by that time aircraft will not be certified.

On February 6, 1968, a major battle in the fight to reduce jet noise developed when the Airport Operators Council International withdrew from membership in the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, an industrywide organization formed 9 years ago to combat the jet noise problem.

The Airport Operators Council has supported Federal legislation to attack the noise problem. This organization has been a responsible spokesman for the airport operators. They have helped draw attention to the urgency of the problem by their action this week.

For the information of my colleagues, I place in the RECORD, at this point, the complete text of the release issued by the Airport Operators Council on February 6, 1968:

SAN DIEGO.—A major battle over jet aircraft noise loomed today when the operators of the nation's leading airports broke with the airlines and aircraft manufacturers, charging that efforts of these two segments of the aviation industry "have been largely a smoke screen which prevents solution of the noise problem."

Directors of the Airport Operators Council International, representing airports which handle 86% of the U.S. domestic airline business, in session here voted to withdraw from membership in the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, industry-wide organization which was formed 9 years ago to seek solutions to jet noise.

Termining further membership futile, the airport operators' directors set forth a "positive action" program, embracing the following:

1. an immediate retrofit program for all present jet engines which would lessen noise;
2. urge more money and full speed ahead on the "quiet engine" program now under development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for future families of jet engines;
3. total support for pending Congressional legislation (H.R. 3400 and S. 707) which would authorize Federal standards and controls of jet aircraft noise.

These bills now before Congress would give the Department of Transportation the power to certificate new aircraft for noise standards and to regulate noise in the operation of present day aircraft by retrofitting of jet engines if necessary.

James R. Mettler, President of AOCI, declared, "We of the airport segment of the aviation industry are tired of being the scapegoat for the airlines and manufacturers. As operators of airports, we can exercise no control over types of aircraft being built for the airlines. We have no control over flight patterns or air routes or air schedules.

"In brief, this is a Federal matter and the sooner we achieve the necessary legislation, the sooner the public can be assured of noise relief."

Telegrams concerning the Directors' action were forwarded to Secretary Alan S. Boyd, Department of Transportation; Air Transport Association of America; Aerospace Industries Association and Air Line Pilots Association.

Members of the Board of Directors of AOCI are representatives of the following airports: Boston, Chicago, El Paso, Los Angeles, Miami, Nashville, New Orleans, New York, Omaha, Rockford, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle-Tacoma, Syracuse, Tokyo, Zurich.

Telegram sent to Hon. Alan S. Boyd, Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

MESSAGE

On behalf of the members of the AOCI, we want you to know how serious airport operators consider the aircraft noise problem and how important we consider the Federal interagency noise abatement program which you head. Accordingly, by action of AOCI board of directors today, we request AOCI representation at all levels of the interagency program structure. As of this date, we have advised NANAC of our withdrawal from that organization.

JAMES R. METTLER,
President, Airport Operators Council
International.

Telegram sent to following:
Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

Karl G. Harr, Jr., president, Aerospace Industries Association, Washington, D. C.

Charles H. Ruby, president, Air Line Pilots Association, Chicago, Ill.

James F. Byrne, president, American Association of Airport Executives, Boston, Mass.

Lloyd Hinton, executive secretary, National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, Washington, D. C.

MESSAGE

This is to advise that after careful deliberation the general board of directors of AOCI has concluded that AOCI can no longer be a member of NANAC. Absence of positive solutions to aircraft noise problems through the mechanism of NANAC led the board of directors to this decision. We believe that coordination of our respective views on aircraft noise should be continued through normal association channels.

JAMES R. METTLER,

President, Airport Operators Council International.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for congressional action. I had the privilege of conferring with Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd last week and I am convinced that Secretary Boyd understands the problem and the urgency to find ways to reduce the menace of jet noise.

The logical first step is the enactment of H.R. 3400. At the same time we must accelerate our research by coordinating all Government activity so as to prevent duplication of research activities. We must win the fight against noise and pollution of our environment.

I applaud the action of the Airport Operators Council and I anxiously await and look for the same realistic approach to the noise problem from the airlines and engine manufacturers. In the end we can only solve the noise problem by a joint government-private industry effort. The airport operators have shown the way. Now is the time for statesmanship from the airlines and aircraft engine manufacturers. The reduction of jet noise through development and use of quieter jet engines will not be economically or operationally beneficial to the airlines, and they will not cooperate unless the Congress makes it clear that minimum standards will be established and strictly enforced.

Our responsibility is clear. We must act quickly on H.R. 3400 and related noise abatement bills now pending before the 90th Congress.

Firearms Resolution

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD a resolution on firearms passed unanimously by the Fish and Game Commission of California, which was carried in the January-February 1968 issue of Outdoor California:

RESOLUTION ON FIREARMS

Whereas, The Constitution of the United States of America guarantees the people of this state and nation the right to bear arms; and

Whereas, California is a sport-minded state, and hundreds of thousands of its citizens

possess firearms used for hunting and other recreational purposes; and

Whereas, The consensus of expert opinion is that state and local laws imposing harsh and certain punishment for crimes committed while armed with effective law enforcement and supported by courts and juries, provide the most certain combination for adequate control; and

Whereas, Any federal firearms legislation further restricting the purchase of firearms by responsible citizens would be a dangerous infringement on the Bill of Rights, and could impose such a burden on the sale, possession, and use of firearms for legitimate purposes that it would completely discourage, and eventually exclude the private ownership of all guns; and

Whereas, Any such legislation could seriously damage the recreational economy of the state and nation, damage essential wildlife conservation programs and inflict further federal authority on powers reserved to the states; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fish and Game Commission of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested to refrain from the passage of the Dodd-Celler Bill, or any similar legislation that would further limit the rights of citizens of this country to possess and bear arms; and be it further

Resolved, That any proposed new legislation be carefully studied to determine if it accomplishes a worthwhile purpose and not just result in further curtailment of the legitimate citizen's right to bear firearms and pursue the recreational opportunities offered by this nation; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption thereof, a copy of this resolution shall be furnished the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the United States Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States. Passed unanimously.

Vietnam—War or Peace

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, mine is a diverse district, rich in diverse viewpoints on the questions that face the Nation. Mr. Casimir F. Sojka, past county commander, New York County, American Legion, is a constituent of mine. In a recent speech, he eloquently presented the case for American involvement in Vietnam. I insert his remarks in the RECORD to let it be understood that all honest men should be heard on this vital issue:

VIETNAM—WAR OR PEACE

Never in the history of our country have our free people been united, initially at least, in purpose, spirit and will—on the issue of "Peace or War". There has always been a division—a division which was accompanied by heated if not bitter and vitriolic debate. So too today we have the same division.

Notwithstanding such initial division, we have always risen on each occasion—became united—for the sole purpose of stopping a juggernaut which sought to envelop the world in a new form of slavery—without rights, hopes or human dignity.

Needless to say, we have never been prepared adequately for War: and upon entry into a conflict, many of our people feared that we would lose the war. Nevertheless, we became united in purpose—in the course of the struggle—because of the moral fiber of our free people, which had been nurtured

and developed under a system of freedom and democracy that the world had never before experienced.

In every major conflict—our common purpose had a slightly different name or epithet such as:

"Taxation without representation is tyranny";

"A country divided (half slave and half free) can not survive or long endure";

"The war to save democracy"; and

"The war to end all wars".

It mattered not what the slogan be! We always fought for freedom's cause. And that has been our salvation.

WHAT OF OUR PURPOSE IN VIETNAM

Our purpose in Vietnam—to me—is quite clear; and known to those who wish to see or hear—even though it has been clouded by those who profess good, misinformed eggheads, peaceniks, beatniks and second-guessing politicians who seek self acclaim or aggrandizement.

That clear purpose is simply this: Do we wish to withdraw from south-east Asia and thereby permit billions of human beings to sink and drown in the quick-sand of fear, ignorance, terror and disease—with no opportunity for education, or self-determination, or self-development, or are we, as the leading western power going to help them win the peace and thereafter participate with them in developing the talents of their people—and the vast and untapped natural resources—for the benefit of its peoples and the world. In the same manner as we did in West Germany, Japan, and the Philippines—and recently in Korea.

I sincerely believe that this underlying purpose has been the governing factor which has determined our foreign policy in Southeast Asia, and course of action, not only under the present administration but under the past four administrations.

For, whether we like it or not, or whether we desire to admit it, the course of history during the next century will largely be determined on how well and how wisely we participate in the development of Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America.

And what of our armed forces; based on all reports and observations—from those of the novice to that of the expert—I daresay that our fighting men honestly believe that this underlying purpose is the sole reason for our being in Vietnam. Oddly enough, the greatest paradox of the war in Vietnam is that the morale and courage of the men on the fighting line is higher by far than that of the people safely at home. And our President—with all his woes—together with his administration must continue to fight for the hearts and minds, not of the Vietnamese, but of his own American people. It is a pity that the courage, spirit, understanding, and patience of our fighting men cannot be transmitted by news media or to our living-room television sets with the same alacrity as to the pictures of the innocent civilian men, women and children who suffer and die in Vietnam, only because modern war cannot and never could confine its casualties to the Armed Forces. I do not know why this is so. But I do know that none of us need to be told or shown that War is Hell, and as such was never meant to be a subject for exposure on a living-room television set. I believe it encourages the dissenters in our midst. But what is worse, every dissent brings glees and cheers in Hanoi. Ho Chi Minh—the political animal he is—knows how to capitalize on adverse headlines in American papers. Lacking victories he tells his people about the loud cries of the American dissenters. His stated purpose is to fan further opposition to the war in America. I am convinced that Ho Chi Minh believes that he can beat the Americans the same way it is claimed he beat the French—with frustrating newspaper headlines that will make Americans at home want to quit the war. If this is so, you can imagine

the field day Hanoi has, when powerful U.S. Senators can be quoted with abandon.

Be that as it may, I wish to come back to our purpose in Vietnam. I ask you as citizen soldiers—who served in our Major Wars—do you for one minute believe that thousands of our fighting men would wade and wallow in the muddy rice paddies or inch their way in and through ominous jungle thickets and over the treacherous mountain passes—*Day In and Day Out*—searching out the enemy—if they were not honestly convinced that they were attempting to save millions of people from annihilation—and especially, a completely helpless people—uneducated and illiterate to the point where they can be molded almost into common beasts of burden: abused and exploited for generations by the War Lords and the old Colonial powers—living for the most part on a starvation diet of rice and strips of meat or fish—and easily terrified by rumors spread by any pagan devil.

Yet for all of that, I have found them to be an industrious people, who crave only what our own forbears sought, an opportunity to work—to till their fields and tend their rice paddies in relative peace—and a hope that they will be able to keep most of the fruits of their labors.

For even today, the masses of people—mainly peasants—keep very little for themselves—as they must continually pay the piper—whether in taxes, tributes, bribes, tithes, or the like. But, who among us is so young or so old that he cannot look back into history, the history of our country and of our Colonial days—and say that their plight is any different than that of our Colonial Farmers, Sharecroppers, Common Laborers, our immigrants and of our Slaves? I say give them the hope of Freedom and the tools, and they will fight for Freedom's cause. You can be sure that the action of our brave soldiers—and the efforts of our pacification program, however slim and slow, are sowing the seeds of that hope. But don't expect miracles over-night of an abused peasantry which has never tasted Freedom or known Self-Government. Just remember that our reforms, social, economic and political, have taken generations to perfect; and our quest for Civil and Human Rights is still going on. The people of Vietnam and we have Korea as a guide and example.

WHAT OF OUR ENTRY INTO VIETNAM

No matter what is now said—our entry into Vietnam has brought about a complete shift in the balance of power away from Red China and in favor of the West. Throughout Southeast Asia, with perhaps the exception of Cambodia, every non-Communist country has turned away from a policy of strict neutrality and accommodation to communist intentions (which I believe was brought about by fear of the specter of a Chinese dominance of all of Asia); and their national leaders, led by Japan's Prime Minister Sato; Singapore's P. M. Lee Kuen Yew and Malaysia's P. M. Tunku Abdul Rahman, have risked their domestic political fortunes by publicly expressing support for the U.S. position in Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia and even Burma, long in the claws and clutches of Chinese perversion and subversion have all dared to throw the subverters out in wholesale lots, solely prompted I believe by our course of action in Vietnam.

What is particularly significant—something which could not have happened a year ago—most of these Countries have exchanged State visits with the U.S. Who in his wildest dreams, would have believed only a short time ago, when Indonesia's Sukarno was still currying favor with Peking and Moscow, would today be in virtual exile.

If it were not for our commitments in Vietnam, these Countries would not have dared to break away from their firm ties with China; and to actively seek discourse with the U.S. What else could have prompted

Thailand to participate with us in stamping out Communist infiltration and subversion in that far away kingdom: and today are preparing more of their troops for action in Vietnam. Our course of action in Vietnam and our supervision of their post-war development has permitted Japan to become the economic, political and industrial giant of the east. I say to you—a year ago, Premier Sato would not have dared to make a State visit to the United States.

ARE WE PROGRESSING—ARE WE WINNING THE WAR

I think it now appears clear that the various phases of our actions in Vietnam were normal developments and not escalation. You will recall that we first entered as advisers. This policy was quickly changed as we found out that you could not advise raw recruits without any training. Then we brought in our troops to bring about a mere holding action, and this too proved unwise and futile. Our next phase was one of limited action which soon proved to be suicidal. For what else might we expect from a policy which prevented our soldiers from shooting unless they were sure that the other person was an enemy Vietcong. You may also recall that this was a frustrating period when our Armies could not move ahead, without first getting approval of the local village and hamlet chiefs as well as that of the leaders in Saigon. During all these periods our Commander-in-Chief and military leaders were forced to take heed of the dissenters and protestors, both at home and abroad, and thus the course and direction of the conflict was governed more by political than military considerations.

Now that our Commander-in-Chief has finally untied the hands of our military to pursue and attack strategic targets, previously off-limits while he still maintains control and direction of the War, most observers believe the end is in sight. The winning of the peace should be our main if not our only concern. I believe the stakes in Vietnam are high. We have within our power the opportunity to bring light and peace to Southeast Asia or to leave it sink into darkness for generations to come.

In all our great wars, our Country's purpose was one of insuring peace to the world. This is our purpose in Vietnam. We have never worried and never asked: is it Europe's war?, or England's or France's? It has always been—as it is today—a war to insure peace, understanding and opportunity to the world. We cannot take such a course in Vietnam without enduring battles such as The Potomac, Gettysburg, Marne, Bulge, Iwo Jima or the Battle for Hill 875. Let us therefore—as citizen soldiers—give undivided support to our Country—our Commander-in-Chief: our Valiant Soldiers: and the Vietnamese battalions which are slowly but surely emerging as a fighting force. General Westmoreland has control over the military and pacification programs, with Special Presidential Assistant Robert W. Komer, deputy in charge of the pacification program and General Creighton W. Abrams, Jr. deputy in charge of developing the Vietnamese Army, and they are working ably as a combined team.

Any one can be a dissenter protesting loudly: but it is "The DO-ERS" who have made our Country great. They have my support. I hope they have yours.

The Medicare Program

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to rectify a seri-

ous inequity that now exists in the Medicare program. Thousands of policemen and firemen throughout the country have become ineligible for basic hospitalization benefits under medicare.

Under my bill, any member of a State or local police unit or fire department who is not otherwise covered by the hospitalization provisions of medicare would now be covered and eligible for these benefits. Of course, these firemen and policemen will be required to fulfill the other criteria for medicare; for example, have reached 65 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey alone over 700 policemen and firemen will find themselves ineligible for medicare when they reach 65 this year. The hardships this discrimination places on the retired policeman and fireman and their families are inexcusable and unjustifiable.

Under the present law the only way a policeman or fireman can become entitled to medicare hospitalization is to moonlight at a job now covered by social security. The policy of the Federal Government should not be to encourage policemen and firemen to seek extra work in order to qualify for full medicare benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the recent report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice pointed up the nationwide need for police and firemen. Yesterday, the President reiterated this growing need in his crime message to the Congress. Police and fire departments throughout the country are seriously undermanned and the strains on the individual members of these departments are already great. The duties these men are charged to perform demand full time and more. One of the most meaningful ways we can encourage and foster excellence in police and fire protection would be by a policy of security in old age and nondiscrimination in the administration of medicare is a long step toward that security. The policy of the Federal Government should be to promote, rather than hinder, the recruitment of young men to fill out the dwindling numbers of qualified applicants for careers in law enforcement and fire departments. These vital public services cannot compete effectively for manpower with the disadvantage of not being able to offer the men the advantage of full medicare benefits upon reaching 65. It is difficult enough attracting qualified men to serve in these arduous and extremely dangerous careers without this added impediment.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hardships that policemen and firemen face each day of their lives and I know the sacrifices they are called on to make. I was raised on a police widow's pension.

The assurance of adequate medical and hospital care, which really go hand in hand in old age, is the very least we owe the men who daily risk their lives to protect us from crime and disaster. I will make every effort to secure passage of this bill at the very earliest possible time and I am urging the Ways and Means Committee to give this measure a priority status.

"Pueblo": Appeasement Hurts**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems not only the American people resent our soft-on-communism policies over the *Pueblo* and Communist terrorism. Now our stance anti-Communist ally, the South Koreans, who have nearly 50,000 troops assisting us in South Vietnam in a war to curb Communist aggression, doubt our national sincerity in defending the principles we say we believe in.

To our loyal, free friends of the Orient, I can but say we people of the United States would also like to know what is going on and who is making the decisions.

Even the U.S. Senate is unsuccessful in having the pleasure of the U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk explain our objectives and principles in the Orient.

Seems Mr. Rusk gladly appears on television and attends every Communist embassy and consular party for developing international good will, but is too busy to defend his policies to his people or our friends.

Mr. Speaker, I include clippings from the Washington Evening Star for February 7 following my comments:

PROTESTS MADE ON "PUEBLO" POLICY

(By Young H. Lee)

SEOUL.—Resentment among South Koreans to the way in which the United States is dealing with North Korea's seizure of the USS *Pueblo* and the recent commando raids in the south continued today.

There have been continuous protests at the American Embassy by groups identified as students, teachers, and families of Republic of Korea troops serving in Vietnam against what they call the "appeasement" policy of the U.S.

The attitude of the demonstrators, reflecting that of the government, is that the United States is overly concerned with the fate of the 83 crewmen of the *Pueblo* and is downgrading in importance the raids by North Korean soldiers.

Demonstrators today shouted, "We denounce the United States attitude that gives more importance to the 83 crewmen than to the 30 million South Koreans."

Seoul newspapers have been particularly critical of the U.S. A leading paper today said:

"The power of a nation is measured not by the size of its territories, its population or its wealth, but to what extent it is or can be resolute in defending the principles in which it believes. We find regretably the United States is failing to show resoluteness in its attitude toward North Korea in settling the commando raid on Seoul and the hijacking of the *Pueblo*."

South Korea's one-house parliament unanimously has approved a nine-point resolution authorizing President Chung Hee Park to take necessary military actions against any future North Korean incursions.

Though it was unlikely Korea would withdraw its nearly 50,000 troops from Vietnam, there have been talks among assemblymen to seriously study this possibility.

Government sources disclose that discharges of Korean army personnel have been delayed until the end of the year.

The Korean air force also is considering a call-up of reservists.

U.S. ARMY TROOPS CLASH WITH SEOUL COLLEGIANS

SEOUL—U.S. Army troops clashed today with about 400 demonstrating South Korean college students about a mile below the demilitarized zone. At least 24 students were injured by bullets or rifle butts, the South Korean national police reported.

The GIs from the 2nd U.S. Infantry fired an estimated 20 rounds of warning shots during the two-hour melee on the Freedom Bridge south of the demilitarized zone, the police said.

Nine students were reported in serious condition. None of the soldiers were reported hurt. The injured included several girls, the police said.

Police said the demonstrators were trying to march over the bridge across the Imvin river to the conference site at Panmunjom, where U.S. and North Korean officials met today at an open meeting of the Military Armistice Commission.

The *Pueblo* was not mentioned at today's open meeting, which touched briefly on the Communist commando raid on Seoul Jan. 21, which the lone Communist raider captured said was aimed at killing President Chung Hee Park.

SENATORS PROD RUSK TO TESTIFY PUBLICLY

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee today voted to invite Secretary of State Dean Rusk to defend the government's Vietnam policy in open Senate hearings.

By a vote of 8 to 4, the panel adopted an invitation to Rusk proposed by Sen. Karl Mundt, R-S.D.

The vote came after more than an hour of "pretty hot discussion," as one senator described it.

Rusk has not appeared before the Senate committee publicly to discuss Vietnam for two years.

He has agreed to appear in private, but the committee has wanted to explore the war with him in open sessions.

The bid for Rusk to testify was sent to President Johnson asking him to free the secretary to appear.

The move arose after Rusk and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara appeared—at Johnson's direction—on television Sunday to defend war policy.

Mundt, who previously had opposed inviting Rusk to an open session, changed his mind after the Meet the Press show on NBC.

The program, Mundt told reporters today, "is not quite the appropriate body set up under the Constitution for consultation on the problems of the country."

FULBRIGHT OBJECTS ALSO

Yesterday, the committee chairman, J. William Fulbright, criticized the television appearance as a "more or less controlled exhibition," which was "misleading the public to make them believe it was a full and fair inquiry" into war policy.

Today, Fulbright refused to discuss with reporters the committee's action.

Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said the TV appearance "raised questions" in the light of Rusk's refusal to testify openly. But he added that he thought it might be inadvisable to hear Rusk publicly now "because it might increase the divisiveness in the country."

Mansfield, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, was on hand for some of this morning's discussion of the new invitation, but did not vote on Mundt's motion.

One Senator who publicly shared Mansfield's doubts about inviting Rusk, George Aiken, R-Vt., said the public appearance by Rusk would only give the "Monday morning quarterbacks" another forum.

"We have a big surplus of Monday morning quarterbacks and an awful shortage of fall-guys," he said.

Mundt told reporters that he favors the

government's current policy in Vietnam. But, he said, "the time has come, once and for all, for a clear-cut statement of our objectives there and the essentiality of not being driven out of Vietnam."

Why It Is a Pleasure To Open the Morning Mail**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this body receives a variety of mail each day and it ranges from the useless to the inspiring. It has always been my practice to go through every piece of mail that comes in. More and more lately, and at least once every day, I will find one letter which makes sorting through all the ads and so forth worthwhile.

As an example, this morning I received a letter from a husband and wife in Plymouth, Mich. I will not use their names, but I would like to share their letter. It is one of those letters that makes it even more worth the effort:

DEAR SIR: In your letter printed in "Time" this week, you call yourself a friend of Barry Goldwater—that is why I'm writing you this letter.

My husband and I, Stevenson Democrats that also voted for Kennedy and Johnson as a matter of course, have come to the conclusion that Barry Goldwater is the only Republican that we could vote for. We believe he was smeared and ruined by the press and others in the last presidential campaign. I have seen him on assorted TV programs and he has come across as a man of character, integrity and sincerity—the type of person this country needs in the White House—now.

We would like to see Barry make himself available. We feel there are plenty of people who have second thoughts about him and are wondering why he hasn't spoken up more and who would stand behind him if he chose to run.

My husband and I are not politically involved. We just feel that Barry is the only Republican we could vote for as president. We also feel that unless he takes an active part in the coming campaign, the Republican Party can't win.

He may have his own reasons for not choosing to run and they may be justified—but we wanted him to know there were at least two former Democrats that were for him.

Sincerely,

I think there are probably many people with the same feelings.

One thing is certain. There is major concern for the Nation and people are looking for other solutions and other leaders to provide these solutions. It is good to see people speak out, whatever their concern.

The mail this morning also contained another letter—this one from California but also showing concern that was sincere. Reasons for writing it were the same, a pronounced concern, but the content was different. The writer has established herself as a "committee of one for Nixon in 1968." She enclosed a

copy of the "Career Highlights of Richard M. Nixon" with the message that her concern has prompted her to send this information to "persons within her limited reach."

Again, this is the type of concern our Nation needs and the type of letter that makes opening the morning mail worthwhile.

I include it at this point. It may not be a professional job, but nevertheless it is a job well done:

COMMITTEE OF ONE FOR NIXON IN 1968:
CAREER HIGHLIGHTS OF RICHARD M. NIXON

Richard Nixon: The Republican John Alden who speaks in praise of every Republican but never for himself.

"Most Useful Vice President in American History." (*Time*, 1958.)

"First to make the Vice Presidency a more notable, more important and more responsible office." (Bill Moyers, Former Aide to President Johnson, *Life*, September 10, 1965.)

Postponing a developing legal career, Nixon served four years in World War II, rising from Lieutenant J. G. to Commander. He received two Battle Stars and two Citations, one of which read in part: "... he displayed sound judgment and initiative... he established the efficient liaison which made possible the immediate supply by air of vital material and key personnel."

Nixon's appraisal of the Vietnam War stems partly from his experience in the Pacific War; he is the only Republican candidate with this kind of experience.

After the war, Nixon served two outstanding terms as Congressman during which he exposed Alger Hiss and won re-election in 1948 by winning the Democratic as well as the Republican Primary.

In 1950, Nixon's Senatorial Plurality was the largest in the nation—almost 700,000 votes. His vote getting ability led to his being chosen at 39, as Eisenhower's running mate in 1952.

In 1960, with over 34 million votes, many believe he was deprived of the Presidency by vote frauds in Texas and Illinois. Documentary evidence exists to support this claim. Dr. Raymond Moley and Chicago Tribune News Chief Walter Trohan believe Nixon won. Walter Winchell says he has documentation of "ballot burglary" which will appear in his book, *Private Papers of Walter Winchell*.

Nixon carried 26 states; Kennedy 23.

Nixon rescued the Vice Presidency from "Throttlebottomism" and was the first creative Vice President in U.S. history, pioneering guidelines for missions abroad and making domestic innovations—"firsts" which his successors flatter sincerely by imitation.

As a member of the National Security Council, Nixon participated in crucial decisions. He headed several important committees, giving brilliant account of himself. His conduct during Eisenhower's illnesses was hailed by observers and insured the smooth functioning of the U.S. Government. Eisenhower has stated that Nixon was one of the most industrious, best informed Vice Presidents and that "no other man had such training and experience for the Presidency."

Billy Graham compared Nixon to Churchill in statesmanship. (*God Is My Witness* by Dr. Billy Graham.)

Nixon persuaded many large organizations, among them was Capital Transportation, to adopt integrated employment policies. (*Mandate for Change* by Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

He fought in Congress for civil rights against segregationists then led by Lyndon Johnson. (*Time*, 1957.)

In 1959, with decisive intervention, Nixon helped settle the steel strike that had disrupted the nation's economy for months without any Kennedy table-thumping, threats, price rise or stock market panic as occurred in 1962.

Nixon helped arrange shelter in the United States for Hungarian refugees in 1956; he flew personally to Austria to encourage them. In 1959, Nixon dared stand up to Khrushchev and also gave an unprecedented radio-TV address in Moscow, fostering respect among the Russian people for the U.S. viewpoint.

Later when Nixon visited Warsaw, a million Poles overwhelmed him with enthusiasm. He used the occasion to plead for better treatment of Polish Jews. Israel sent a message of "profound gratitude." Yeshiva University awarded him an honorary degree. In 1967, Nixon was the only prominent American to fly to Israel right after the war ended. He visited both the Israeli and the Arab wounded, many of whom showed effusive gratitude, and shouted, "Gott bensch eich" (God bless you).

Nixon's courage in facing the implacable Communist mobs in Caracas won him respect and admiration in Latin America. Ecuador issued a commemorative stamp in honor of his visit. He was the only American Vice President so honored.

In 1959, a few months after Castro's takeover, while President Kennedy was comparing Castro with Simon Bolivar (*Strategy of Peace*), Nixon warned the State Department that Castro was a Communist. Had Nixon's appraisal been heeded, we might have been spared a Communist take-over of Cuba. (*Reader's Digest*, November, 1964.)

Today, out of office after twenty years of dedicated service, Nixon at 54 is the youngest of the potential candidates. His counsel is wise, vigorous, and geared to the best interests of the United States. His labors in fund-raising and in electing Republicans to office have been crowned with spectacular success.

Ever aware of civic responsibilities, Nixon succeeded Herbert Hoover as head of the Boys' Clubs of America.

His record of *eloquent deeds and simple words* has won him respect and admiration in his Party and in the nation.

Missouri-Pacific Railroad Strike

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, defense related and perishable products—including poultry feeds, ammunition pallets, and petroleum in various forms—are not moving from producers because of the Missouri-Pacific tie-up. The strike has already worked a great hardship on Arkansas and is getting worse hourly, as illustrated by the following wires:

W. R. Stephens, president and chairman of the board of Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., said:

Strongly urge that you take action to settle dispute between Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Missouri Pacific Railroad in order to restore service. We have three large plants in Arkansas curtailed. Request you use the Railroad Labor Act machinery to try to settle the dispute so that these plants can operate while settlement is made. Unemployment is spreading in Arkansas due to this strike and if the strike is not ended complete shutdown will be required in many manufacturing plants.

Lex Killebrew, executive secretary of the Arkansas Poultry Federation, stated:

Because of tie-up on Mo-Pac Railroad, Poultry Industry in Arkansas in danger.

Grain supply shortage at hand this weekend. Producers face real danger to flocks, hens, broilers, turkeys. Help urgently needed.

G. Ted Cameron, president of Mountaire Poultry Co., Inc., said:

Urgently request your help and influence in bringing the strike of the Missouri Pacific Railroad to an immediate end. Impossible to provide feed for poultry and livestock without Rail service.

Kenneth Smith, of the Mulberry Lumber Co., stated:

Missouri Pacific Rail strike has worked a grave hardship on us as pallet manufacturers. We have several government contracts with strict delivery requirements most of which have to be shipped by rail. These pallets are used for shipping ammunition and supplies to Vietnam. At the present time, our warehouse is filled to capacity. If this strike is not settled immediately we will be forced to shut our complete operation down. This being a labor surplus area would mean that a lot of people would be out of work. We strongly urge you to commute on our behalf as well as others and recommend compulsory arbitration be enacted or some similar action be taken to settle this strike.

Paul McHenry, vice president of MacMillan Ring-Free Oil Co., Inc., in El Dorado, said:

Rail strike preventing movement of 400,000 gallons of motor oil this month against government contracts. Urgently request your help in restoring service as soon as possible.

James A. Ward III, of Ward Furniture Manufacturing Co., in Fort Smith, stated:

Our plants are completely surrounded by the Missouri Pacific Railroad and their continual strikes have caused us a lot of expense. If this wild-cat strike continues 3 or 4 days, we will be forced to shut our plants down. Isn't there something that can be done to prevent these situations?

Don H. Flanders, president of Flanders Manufacturing Co., of Fort Smith, said:

Please do everything possible to end Missouri Pacific Railroad wildcat strike. Since Congress has not acted on S.B. 751, we cannot ship by truck, now we cannot ship by rail. Our situation is desperate.

Cliff C. Lane of Lane Poultry, at Granis, stated:

The Poultry Industry in Arkansas is in real danger because of rail stoppage of Missouri Pacific Railroad. Grain supply will be critical by the end of week. Must have rail service to major production areas or face real danger of mass mortality on hens, broilers, and turkeys. Any assistance you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

Some of the serious effects of the above are illustrated in the wire I received yesterday from Arkansas' Governor, Winthrop Rockefeller. Governor Rockefeller said:

A continued strike and interruption of service on the Missouri Pacific Railroad will result in a devastating impact upon the economy of Arkansas. As Governor of Arkansas, I urge you to appoint an Emergency Board in an effort to compose the differences between the striking employees and the Railroad Management as contemplated the procedures established under the Railway Labor Act. It is in the public interest that you take this action as quickly as possible in order that railroad service affecting the health and economic welfare of the people of Arkansas may be restored. Original message sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Treatment of Narcotics Addicts and Alcoholics

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Johnson sent to the Congress for our consideration his message on crime.

Along with other proposals he made for reducing crime in the Nation, he made several proposals to socially rehabilitate narcotics addicts and alcoholics. Given the serious problems posed by both these groups, I consider it very important that my colleagues have an opportunity to study the proposals in depth. I have asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would administer the proposed programs, to develop fact sheets for my use, and now insert them in the RECORD so they may be studied by all Members of Congress:

ALCOHOLISM BACKGROUND

Alcoholism is a major health problem in the United States that affects millions of persons directly or indirectly. Currently, the majority of helping agencies—medical, psychiatric and others—do not pay adequate attention to the needs of patients with drinking problems. Action is needed to overcome neglect of this very large number of sick persons.

A special problem requiring rapid action is posed by the increasing number of court decisions which preclude the jailing of chronic alcoholics for the offense of public drunkenness. Arrests for public drunkenness constitute the single largest category of arrests in the United States. Many of these individuals are chronic alcoholics who require a wide range of medical and other services. At present most communities have no adequate services for these homeless individuals.

PROPOSAL

The Community Mental Health Centers Act would be amended to provide special funds for the treatment and prevention of alcoholism. Under these amendments community mental health centers would be eligible to receive grants for the construction, acquisition, staffing, operation, and maintenance of facilities for treatment, prevention and control of alcoholism and rehabilitation of persons with alcoholism and alcoholism-related problems. Without such incentives, few communities will be able to develop the comprehensive network of services that are required to deal with alcoholism.

It is also proposed that the Community Mental Health Centers Act be amended to assist communities in developing services for homeless alcoholics even in the absence of community mental health centers. Services for homeless alcoholics need to be closely coordinated with other community programs—medical, psychiatric, social service, rehabilitation, etc. Funds for the establishment, staffing, operation, and maintenance of specialized residential and other facilities for homeless alcoholics would be made available to communities. The grants for staffing, maintenance, and operation would be for a longer period and carry a higher Federal share than the regular Community Mental Health Centers program. Whenever possible, these facilities for homeless alcoholics would be integral parts of community mental health centers. However, because of the urgency to develop alternatives to the

legal-criminal management of chronic alcoholics, communities not yet having developed a community mental health center would also be eligible for grants under this program.

NARCOTIC ADDICTION

BACKGROUND

In 1966 Congress passed the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act in an attempt to substantially increase the number of addicts rehabilitated and returned to useful places in our society. Part of this legislation consists of a program of financial assistance to States and communities for the treatment of addicts following their release from hospitals.

This critical phase of aftercare for the addict is best carried out in the community in which he resides. The prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation activities related to narcotic abuse should be incorporated into community mental health centers to get the most out of existing resources, especially manpower. The integration of the addiction treatment facility in the Center would allow staff members to involve themselves in the addiction treatment process without being cut off from the mainstream of mental health.

PROPOSAL

The section of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act dealing with financial assistance to States and communities for aftercare programs would be allowed to expire on June 30, 1968. The Community Mental Health Centers Act would be amended to add a new section providing for project grants for specialized programs relating to prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addiction. These project grants would include funds for construction, staffing, operation, maintenance, and training of professionals for community services for treatment of narcotic addicts. Additionally, funds would be available for developing specialized training programs or materials relating to the prevention of narcotic addiction, including education of high-risk groups, provision of Public Health services for the treatment of narcotic addiction, development of inservice training with respect to provision of such services, and conducting surveys to evaluate the adequacy of the programs for the treatment of narcotic addicts.

Congressional Medal of Honor

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I attended a ceremony at the Pentagon in the Office of the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Stanley Resor. The occasion was the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Sgt. Donald Russell Long, U.S. Army, of Blackfork, Lawrence County, Ohio.

I wish to honor this brave and dedicated young man who has given his life in service to the United States of America, and to include in this public RECORD the citation which accompanied the award:

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to Sergeant Donald R. Long, United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

On 30 June 1966, Troops B and C, 1st

Squadron, 4th Cavalry, while conducting a reconnaissance mission along a road in the Republic of Vietnam, were suddenly attacked by a Viet Cong regiment, supported by mortars, recoilless rifles and machine guns, from concealed positions astride the road. Sergeant Long abandoned the relative safety of his armored personnel carrier and braved a withering hail of enemy fire to carry wounded men to evacuation helicopters. As the Platoon fought its way forward to resupply advanced elements, Sergeant Long repeatedly exposed himself to enemy fire at point blank range to provide the needed supplies. While assaluting the Viet Cong positions, Sergeant Long inspired his comrades by fearlessly standing unprotected to repel the enemy with rifle fire and grenades as they attempted to mount his carrier. When the enemy threatened to overrun a disabled carrier nearby, Sergeant Long again disregarded his own safety to help the severely wounded crew to safety. As he was handing arms to the less seriously wounded and reorganizing them to press the attack, an enemy grenade was hurled onto the carrier deck. Immediately recognizing the imminent danger, he instinctively shouted a warning to the crew and pushed to safety one man who had not heard his warning over the roar of battle. Realizing that these actions would not fully protect the exposed crewmen from the deadly explosion, he threw himself over the grenade to absorb the blast and thereby saved the lives of eight of his comrades at the expense of his own life. Throughout the battle, Sergeant Long's extraordinary heroism, courage and supreme devotion to his men were in the finest traditions of the military service, and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Closing the Travel Gap Constructively

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, since New Year's Day a great deal of attention has been focused on the so-called "travel gap," the balance-of-payments deficit which results from Americans spending more dollars in the course of travel abroad than foreign visitors spend in this country. Estimates of the width of this gap in the past year vary tremendously, from about \$300 million to perhaps \$2 billion.

The administration has proposed to close this gap by clamping curbs on Americans' spending or travel abroad. In my judgment, it would be far more constructive, and far more in keeping with our national traditions of freedom of movement and international communication, to bridge the gap by encouraging more Europeans to visit the United States.

One imaginative way to promote tourism in this country has been advanced by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. He has introduced legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, to establish a system of "travel stamps" to cover part of the cost of travel in the United States for Europeans visiting our shores for the first time. The stamps would be funded jointly by the Government and participating private firms, including carriers, hotels, and motels. This legislation has been en-

dorsed by the American travel industry and I hope that it will receive prompt consideration by the House.

To acquaint our colleagues with this creative initiative, I include in the RECORD today an article on the subject by Mr. REUSS, which appeared in the New York Times on January 20. I would also like to call to the attention of the Congress an article from the Times of January 26, which summarizes the significant position in opposition to travel curbs taken last week by the directors of Discover America, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation established by the Congress 2½ years ago specifically to promote tourism in the United States. The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1968]

TOPICS: A PLAN TO SEE AMERICA—AND EUROPE, TOO—FIRST

(By HENRY S. REUSS)

The President is properly trying to bring under control our balance of payments, including the tourist account. But trying to achieve the needed improvement in the tourist ledger by keeping as many as a million Americans at home who otherwise might visit Europe looks at the problem from the wrong end.

Restricting the freedom of travel of Americans is an odious form of intervention, particularly for a country that talks about "opening windows." It is administratively very difficult, leading to Prohibition-era types of evasion. It may well fall hardest on the student and moderate-income traveler. And it almost inevitably leads to retaliation, official or private.

BRINGING EUROPEANS HERE

Fortunately, it is not too late to switch our signals and accentuate the positive in tourism: Forget about a "head tax" on American tourists to Europe and instead attract to America in 1968—and if needed thereafter—an additional half-million to one million Europeans. This would achieve the same benefits for our balance of payments, but would do so by expansion rather than by restriction.

Since 1961, the United States Travel Service, through its package tours, its offices in leading European cities, its programs to see American homes, industry and scenery, has expanded European travel to this country to 600,000-700,000 annually.

With tens of millions of affluent Europeans now flooding Spain, France, Italy, Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe it would be no great trick to lure an extra one-half million to one million tourists to this country. But how?

We could do it, I believe, if we started now to package tours to the United States in which the bait was a once-in-a-lifetime \$100 travel stamp booklet, free to every first-time European traveler to the United States, and spendable in all participating United States air, rail, bus and car rental carriers, hotels and motels. Properly advertised, it could attract the additional Europeans we need, since it would constitute a gift of some 20 per cent of their average expenditures on United States travel.

The American travel industry, meeting in New York on Jan. 9, endorsed the travel stamp proposal. A participating United States business would meet half the travel cost, the United States Treasury the other half.

I estimate the cost of the United States subsidy at \$40 million—surely not out of line with the billions we are spending for the supersonic transport with no balance-of-payments payoff until 1975, or with the \$200 million the President has requested to promote United States exports.

A SMALL SUBSIDY

Indeed, the budgetary cost need be nothing; the extra \$250 million to be spent here by 500,000 additional European tourists (all a plus for our balance of payments, incidentally) would generate some \$750 million of gross national product, which in turn would yield the Treasury an extra \$75 million in revenues.

The proposed tourist incentive stamp could not possibly be offensive to Europeans. It violates no commitments in the GATT, or anywhere else. It closely resembles the "Eurail Pass" by which European countries grant substantial discounts on their government-owned railroads to Western Hemisphere tourists in Europe.

AID TO ECONOMY

Incidentally, the tourist-stamp proposal could improve business and reduce hard-core joblessness here without causing inflationary pressures. The \$250-million infusion of European travel spending into the American economy will fall not upon overtaxed United States resources but upon the transportation, hotel and restaurant industry, all of which now have much under used capacity. The proposal would increase jobs, particularly in transportation, hotels and restaurants, for unskilled and semiskilled workers.

The President's task force, under Ambassador Robert McKinney, is now considering the proposal. If adopted, it could give our balance of payments the maximum of improvement with the minimum of tears.

Representative Reuss, Democrat from Wisconsin, is chairman of the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

DISCOVER AMERICA, TRAVEL GROUP, WILL OPPOSE PLAN TO TAX TOURISM

(By Paul Friedlander)

SAN JUAN, P.R., January 25.—The directors of Discover America, Inc., a private enterprise nonprofit organization set up 2½ years ago by Congress, voted here today to oppose a travel tax or any other type of restriction on the free movement of Americans at home or abroad.

Following the directors' quarterly meeting, Robert E. Short, national chairman, announced that a formal statement of the Discover America position on the travel restrictions proposed by the Johnson Administration to support the dollar during its present state of imbalance would be presented to President Johnson, probably next week.

Discover America, Mr. Short said, "believes in the right of the individual to travel freely where he would, in the complete freedom to travel for anyone no matter where he lives in the world."

ADVICE TO PRESIDENT

Copies of the resolution being directed to the President will go also, he said, to Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler and Representative Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who has been reported as having been entrusted by the Administration with the drafting of a travel restriction bill.

Mr. Short said the directors were eager to advise the President of their position on the travel restriction proposal since "we know he will understand our position; it was his position when he appointed me chairman of Discover America and I know it is still his position."

The directors' view, he said, is "that we should forget terms of restriction and marshal all forces of Government and industry into a hard-sell campaign aimed at our own people and at foreign visitors."

HARDLY PAYS CARFARE

The Discover America directors, Mr. Short said, prefer a positive approach to the dollar situation and the so-called travel deficit. He said "we never have recognized the deficit

as really as great as other people would have us believe."

Discover America, Inc., operates on a \$500,000 annual budget raised from membership of hotels, car rental companies, the Air Transport Association of America, automobile and aircraft and tire manufacturers' associations, the American Petroleum Institute and many individual units of the travel industry.

Mr. Short said the directors endorsed a major increase in the \$3-million budget of the United States Travel Service, a unit of the Commerce Department and an expansion of its staff.

"Its present budget hardly pays the carfare of its overseas offices," he said. "It should have the kind of staff that it takes to sell this country properly abroad, and the budget to merchandise it."

These positive steps for promoting foreign travel to the United States were reported to the directors' meeting:

In April, a group of 25 to 30 managers of convention bureaus of American cities will tour Europe to meet with officials of organizations that hold conventions, seeking to persuade them to bring their meetings to the United States and Puerto Rico. Their "hard sell" tour, Mr. Short said, will be aided financially by Discover America.

Members of the Air Transport Association, which includes American-flag airlines that fly overseas and domestically, will meet next week to consider a program of jointly sponsored advertising and promotion campaigns trying to sell the idea of travel to this country.

The firm opposition of Discover America to the Administration proposals to tax and restrict travel abroad was said to be the first formal declaration of opposition made public by such a large segment of private industry. Some board members believed their resolution would be especially effective in Washington because Discover America was established originally during another period of dollar weakness for the purpose of promoting more travel within and into the United States.

Mental Health

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the field of mental health is one in which you will find the most dedicated, energetic workers imaginable. And in light of the problems and hardships faced in this area—it is a good thing.

Recently, I had occasion to participate in several mental health activities in Austin. In early January, I spoke at the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the new Mental Health-Mental Retardation Community Center in Austin. Again, at the University of Texas, I met with people working to educate professional staffers for these centers.

I feel that the progress these people have made under the relatively new Federal-aid program is monumental. And now, in light of President Johnson's latest proposal, we see that they will be called on to extend their work to new but related fields.

The President has proposed important legislation providing for facilities for the treatment of narcotic addicts and alcoholics as part of the community mental health centers program.

Professional consensus supports the integration of treatment programs for addicts and alcoholics into community mental health centers. The reasons are plain. Addiction and alcoholism are associated with emotional problems and therefore are said to be best treated by mental health professionals. Addiction and alcoholism also require a broad range of treatment services. These centers have this range—inpatient and outpatient, day or night care hospitalization, emergency services, along with consultation and education with other agencies likely to have contact with addicts and alcoholics. Coordination of these services by a single agency permits the staff to design treatment appropriate for individual patients needs. The patients can also be followed into the community with long-range rehabilitative support of the kind that is essential to reduce the high rate of relapse originally characteristic of addicts and alcoholics.

It makes little sense to begin now to build a new network of facilities devoted solely to treatment of addicts and alcoholics. More than 250 community mental health centers are in operation or being developed. They have the staff, the knowledge, and facilities to provide these new treatment facilities.

These amendments are, in effect, a move against fragmentation of what are essentially mental health programs.

Toward a More Peaceful World

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today we have received the President's special message on foreign aid.

In his message the President has wisely observed that "a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—does more to build the peace and guard America from harm than all the guns and bombs." This is a vitally important observation, and one, unfortunately, which has not yet been learned well.

Every 5 minutes somewhere in the world, 35 people, most of them children, die of starvation. These people live in countries which need foreign assistance to help them preserve the very lives of their people. It is quite clear that, as the President has said in his message, foreign aid "is a commitment to conscience as well as country."

My regret, on receiving the President's message, is that he has not asked for a larger amount. I hope that on reflection this body will decide to provide more foreign economic assistance.

The problems of world poverty, of hunger, population, disease, illiteracy are so great that I am fearful that even with several times the present effort they may not be solvable. But we must try—with more resolve and commitment than we have shown up until now.

There are three other points in the Presidential message to which I would like to give special mention.

First, the President has in several in-

stances dealt with the world food and population crisis.

Starvation is a problem now. But unless massive and concerted efforts are made to curb the world population and to improve the world food supply, millions of people will die of starvation in the coming decades. This is a very real and dreadful prospect. It is not reality today, but if we wait until it is reality, it will be too late to do anything about it. The Reverend Malthus has not yet been disproved.

I am encouraged by the efforts which we are planning to take to help avert this disastrous prospect. While they are not sufficient in themselves, they are an important step in the right direction.

I am pleased that the message reiterates our priority commitment to help develop agriculture in the less developed countries.

These are vital efforts, they must be carried out.

In the message, it is clearly recognized that we in the Congress have placed limitations on the use or diversion of American aid for the purchase of weapons by less developed countries.

The President has restated American policy on this subject when he said:

Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures.

And I would add the caveat that we must enforce very rigidly our condition that we provide assistance to countries only if they prove their military expenditures are for "legitimate defense and internal security needs."

Mr. Speaker, the President's foreign aid message pledges this country to move in the right direction. We should see to it that the full measure of economic assistance requested is provided.

Television Network Practices

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15267, which I have introduced with Congressman Moss and Congressman OTTINGER, draws upon years of study by the Congress and Federal Communications Commission into television network practices and upon legislation previously introduced by distinguished Members of both Houses.

The first comprehensive inquiry into this subject occurred from 1938 to 1940 and resulted in the adoption of chain broadcasting rules in 1943. See 6 F.R. 2282, 5257; 8 F.R. 7355, 8355; 14 F.R. 179; 12 R.R. 1537; 19 R.R. 1501; 20 R.R. 1568, and 25 R.R. 1651. But, these rules were intended merely to govern certain contractual relationships between networks and their affiliated stations and, significantly as limiting, were promulgated with only radio broadcasting in mind. They were not designed to bring networking, as now practiced, directly into the regulatory fold. They were directed toward, and are enforceable against, licensees

rather than network companies. Quite clearly, they have little prophylactic value for the broad domestic and international scope of present-day television network operations.

When these chain broadcasting rules were issued the majority of the Commission felt that—

They will tend to decentralize the tremendous power over what the public may hear which is now lodged in the major network organizations, and will remove existing restraints upon competition without interfering unduly with the operations of the network organizations. (Supplemental Report on Chain Broadcasting, p. 16, October, 1941.)

However, they stated that if this regulatory trial did not produce results, other action should be taken:

If the industry cannot go forward on a competitive basis, if the substantial restraints upon competition which we seek to eliminate are indispensable to the industry, then we must frankly concede that broadcasting is not properly a competitive industry. If this be the case, we recommend that the Congress should amend the Communications Act to authorize and direct regulations appropriate to a noncompetitive industry with adequate safeguards to protect listeners, advertisers, and the consumers. (Report on Chain Broadcasting, pp. 88-89.)

Unfortunately, despite their proven inadequacy, these regulations, and the licensing power of the Commission over individual stations owned by the networks, are all that protect the public interest from abuse by these multi-billion-dollar communications cartels.

In 1955, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 112, which authorized a study to determine whether the radio and television networks impeded the development of a nationwide competitive system of broadcasting. Upon its termination in 1957, a report was submitted by the special staff, headed by Mr. Roscoe L. Barrow, to the Congress and printed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Report No. 1297, 85th Congress, second session. Two of the conclusions from this comprehensive 700-page report are particularly noteworthy here:

An important Commission policy impinged upon by network structure and practices is that of making the station licensee responsible for broadcasting in the public interest. As has been seen, stations are highly dependent on the network program service, and the network affiliate carries a large schedule of network programs. The networks through their use of the contractual right of option time, and through other practices, have persuaded affiliated stations to accept a larger schedule of network programs than they would otherwise be disposed to carry. In this way, network practices have, to some extent, restricted the programming responsibility of the station licensee and limited the licensee's opportunities to program according to the specific needs of his local community. They have also curtailed the availability of alternative program sources to the station and thus to the public which it serves." (p. 664)

Another statutory and Commission policy directly affected by networking is that of preserving effective competition in broadcasting. Networks have a high concentration of control over important facets of the television industry. The principal factors accounting for the high concentration of control by networks are the shortage of competitive station facilities in the VHF spectrum and the economic advantages to networks and stations inherent in the affiliation rela-

tionship. Despite the very high network profits of CBS and NBC, there is little prospect for the immediate entry of a fourth network. While the three existing networks compete among themselves in many areas, the small number of networks and the formidable barriers to new network entry are limitations on the effectiveness of competition at the network level. The encouragement of greater competition between networks and national spot telecasting, therefore, hold out the principal hope of providing more effective competition in the public interest. However, a number of network practices have served to restrain competition between network and national spot advertising, and to place the station representatives, program suppliers and advertisers using national spot at a competitive disadvantage. These practices, in combination, have restrained competition between networking and the national spot system to a significant degree. (p. 664)

In 1956 Senator John W. Bricker submitted a report to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—The Network Monopoly, 84th Congress, second session—in which he stated:

Two networks—Columbia Broadcasting System and National Broadcasting Co.—have an unprecedented economic stranglehold on the Nation's television industry. Effective competition is stifled under this yoke of economic dominance. The result is a private monopoly. This conclusion, though startling, is in no degree speculative. It is based on incontrovertible evidence in the form of heretofore confidential financial data furnished the Congress at the express direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As a result of his study he introduced S. 825 on January 28, 1955, to authorize the FCC to establish rules and regulations with respect to networks and their activities.

During 1956 the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also made an exhaustive study of television network practices—The Television Inquiry, Television Network Practices, adopted July 8, 1957, page 99. This report pointed out the anticompetitive aspects of network film syndication activities and network acquisition of interests in independently produced programs. More important, it emphasized the unfortunate anomaly afflicting the broadcasting industry: "So despite the fact that television networks are the most powerful and significant factor in the broadcasting industry, all Government regulations directed toward controlling their operations are couched in terms of prohibitions against action by individual stations—pages 2 and 3.

That same year, hearings were also held before the House Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on "Monopoly Problems in Regulated Industries." Pertinent to this review was a colloquy between Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS and the committee's chairman:

The CHAIRMAN. The FCC adopted rules back in 1941 concerning radio chain broadcasting and those rules were approved by the Supreme Court, which said the FCC had the right to issue those rules. Presently the FCC regulates stations, is that correct?

Mr. STANTON. Yes, that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And the FCC does not regulate the networks?

Mr. STANTON. Not directly, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They only do it by virtue of their regulation of the stations?

Mr. STANTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words there is indirect regulation by virtue of Commission jurisdiction over stations, but there is no direct regulatory jurisdiction over networks?

Mr. STANTON. As I understand it, that is a correct statement of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I would like to ask you this, and you do not have to answer if you do not wish: Would you be averse to having the Federal Communications Commission regulate directly in the way that they now regulate indirectly; that is, have direct regulatory jurisdiction over networks?

Mr. STANTON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would make sense if that were what the regulation was intended to accomplish. So as not to look as if I am on both sides of the issue, I have opposed network regulation when it was nonspecified, because I feared program control and certain other features that might be introduced into such regulation, but if you are asking me, as I understood your question, would I prefer to have what I have now got, directly as against indirectly, my answer is in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would rather see direct regulation concerning what you have now got rather than indirect regulation?

Mr. STANTON. Yes, I think it is a less complicated way to live, because we get our regulation now only as it affects our affiliates and our company-owned stations, whereas if the same regulations were applied directly to us, I think it would be a more businesslike and systematic way to handle the situation. But, it is the blank check kind of regulation that troubles me, and that is the reason I opposed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, just one more question: If it is found by the Federal Communications Commission that they just cannot change their regulations to conform to what you desire, you would not be averse to changing the statute to give them the power?

Mr. STANTON. No.

Mr. KEATING. You had better talk that over with the lawyers first.

Mr. STANTON. I wanted to say just that, Mr. Keating, but if you look through to the end of what the net result is, I think it is better to have the regulations direct than to have them indirect, and I stand by that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think it is a natural inference to state that if the Federal Communications cannot do that, but needs changes in the statute, it would seem advisable to make the changes to give them the power. (*Monopoly Problems in Regulated Industries*, Part 2—Vol. 3, *Television*, Hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1956, pp. 5029-5030.)

In February 1959, the staff of the Commission's Office of Network Study was directed to make a detailed examination of the network television program process. This subject had not been within the purview of the earlier Barrow investigations. Over a 3-year period more than 200 witnesses were heard and 11,000 pages of transcript recorded in public hearings in Washington, New York, and Los Angeles. As a result of the early phases of this program inquiry, the Chief of the Office of Network Study submitted two interim reports to the Commission—House Report No. 281, 88th Congress first session, May 8, 1963. Reference to a few of their observations will underscore the network problem:

... Deference to the need of advertisers to conform broadcast programming to their marketing requirements and commercial objectives remains an accepted business practice in network program selection. (P. 58)

... The station licensee plays little or no

part in the production or selection process. ... His responsibility to bring his influence directly to bear upon all who "have a hand" in programming his station has been replaced by "practical reliance" on the skill, judgment and integrity of the managers of his network. (P. 58)

... As network television is presently operated it is difficult to say who is responsible for what in network entertainment programming. However, it is entirely clear that the notion that actual responsibility for network programs is exercised at the station level is pure sophism. Licensee-affiliates have as a practical matter, delegated responsibility for program creation, production and selection to networks ... (p. 59)

... The overall effect of the development of network television as a national advertising medium and the growth of the policies and practices which have accompanied it has been to render largely impractical the original system of local autonomy devised by Congress. (P. 59)

... Each network engages in film syndication and foreign sales, and many of the programs which are currently offered for sale by them derive from their own networks. The net result appears to be that the networks may have strong economic motives to choose for network exhibition and thus to popularize those film series in which they have a right to share in the subsequent and continuing value thus created and enhanced. (P. 76)

... A number of witnesses ... expressed the view that because of the policies and practices of the networks outlined above, much of the diversity in program schedules has disappeared, and the opportunity to attract and develop creative artists and other skills necessary to the continued advance of the medium has largely been dissipated. (P. 87)

... Television licensees play only a minor role, if indeed, they play any significant part at all, as decisional factors in the network program procurement process. (P. 96)

... Networks produce, own, and control almost without exception, all of the news and public affairs programs which are included in their schedules. (P. 99)

... As a practical matter the market for independently produced network programs tends to be composed of the managers of the three national television networks. (P. 99)

... Few television licensees, save for multiple owners in the largest markets can afford to produce any considerable part of the programming broadcast through their facilities. They must rely on syndicated programs for much of that part of their schedule which is not network originated. This includes both films originally produced for television and various types of film produced for motion picture theatrical exhibition ... network companies through their syndication, affiliates or division, compete with independent entrepreneurs to market syndicated programs to be exhibited in available broadcast time on local stations already committed by contract as affiliates to the same network or another network. (P. 102, 103)

In addition to network program ownership and syndication restrictions, recommended for those areas of network policy and practice noted above, the network study staff also urged that congressional authority be given the Commission to do the following: (a) To require networks to exercise supervision and control over the preparation of and to prohibit discriminatory practices in the selection of all matter supplied by such network to any licensee for broadcasting; (b) to prohibit networks from entering into a contract or undertaking with any broadcast licensee which would limit the ability of such licensee to operate his station in the public interest, including, without limitation, provisions

relating to exclusive affiliation or territorial exclusivity arrangements; (f) to limit network practices or activities in the representation of stations in the sale of nonnetwork time; (g) to require networks to make reasonable distribution of their programs to stations; (h) to prohibit discriminatory practices by networks in the selection of affiliates; (i) to require networks to provide equal opportunities to legally qualified candidates in accord with the provision of section 315 of the act—page 109.

During 1959 and 1960 the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight conducted hearing into "the rigging of quiz shows on national television hookups and the surreptitious placing of plugs by advertisers on national radio and television programs"—House Report No. 1258, 86th Congress, second session, at pages 7 and 13. The report stated that "these hearings—referring at this point to the rigged quiz shows—demonstrated beyond dispute that imposition of legal responsibility upon the individual licensee for the quality and balance of program content and its freedom from deception has not worked and is not likely to work in the future.

The concept that the airwaves must be used in the public interest requires that definite responsibility should be imposed not only upon the individual licensee but upon the networks, advertisers, advertising agencies, and producers. Guidelines should be furnished by Congress—page 16.

During the quiz hearings in October 1959, the subcommittee staff stated that it was impressed with testimony of former Chairman Doerfer of the FCC that networks should be licensed. Mr. Doerfer stated that:

I am inclined very much to consider very carefully the licensing of networks, indeed . . . I think that where we cannot reach network practices through our power over the licensee, certainly it calls for the licensing of the network. (See Memorandum of Robert W. Lishman, Chief Counsel to the Subcommittee, dated July 28, 1960, directed to Chairman Harris, Congressional Record, vol. 106, pt. 14, beginning on p. 18361.)

The subcommittee staff were also impressed with the suggestion made by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Rogers, in his report to the President on "Deceptive Practices in Broadcasting Media," that: "legislation could be enacted which would place direct regulatory authority over the networks in the FCC"—report of December 30, 1959.

Amendments to the Communications Act were enacted to correct the specific abuses revealed by the above-mentioned oversight hearings. In addition, Congressman Bennett, of Michigan, introduced a bill to regulate the networks—H.R. 7003, 87th Congress, first session, May 11, 1961—as did Congressman Harris—H.R. 1164, 87th Congress, first session, January 3, 1961. Mr. Harris' amendment to the Communications Act sought to license the networks while Mr. Bennett's would have accomplished this result through legislative authorization for rules and regulations.

The Commission had the following comment on these bills:

. . . the Commission's continuing studies and consideration have brought it to the view that the present statutory pattern, which places the entire responsibility for broadcast matter on individual station licensees, has been so affected by the realities of network broadcasting that it is no longer adequate to provide reasonable assurance that the airwaves will be used in the public interest solely through regulations of station licensees. Because of this, and other practices evident in network operation, the Commission is in accord with the objective of these two bills to permit the regulation of those network policies, practices, and activities which directly affect the ability of station licensees to operate their stations in the public interest. (P. 7. H. Report 281).

The Commission suggested a substitute for these bills, which was introduced by Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Communications Subcommittee on August 10, 1961—S. 2400, 87th Congress, first session. H.R. 15267 embodies most of the provisions of the Bricker, Harris, Bennett, and Pastore bills but, as discussed below, extends beyond them.

On July 2, 1965 the Office of Network Study submitted Part II of the Second Interim Report to the Commission. It covered in detail the testimony, documentary evidence, information and data contained in the record of the program inquiry—FCC docket No. 12780—which supported the conclusions and suggestions for Commission action contained in part I of the report.

H.R. 15267 embodies the ideals pronounced in the extensive legislative history and concern over network regulation since the late 1930's. It would subject networks to the same regulatory standards as individual stations licensees, and authorizes the Commission to promulgate rules and regulations to insure that network operations will be in the public interest.

Against the backdrop of this discussion, most of the prohibitions are self-explanatory. However, a few need further elucidation.

Section 341(11) of H.R. 15267 would prohibit television networks from engaging in any other business enterprise, with the exception of individual station ownership. This restriction also covers persons controlling, controlled by or under common control with such network. This provision was designed to prevent those who are granted the free privilege of using public domain from engaging in enterprises which conflict with their fiduciary commitment and responsibilities to the public and which would attenuate their fullest efforts and energies which they pledged to the public interest. It effectively precludes anticompetitive activities which often evolve from interlocking management and prevents vertical concentration of control which has proven so harmful to our system of broadcasting diversity. Further, it banishes from possibility the ever-present fear that all communications avenues to the American home could be directed by any small handful of individuals, whatever their motives.

Section 341(12) would take the networks out of the syndication business. A separate enterprise, this lucrative program marketing method, has virtually put most affiliate and independent stations at the complete mercy of the net-

works and cut licensees off from sources of information and entertainment which would otherwise be available to them. As engaged in by the networks, syndication has also dried up huge reservoirs of production and performing talent in this country and frustrated into extinction the creative idea as a means of electronic expression.

Section 341(13) would extend the recommendations of the Office of Network Study in prohibiting all network owned programs from network presentation. That staff had suggested a 50-percent ownership limitation and none in the news and public affairs area. However, their proposal was made prior to the networks acquiring, in any substantial amounts, ownership interests in major film companies. By virtue of this later occurrence, a much larger percentage of network shows are now produced and owned by them. Whereas a 50-percent ownership ceiling was reasonable in light of prior *modus operandi* in film production, such a figure today is an unrealistic restraint objective.

International Conference on Trade and Development

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today four articles from leading U.S. newspapers. These articles focus attention on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—presently being held in New Delhi, India. Basically, this United Nations Conference has acted as a forum between the less developed countries—LDC's—and the industrialized nations. Issues presently being discussed are varied and complex, including the shrinking flow of AID funds, the growing economic gap between the "rich" and "poor" nations, and preferential trade treatment for products manufactured in the LDC's.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Committee on Foreign Affairs, I can attest to my fellow colleagues in the House the importance of this Conference. As one of the authors noted, bridging the economic gap between the "rich" and "poor" nations will remain one of the central foreign policy problems facing the United States in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend these four articles to all House Members who have an abiding concern for long-range U.S. foreign policy commitments:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 1, 1968]

CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT:
TIME RUNNING OUT ON POVERTY SOLUTION

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—Radical new ideas for closing the gap between the rich and the poor nations of the world are circulating in the upper atmosphere of economic thought.

The question is, though, can they be condensed and brought down to earth in time

to solve the major problems of national poverty?

For time is running out.

It is a question that will receive at least a partial answer at the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development being held in New Delhi from Feb. 1 to March 25.

FINANCIAL PROBLEM

The first conference was held in Geneva in 1964. It debated the potentialities of world trade as a means of promoting economic development. It sought to make adjustments to the existing system of trade and aid.

This second conference will be very different. Its aim is to change the system.

In this sense UNCTAD Two can be rated as a conference without precedent. Some 1,400 representatives of 132 countries and 47 international and national agencies will be engaged in the task. The whole world is looking for the answer.

The challenge by now is well enough understood. It finds expression in a calculation like this: By the year 2000 each person in the farm population of the developed countries will have 20 times as much land as the average person on the farms of the developing countries. Compared with people in the Far East, farmers in the rich countries will have 50 times as much. And their land will, of course, be far more productive.

Then there is the problem of finance. To ensure their economic growth the poor must have foreign exchange. Otherwise balance-of-payments problems cause them to put the brake on expansion just as those same problems do any other country—even the richest like the United States and Great Britain.

But for the poor countries it is much, much worse.

Only 20 percent of their foreign exchange comes in the form of aid or investments. Eighty percent comes from their trade. But the terms of trade have been moving against them. The proportion of their trade in world trade has been falling. Their international indebtedness has risen from \$10 billion to more than \$40 billion. The burden of interest payments has quadrupled, too.

DECLINE IN VALUE

But aid itself also has leveled off. Indeed, its effective level has fallen.

Take the consequences of Britain's devaluation as just one example. The total of British official aid will be kept at £205 million a year. That now is worth \$492 million instead of \$574 million. The fall in the value of Britain's aid will not be quite as great as those figures suggest, for a pound sterling will still buy a pound's worth of most British goods. But the real value of British aid overall will certainly be reduced by from 5 to 10 percent.

The amount the British spend on aid, by the way, is the equivalent of one shilling and fivepence halfpenny (17½ cents) per person per week. This is far more than many other nations spend. And such is Britain's own indebtedness right now, and so perilous is its own balance of payments, that the British can only afford to spend this much with the greatest difficulty.

So it begins to look as if no firm basis can be laid for a new and efficient structure of world aid and trade until the developed countries themselves reform their system of international payments.

CODE OF RULES WANTED

Secondly there is seen to be a need for concerted action among the developed nations to get their interest rates down. Those rates now are at an all-time high. This means that low-interest aid to developing countries has to be severely rationed. And it means that the flow of private capital to developing countries is substantially reduced.

The developed countries are moving in this direction. The Organization for Eco-

nomie Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris has expedited the work of its "Working Party Three." The OECD also has an active Development Assistance Committee.

The DAC now wants to set out an international code of rules for aid so that the aid performance of donor countries can be judged and improved. It wants donors to commit themselves in advance to a multi-year aid program of an adequate size and to give each program maximum publicity.

But aid, vital as it is, has its limits. You can't make people rich by giving them money. That way you only alleviate their poverty. Maybe you cannot actually make them rich at all; you can only enable them to conquer poverty for themselves. However, to do this they must be provided with the means and the opportunities to be productive.

"The building up of the exports of the developing countries is of paramount importance," the OECD declares.

There is no way of gainsaying this deceptively simple proposition. But no way yet of implementing it.

A global system of preferences for developing countries will be discussed at New Delhi. But, as things stand today, it could be difficult to make such a system effective.

TRADE CONCESSIONS

Preference systems that exist already, for instance within the British Commonwealth and the European Common Market's system of African associates, would have to be renegotiated and opened up. Safeguards for domestic producers within developed countries would have to be held to a minimum. Neither would be easy.

The latest proposal to reduce the difficulties comes from the Atlantic Trade Study. A paper by David Wall of Britain's Sussex University, published by this organization, propounds the idea that an open-ended, Atlantic-based, free-trade area could provide the way out.

A preference system would require great structural alterations in the trade of developed countries. Hence current resistance to the idea, Mr. Wall suggests. But if a "North Atlantic Free Trade Area" (NAFTA) was set up, comprising the United States, Canada, Britain, and the other members of the European Free Trade Association, structural alterations would have to take place anyway. Provisions for trade concessions to developing countries could be built into the system.

As things stand, says Mr. Wall, concessions to developing countries cannot be matched with benefits for the developed countries. NAFTA would produce the benefits, he says, thus promoting the concessions.

INTEGRATED POLICY

The proposal is significant as another example of the way developed countries are tending toward a concerted attack on the problem and toward basic changes in the economic system that nurtures it.

Here in London the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) looks rather to "a coherent set of measures, interlinked and based on specific technical, economic and institutional needs, not emotional attachment to dogmas." In short, it proposes an integrated development policy.

Even in a single country, the ODI notes, one government department may be negotiating the removal of trade restrictions while another will be busy constructing a massive new structure of other restrictions; one may be providing aid for a particular industry in a developing country while another organizes protection for home industries in the same field.

Policy needs to be totally integrated instead, not only nationally but internationally, the ODI declares.

Much thought is being given to ways of

expanding the role and effectiveness, too, of private capital in developing countries.

URGENT NEED FOR FOOD

Two main impediments block the way to the expansion of private investment. One is the possibility of expropriation by the local government. The other is the lack of qualified labor. The first requires acceptance by developing countries of the need to provide security for private investors from overseas. The second requires the organization of training programs by private firms, both alone and in conjunction with local governments.

One of the most urgent needs is for private investment that will increase food production in developing countries. Specially there is a need for fertilizers and fertilizer production units and distribution networks. The OECD calculates that by 1980 the annual foreign exchange required for fertilizers alone will exceed \$5 billion, the equivalent of almost half of all the aid provided today for all purposes.

A great expansion of agricultural education is urgently needed, too.

FOOD WITHOUT PLANTS

Another idea is the formation of a world food reserve, to cope with emergencies such as the failure of monsoons.

"It is necessary that the developing countries be enabled to undertake the research required to expand agricultural production and to train research workers on their own," the OECD also states.

The most radical innovation of all, it adds, would be to produce food without using plants.

Plant life synthesizes carbon dioxide from the air and mixes it with materials from the soils, using the energy of sunlight. The same process is possible in laboratories.

British Petroleum is producing protein from oils already.

Nuclear scientists are working on the preservation of food by irradiation techniques. Infestation by insects can be reduced, reports Kenneth F. McQueen of the Atomic Energy Agency of Canada. This is important. Almost half the dried fish produced in Africa is at present lost through infestation.

Irradiation can also preserve fresh foods.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 2, 1968]

PLEDGE AT UNCTAD: TARIFF BREAK SET FOR POOR NATIONS

(By Bernard Nossiter)

NEW DELHI, February 1.—The second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development began here today amid strong indications that the 87 poorer nations would achieve some success for at least one of their long list of demands.

Delegates from affluent and influential western nations are at last ready to give tariff advantages or preferences to some finished products of the poor.

By the time the marathon meeting of 131 nations ends here in the spring, there is every likelihood that it will go on record with a pledge of limited preferences.

Even in this one sector, the poor won't get all they want. The pledge will probably be surrounded with safeguards to protect the industries of the rich from too much competition.

MAJOR HURDLE

Another major hurdle will involve reconciling the positions of the United States and France, reluctantly supported by its Common Market partners. Washington is determined to wipe out the tariff advantages that the Common Market now enjoys in France's former African colonies and Paris doesn't want to give them up.

Moreover, any pledge made at UNCTAD is only morally binding. The long task of actually negotiating tariffs down for the products

of the poor must still be accomplished and the United States will need approval for this from an increasingly protectionist Congress.

Thus it will be years before a Brazilian machine tool maker can hope to sell his products in Germany at tariff rates lower than that imposed on his British competitor. But even a pledge to move in this area would be something more than the first UNCTAD accomplished in Geneva four years ago.

The other principal demands of the poor, price supports for the raw materials that make up the bulk of their exports and an increase in the shrinking share of foreign aid are running into stiffer opposition. The diplomatic game for the rich West is to appear forthcoming in these areas without making any firm commitments.

Thursday's opening session heard Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India warn "there can be no peace without erasing the harshness of the growing contrast between rich and poor." Speaking in a nation that is wracked by riots almost every day, she said:

"Unless we sense this urgency and use our energy to eradicate the economic causes which make for conflict, men and women will be impelled to revolt, and to use violent means to bring about change."

Mrs. Gandhi, speaking in a hastily-constructed and still-unfinished wing of the Ashoka Hotel, complained that "our affluent friends seek to curtail their contributions to development . . . the rich nations find it more rewarding to invest their savings in their own security, in the advance of their technology or even establishing contacts with distant planets. They find it more interesting to trade amongst themselves."

BUSINESSLIKE MOOD

She made the ritual bow towards the responsibility that the poor have to develop themselves, but her stress was clearly on the responsibilities of the rich.

"The question before the advanced nations" she said "is not whether they can afford to help the developing nations, but whether they can afford not to do so."

The atmosphere here was considerably more businesslike than the loose ways of UNCTAD I. The routine complaint of African nations against seating South Africa was disposed of in half an hour. Four years ago it stretched on for days.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 3, 1968]
POOR NATIONS' PLIGHT: RICH LANDS' MONEY ILLS AGGRAVATE THE TROUBLES OF BACKWARD COUNTRIES—IN SOME LOW-INCOME AREAS, LIVING STANDARDS DECLINE—INEPTITUDE ADDS TO WOES—AID FROM WEALTHY DECLINES

(By Alfred L. Malabre Jr.)

The much-publicized monetary troubles of the rich nations are obscuring—and aggravating—the economic woes of the world's poor countries.

That's the conclusion of a broad range of analysts who keep close tab on the economies of so-called less-developed nations, mostly impoverished lands in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The 1960s were once heralded at the United Nations as the "decade of development" in which poor countries finally would start to close the vast economic gap that separates them from such wealthy lands as the U.S., the major European countries and Japan. But instead, the gap appears to be widening, not only because of monetary troubles but for reasons that range from rich-nation indifference to poor-nation ineptitude.

"The decade of development is going down as the decade of disappointment," says a UN official who reflects the increasing dismay of many American and foreign analysts. "Let us hope that the '70s won't turn into the decade of disaster."

AN UNHAPPY PROSPECT

The UN official's use of "disaster" is perhaps overly dramatic. But the prospect of a

world increasingly divided between a few very rich nations and many very poor nations, with the latter containing more than two-thirds of the globe's population, is grim. The picture is not brightened by the harsh militancy of the world's most populous and powerful poor nation, Red China. And adding to the concern is the possibility that sooner or later many poor countries will possess at least rudimentary nuclear weapons.

Signs of a widening economic gap between rich and poor nations show up in statistics pertaining to living standards. One such statistic is gross national product, on a per-capita basis to allow for population growth and in "real" terms to allow for rising prices.

A private study by a large New York City bank shows that since 1965 the "real" per-capita GNP of some poor nations actually has been declining. In Ghana and Indonesia, this GNP figure has dropped roughly 5% since 1965, the bank estimates. In India, in the same period, there has been no increase. In Brazil and Kenya, the increase since 1965 has averaged barely 1% annually.

In the same period, in contrast, per-capita GNP in the U.S. has climbed about 10%. In absolute terms, the statistics are still more striking. The U.S. figure now approximates \$4,000, compared with \$67 in India, about \$85 in Indonesia, \$110 in Kenya, \$244 in Brazil and \$260 in Ghana.

RECEDING RESERVES

Another indication that the gap between the rich and poor is widening appears in statistics covering the amount of gold and foreign exchange, such as dollars and pounds, held by various countries. These reserves, which are used to settle debts between governments, tend to fall when a country is unable to compete effectively in world markets.

Through most of the '60s, the overall reserves of less-developed countries rose steadily, according to figures compiled by the International Monetary Fund. But recently, as the monetary difficulties of the rich world have intensified, the trend has changed. From July through September, reserves of less-developed lands fell to \$12.1 billion from a record \$12.4 billion, and some analysts believe the decline is continuing, although later overall figures aren't available.

The recent trend has been very different in rich countries, which the IMF classifies as "industrial" lands. In the same three months during which poor nations' reserves declined some \$300 million, rich countries' holdings increased to \$54 billion from \$53 billion. These reserves now exceed \$55 billion, economists estimate, nearly five times the reserves of less-developed countries.

Most analysts agree that the recent devaluation of the British pound provides the most dramatic illustration of how the monetary troubles of rich nations are hurting many less-developed countries that have traditionally used sterling as a monetary reserve. Devaluation of the pound, for example, is estimated to have caused a \$10.5 million overnight drop in Nigeria's reserves. These reserves, which had been falling even before Britain's November devaluation, have recently been as low as \$135 million, down from \$227 million at the start of last year.

A FADING GOAL

Rich-nation monetary problems also are hurting backward countries in more subtle ways. Looking for ways to improve their balance-of-payments positions, some wealthy countries, including the U.S., have begun to cut back foreign-aid programs. As a result, the flow of aid from rich to poor countries is shrinking. At the start of the "development decade," it was hoped that the major industrial countries would contribute, on the average, 1% of their gross national product to aid backward economies. Instead, the percentage has been shrinking steadily, from nearly 1% in 1961 to an estimated 0.5% in 1967.

In the U.S., Congress cut foreign-aid funds to about \$2.3 billion for the current fiscal year ending June 30, down from about \$3.3 billion in fiscal 1967 and the lowest total on record. In fiscal 1967, U.S. aid commitments in Latin America totaled \$572 million, \$112 million below the previous year, and officials in Washington estimate a further reduction of 10% in fiscal 1968. In Africa, where U.S. aid programs amounted to about \$360 million in fiscal 1967, officials estimate that cuts will average about 25% in the current fiscal year.

Aid provided by many wealthy nations, moreover, increasingly has strings attached to it; for example, the recipient may be required to purchase items from the donor, even when better bargains are available elsewhere. By one estimate, roughly a fifth of all aid now is "tied" in this fashion. In this week's budget message to Congress, President Johnson stated that "more than 90%" of U.S. aid spending in fiscal 1969 "will be for purchases made in the United States, and I have directed intensified efforts to increase this percentage."

It's becoming increasingly apparent, too, that much of the money flowing from rich to poor countries carries a worrisome, growing debt-service burden. UN officials estimate that yearly debt-service payments, on the average, now amount to more than 10% of a less-developed country's export sales, up from 4% a decade ago. In the case of some countries, it's estimated that the percentage exceeds 30%.

An extreme example is India. Indian officials recently noted that half the financial aid their nation receives from the European Common Market countries in 1968 will have to be used for paying debts and interest to those countries; the officials said the percentage may rise to as high as 90% within a few years.

"There has recently been a marked hardening of the terms on which loans have been offered by the industrial countries to the developing countries," reports Raul Prebisch, secretary-general of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, or UNCTAD, the UN agency most concerned with economic problems of backward nations. Mr. Prebisch also says that import restrictions imposed by industrial countries on primary products sold by less-developed lands have recently become "more severe."

SEEKING SPECIAL TREATMENT

Mr. Prebisch and other UN officials hope that the wealthy nations can be persuaded to step up their assistance to less-developed lands. To this end, UNCTAD is sponsoring a meeting of 132 nations, rich and poor, in New Delhi. At the meeting, which starts tomorrow and is expected to run for about seven weeks, the have-nots will press for a variety of trade concessions and other aid.

Example: To encourage industrialization, poor countries will seek preferential tariff treatment for their manufactured goods. These goods now make up only about 5% of the total exports of poor countries.

Analysts doubt that the UNCTAD meeting will bring any significant change in the attitude of most industrial countries. "The chances of any big breakthroughs are very slight," says one UN diplomat. "The rich countries are too concerned with their own monetary problems to worry much about the situation in the less-developed economies."

The diplomat notes that the U.S. delegation to the New Delhi meeting has been "cut down to only about 10 persons." He recalls that the U.S. sent about 40 delegates to a similar UNCTAD meeting four years ago. "Partly, this reflects American attempts to keep dollars at home," the official says. "But I'm afraid such reductions also may be a reflection of the generally lukewarm interest of industrial countries" in the New Delhi meeting.

Some economists contend, moreover, that most less-developed nations would be faced with a gloomy economic outlook even if the industrial countries were not preoccupied with their own monetary troubles.

The increasing self-sufficiency of industrial countries is often cited as a major long-range problem for less-developed lands. These nations largely depend on sales of raw materials for their exports. But laboratories in the industrial countries are busy developing all sorts of synthetic substitutes for rubber, wool, cotton, jute and other key exports of poor nations.

The UN estimates, for example, that man-made fibers now account for more than 60% of world textile consumption, up from 30% a decade ago. Other studies show that the average price of raw commodities exported by less-developed countries has dropped 7% in the past decade. An extreme example is natural rubber, whose price has dropped by more than 50% just since 1960.

In addition, industrial nations generally are increasing their own output of raw materials. One UN economist reckons roughly 60% of world exports of primary commodities are from advanced countries, compared with about 45% in 1950. The upshot of such developments, says Mr. Prebisch, is that the less-developed nations' share of world trade has shriveled to 13.5% from 25.4% in 1950. "I'm afraid the decline will continue in 1968 and beyond," the UN economist adds.

"NOTORIOUS" WASTE

The worsening economic plight of less-developed countries, many economists say, also stems from their own ineptitude. "There have been notorious cases of wastage of domestic resources that could have been put to productive use," charges Mr. Prebisch. Examples in recent years, he says, range from the India-Pakistan war to the "costly and opulent" projects of Ghana's deposed dictator, Kwame Nkrumah.

No less discouraging, according to many analysts, have been attempts by less-developed countries to forge price-propping commodity agreements. Typically, such agreements aim at arrangements whereby poor nations agree to limit their output of particular commodities in the hope that prices will increase. However, Mr. Prebisch reports, "apart from agreements on coffee, tin, wheat and olive oil, no headway has been made with measures to stabilize primary commodities."

At least one agreement appears in trouble. The International Coffee Agreement, due for renewal in September, is jeopardized by a dispute between Brazil, the major producer, and the U.S., the main consumer of coffee. The dispute boils down to a squabble over how to regulate Brazil's sales of instant-type coffee to the U.S.

"Failure to renew the agreement could lead to a collapse of world coffee prices," says a New York-based coffee dealer. Even with an agreement, coffee prices have declined in recent years. The wholesale price of Brazilian coffee in New York, for instance, has fallen roughly 20% since 1964. Dealers blame the drop partly on "bootleg" sales by Brazilians and others in violation of the coffee pact.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Feb. 6, 1968]

POORER NATIONS ASK MORE HELP (By David K. Willis)

WASHINGTON.—What officials of the Agency for International Development (AID) see as one of the most significant conferences of the decade has opened. Washington is there taking full stock of the reasons it cannot do more to help underdeveloped nations.

The world's poorer nations are in New Delhi to ask the rich: Will you provide us with more economic aid? Will you buy more from us, on better terms? Must the rich-poor gap keep growing?

Ideally, the richest of the rich—the United

States—ought to be able to answer "yes" to the first two questions, and "no" to the third.

At the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UN-CTAD), Washington's likely answers will be, according to informed sources:

"No" to more aid (at least until the Vietnam war is over); "maybe" to buying more; and "we-hope-not-but-we-don't-really-know" to the problem of the gap.

Many senior officials here see bridging the gap as the central foreign policy problem for the United States in the rest of the century.

The rich are getting richer. Their yearly per capita incomes are growing by some 4 percent; but the poor, with soaring populations, can manage only a 2 percent rise, and sometimes less.

Formosa, the Ivory Coast, Israel, and South Korea are bounding ahead, but huge India and sprawling Indonesia are struggling to stay where they are.

ATTITUDES WATCHED

United States predominance is staggering. Its defense budget alone (\$79.8 billion for fiscal 1969) is almost as large as the gross national products of all of Latin America combined.

But Washington is not about to provide more economic aid. That much is clear from the fiscal 1969 budget handed down by the President this week.

Mr. Johnson is asking for \$2.5 billion for AID programs. It is the smallest amount ever requested. The total assistance budget (including Food for Freedom, AID, the Peace Corps, contributions to the Asian Development Bank, the International Development Bank, the International Development Agency, and others) is \$4.255 billion.

This is about 1/19th of the defense budget, AID officials note.

And it is likely to be cut, just as it was in the last session of Congress. At that time, the President asked for economic assistance of \$2.6 billion, but received only \$1.89 billion. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. W. Fulbright, says he sees no change in congressional attitudes this year.

Congress was, and is, restive about American foreign ventures because of Vietnam. The war costs so much that economic aid suffers as a target for the congressional economy bloc. Economic aid has never been resounding popular; it is even less so today.

Aid officials say they do not go back to Capitol Hill this year to fight for their \$2.5 billion "in a halfhearted way, with our tail between our legs."

But even as they speak, they know full well that cuts are in store.

SHORT OF TARGET

Similarly, the World Bank reported last year that aid from other so-called rich nations was either holding steady or declining somewhat.

No other nation matches the range of American assistance, though France channels a great deal of aid into its former African colonies. Britain is contracting overseas spending.

According to a report issued this week by the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, net flows of aid from rich to poor countries in 1965 were about \$7 billion.

This falls well short of the United Nations target of 1 percent of gross national products each year in the 1960's. In fact, it averages out at less than one-half of 1 percent, and amounts to only 6 percent of their military outlays.

(World military spending reached \$155-\$160 billion in 1966, the agency reports: an increase of \$15 to \$20 billion over the previous year, or twice the annual flow of aid.)

In 1965 the United States disbursed almost \$4 billion in economic assistance; the Soviet Union provided only \$0.4 billion. (The

agency took its figures from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris.)

With the Vietnam war costing upwards of \$25 billion per year, and no fewer than 40 percent of AID employees tied down in the Vietnam aid program alone, Washington can offer little hope of more aid flows in the near future, sources say.

PREFERENCES CONSIDERED

What are the prospects, then, for the United States buying more from the poorer nations?

The leader of the American delegation to UNCTAD, Undersecretary of State Eugene V. Rostow, left here this week carrying a significant change in American policy.

Instead of resisting the poorer nations' demand for trade preferences on manufactured and semimanufactured goods, he will tell the conference that Washington is prepared to agree to preferences.

But there are conditions: the preferences must be general, for all poorer nations (to let them sell their goods at a higher profit), and they must be temporary—say, for 10 years.

Moreover, Washington wants all the other rich nations to agree to a concrete effort. The snag here is that Mr. Rostow will, at the same time object to "reverse preferences"—the benefits Britain and France, for instance, receive in return for granting preferences to their former colonies.

Washington wants the rich countries to take nothing in return for offering preferences, thus helping the poor to the maximum degree. But Britain, France, and other Common Market countries object to giving up their traditional ways of doing business.

Officials here say their aim is to avoid a system of competing preference blocs in the world. A struggle in New Delhi is predicted.

Apart from this, the major Western trading nations are generally trying now to sell more and buy less. The poor at New Delhi want exactly the reverse.

FUND FOR FOOD

President Johnson's restrictions on American investment and travel abroad show his deep concern with closing the balance-of-payments deficit. Western Europe, too, is concerned about losing some of its own income abroad.

So, observers note, this is hardly an ideal time for the world's poor nations to be knocking on the door of the rich man's club, petitions in hand.

What will emerge from New Delhi, however, remains to be seen. The poor nations do obtain some leverage from the conference, it is argued here. The change of American attitude on preferences is an example. So was the decision of the "Kennedy round" to share tariff reductions with the poor, and to set up a special fund for food for the developing countries.

Some observers are pessimistic that the poor will actually gain much from New Delhi. Officials here admit that the United States' contribution can only be limited.

But the very existence of the UNCTAD forum is important, it is said. The urgency of the rich-poor gap demands action before long, many believe.

North Viet Shipping Shows Russian Support

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the reported heavy buildup of enemy

troops in the Khe Sanh area necessarily causes us to reflect again upon the nature and extent of the enemy's sources of supply. In testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last summer, it will be recalled, Defense Department spokesmen acknowledged that approximately 75 percent of all North Vietnam's imports arrived by sea, and further that the Soviet Union and East European countries provide 60 percent of these total imports, 75 percent of which are delivered through the port of Haiphong. My diligent and able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who has worked hard for many months to dig out the facts about this seaborne trade and bring them to the attention of the Congress and the American people, on January 15 made a yearend report about this traffic which has not gone unnoticed by observers knowledgeable as to its importance.

Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars devoted a recent column to indicating the significance of these shipping statistics and has done so with telling effect. Whether one accepts or rejects General Hittle's recommendations as to the best means for dealing with this seaborne supply route, it is clear that he has made a very strong case and that his proposal deserves careful consideration by the administration. I insert at this point in the RECORD the news article entitled "North Viet Shipping Shows Russian Support," distributed by Copley News Service, appearing in the Sunday, January 28, 1968, issue of the San Diego Union:

TWO SHIPS EVERY 3 DAYS—NORTH VIET SHIPPING SHOWS RUSSIAN SUPPORT
(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle)

WASHINGTON.—The 1967 totals for shipping to North Vietnam are in. And it's not a pleasant story they tell.

Rep. Charles E. Chamberlain, R-Mich., has made the month-by-month compilation a matter of public record. Chamberlain, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, is widely recognized as a one-man "watchdog" committee on seaborne supplies to Ho Chi Minh, premier of North Vietnam.

Anyone who wonders how industrially primitive North Vietnam could escalate the war both technologically and quantitatively to its present level should be puzzled no longer.

The procession of cargo ships pouring war material on the docks of North Vietnam explains the magnitude and the principal sources of the logistic back-up.

Also, those who still believe that Russia wants peace in Southeast Asia will see how flimsy a myth that is.

Here's why: During 1967 a total of 185 Russian ships arrived in North Vietnam. This is a big tonnage in itself. But, to get the complete picture, there should be added to this the 31 merchantmen from Moscow's Eastern European satellites.

That, then, gives a total of 216 Russian-bloc ships delivering the goods of war to North Vietnam in 1967. It means that, on the average, the Kremlin and its satellites were putting about two ships every three days into North Vietnam.

What's more, these ships, in contrast to much of the free world and Red Chinese shipping to Hanoi, were large modern cargo ships of the rapidly expanding Soviet merchant marine.

Among the ships flying free world and

Red Chinese registry flags were an assortment of small coastal freighters.

One of the most significant things about the 1967 Russian shipping to Hanoi is how it compares with previous years. The number of Kremlin ships to Ho Chi Minh in 1964 totaled 47. This jumped to 79 in 1965, 122 in 1966, and to the 185 total in 1967.

This is pretty strong evidence that the Kremlin is making good on its promises to Hanoi for increased assistance in the war against us and our allies. There no longer should be any doubt that the Soviet Union is deeply and increasingly committed to our defeat in Southeast Asia. Nor should there be any question, for instance, as to the source of the modern sophisticated missiles and radar-controlled antiaircraft guns that are taking such a toll of our fighters and their planes. Ho Chi Minh doesn't grow them in his rice paddies! They are "made in Russia."

Free world shipping to North Vietnam totaled 78 vessels of various categories. This is a big drop from the 401 free world ships arriving at Ho Chi Minh's ports in 1964. There's little consolation in it, however. Even one ship flying a free world flag in the immoral trade with our enemy is one ship too many.

Two conclusions can be drawn from these totals of shipping to North Vietnam:

1. Russia is clearly the worst culprit in providing the tremendous tonnages of war supplies Ho Chi Minh is getting by sea to support the war against us. This makes the Kremlin, despite its peace propaganda, a partner in the Communist aggression against South Vietnam.

2. It underlines, once again, the strategic necessity of establishing a "Kennedy-type" quarantine to cut off the procession of ships delivering war material to North Vietnam. We blockaded Cuba to cut off delivery of Russian missiles in that crisis.

The lamentable increase in U.S. and allied casualties in Vietnam makes a blockade, in this war, a strategic and moral necessity.

Community Progress, Inc., in Conflict

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report which I prepared on my investigation into the activities of Community Progress, Inc., the community action program in New Haven, Conn.

Since that time, two reporters for the New Haven Register, William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas, have written an eight part in-depth study of CPI in which they evaluate the content of my criticisms of CPI and CPI's rebuttal to that criticism.

Today, I will introduce parts 1 and 2 into the RECORD and will follow on successive days with the rest of the series:

[From the New Haven Register, Jan. 25, 1968]
CPI IN CONFLICT: HOW SUCCESSFUL IS THE JOB PROGRAM? LACK OF A FOLLOW-UP PRECLUDES ANSWER—PART I

(By William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas)

Nobody—not even Community Progress Inc. (CPI) itself—can say truthfully that its \$9 million manpower program has been effective in cracking the solid bedrock of hard-core unemployed persons whom it wants to put to work.

And the prime reason why no one can state accurately whether CPI has succeeded or failed in reaching the "virtually unemployable" is that there is little, if any, informa-

tion on what has happened to the 6,500 or so people CPI claims to have placed in jobs or training "leading to gainful employment."

ONLY SPOT CHECKS

Recognized as the most glaring deficiency one on which there is almost universal agreement, is the lack of a "follow-up" on the persons processed by CPI. Spot checks have been made, but they hardly qualify as meaningful measures of the overall effort.

CPI can cite statistics showing that its manpower operation has led to over 4,000 direct job placements. This figure loses some of its impressiveness when the question of how these men or women are doing on the job—yesterday or today—is raised.

Not knowing if the person placed remains on the job—or if he does, for how long—means that neither CPI nor anyone else is able to determine exactly whether the approach being followed is the best one. The same applies to the training courses.

One of the first to admit that the failure to find out how a person does once he has been placed on a job or completed a training course is a shortcoming in the total manpower effort is Joseph Marci, the \$17,674-a-year director of the CPI's manpower division.

There is no question, says Marci, that the manpower program would be strengthened if there was an adequate "follow-up" procedure.

AN ADDITIONAL \$100,000 NEEDED

He estimates that it would cost an additional \$100,000 to \$120,000 per year to carry on a full-fledged program of checking up on the progress or lack of progress of the persons served by his division.

The manpower unit has received upwards of \$7,500,000 from various sources between September 1962 and June 1967, according to a five-year recap it submitted to the Ford Foundation last year. But, with all this money, it apparently cannot lay its hands on funds to institute a follow-up program. An attempt to get the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund such a program was unsuccessful, says Marci.

Besides the \$7.5 million it has reaped from the Ford Foundation, federal, state and local governments and private sources, the manpower division is expected to spend \$1.5 million or more in grants throughout the current fiscal year. And while it averages almost \$1,000 a week in "research" expenditures, the research doesn't include a follow-up on people it places on jobs.

Spotlighted in the sweeping criticism of CPI's operation by a former job coordinator was the complaint that the figure for placements in jobs or training courses "is not significant by itself unless answers to some important questions are provided that indicate how these 5,000 people were aided."

WANTS DETAILS

Janette J. Parker, who worked at CPI for almost five years, feels it would be appropriate to find out: "1. Where placed? 2. How many dropped out? 3. Let go? (1st day, 2nd day, etc.) 4. Reasons for dropping out; being fired? 5. How many in menial type jobs? 6. How many upgraded? How much follow-up? Supportive services?"

In her criticism of the manpower program, Mrs. Parker said:

"I believe that the staff and programs, while they looked good on paper, are inadequately implemented to service the poor. Evidence of this was continually shown in the skills center, which was staffed with non-professionals attempting to teach skills to the uneducated or under-educated. Candidates for these programs were placed in various agencies throughout the city without financial obligation to the agency; some for months, others for years, with little or no supervision by the agencies.

"Public and private agencies took the trainees' services for free and gave very little in return. Many who were unsuccessful and could not get permanent jobs returned to

the skills center—for more paternalism, inadequate training, improper counseling and a try at another program. Many averaged four different programs—and, as a last resort, were sent for placement to the OJT (On-the-job training) program, which in essence became a dumping ground instead of a specialized placement department for successfully trained applicants."

CPI VIEW DIFFERS

Mrs. Parker's estimate of OJT differs sharply from the view held by CPI, which maintains that it is an "effective way to teach a man, a skill while he earns a living." More than 300 firms have contracted with CPI to give on-the-job training since May, 1964.

In 1967, 211 persons were trained and placed in such jobs as secretary, recreation supervisor, machine operator, carpenter's helper, electrician apprentice, service representative, cook, telephone operator, draftsman, veterinarian's aide, and electronics technician.

"On-the-job training works best for us," says Marci.

Further agreement that the lack of a "follow-up" to the manpower program hinders it comes from Charles Hall, executive director of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce and Joseph Purcell, director of the Connecticut State Employment Service (CSES) here.

Hall feels that the failure to find out how a person does after he has been placed on a job is a major "downfall" in the manpower program.

Purcell is quick to concede that CPI's manpower effort has "had an effect" on the unemployment picture in New Haven. He adds, however, "how we are going to prove the total effect is a problem. We don't know of anyone, as yet, who has come up with the answer."

Attempting to use statistics to determine in a general way the impact CPI may have had on the employment situation in the New Haven Labor Market Area—a 12-community district taking in New Haven and 11 surrounding towns—Purcell noted that the unemployment figure for this area at the end of 1962 was 6,800. That was the year CPI started. At the end of 1966, the figure had been reduced to 5,200. The 1967 figure is not yet available, according to Purcell.

Of course, CPI has been ready to claim credit for reductions in the unemployment rate. In its report to the Ford people last July, it pointed out that the unemployment rate had decreased steadily since 1960, from 5.6 per cent to 3.0 per cent for the months of April and May, 1967. It dropped even further later on.

"A substantial portion of this drop can be attributed to CPI's manpower effort, which has placed more than 7,000 people in jobs and training since 1962. A major factor in the decrease is the general prosperity of the New Haven area," CPI told Ford.

In the meantime, however, the unemployment in this labor market area has risen to the point where the area has had to be reclassified. According to Purcell, New Haven's classification was changed in mid-December from "B" to a "C" rating. The "B" rating is given an area where the number of unemployed persons represents 1.5 to 2.9 per cent of the work force. The "C" classification is given when the unemployment rate reaches 3.0 to 5.9 per cent of the employable population.

Seasonal unemployment plus a few layoffs are the main reasons for the growth in the number of people out of work, according to Purcell.

At the same time, he observes that the number of people available for gainful employment is growing scarcer and scarcer. In addition, he notes that there are some 5,000 unfilled jobs in the greater New Haven area, but a majority of the people now unemployed do not possess the skills necessary to fill them. This is the reason Purcell feels

it unfair to compare the unemployment rate with available jobs.

Like almost everyone else interviewed, Purcell realizes that CPI's manpower program is just now reaching the ledge of truly hard-core unemployed persons.

When CPI first started out, intentionally or not, it skimmed the "cream" off the top of the unemployment list. Being selective at the outset gave CPI the opportunity to develop programs that had an outward appearance of success. This was necessary in order to obtain monies from the federal government in order to carry on the programs. According to this theory—a common one in government circles—the federal officials weren't going to continue handing CPI money if the programs met with failure. The more success, the more money. But no one can yet say that the CPI manpower program was successful at the early stages, even when it was skimming the "cream" for easy placements.

And the outlook for manpower development among the hard-core unemployed doesn't look too promising, according to CPI's application for manpower funds to the Office of Economic Opportunity last year.

In the application, which has never been released to the public by CPI, the anti-poverty organization said:

"It is clear, therefore, that the manpower problem in New Haven is such that the goal, of full, meaningful employment for everyone, despite the presence of the manpower program for the past four years is still a distant one.

"In many ways it is an insoluble problem, since it is not a static one; the realities of immigration and population turnover make it clear that as soon as one individual has been assisted toward meaningful employment, another will take his place in need of the services that a manpower program can and should provide. As obvious as this is, it is equally obvious that the effort must continue."

As for CPI's claim that it has "placed more than 7,000 people in jobs and training since 1962," as it told Ford, this figure apparently is the main bone of contention between U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaino and CPI.

According to the latest figures compiled by CPI, only 6,445 have been placed in jobs and training programs. This is half-a-thousand less people than the 7,000 reported to Ford.

Reviewing CPI's own reports and grant applications provides some of the most meaningful insight into whether it has dealt effectively with the problem of hard-core unemployed. Regardless of the total number placed in jobs and training, there is a significant figure related to this activity. It has to do with direct job placements, which means—for all practical purposes—that the person had an interview and some tests at the Neighborhood Employment Center and then was referred to a potential employer. At last reading, the number of direct job placements had exceeded the 4,000 mark. That represents nearly two-thirds of the persons passing through the manpower program.

In its unpublished application for OEO funds to cover the 1967-68 period, CPI's manpower division addressed itself to this situation. Explaining that the success of any manpower program depends on the "effectiveness of the direct job placement operation," the report further said that "during 1966, for example, nearly two-thirds of all placements (jobs and placements) were into job placements."

Keeping the above statement in mind, one turns to another part of the application and finds the following observation:

"Despite generally good quantitative results, in terms of numbers of individuals placed, there has been little effort to develop a systematic approach to matching individuals with jobs that provide him with the most opportunity to earn more, and to upgrade his skills and position." This seems to

imply that CPI has been interested in simply matching bodies with jobs, irrespective of the person's qualification, and thus making the manpower effort into a statistical success.

Another area which has hindered the manpower program has been the somewhat distant relationship between CPI and the city's business and industrial leaders. It must be noted here, however, that Lawrence N. Spitz, who succeeded Mitchell Sviridoff as head of the operation, is making an earnest effort to enlist the active support of the business community in an effort to develop a good manpower program.

While business and industry, guided by the profit motive, are among the last to get in the swing of things as far as social changes are concerned, there was never any real partnership during the early days of CPI, mainly because Sviridoff was at the helm.

FORMER LABOR LEADER

As Hall, the executive director of the Chamber of Commerce notes, "the businessmen were fearful that Sviridoff would send them labor organizers." Sviridoff was a former president of the State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, and had spent most of his life in the organized labor movement.

Spitz is also a product of organized labor, but he appears more willing to develop some contact with the business people in connection with the manpower effort. The chamber has organized a task force which is looking into the possibility of a business group serving as advisors to CPI. It is still in the talking stage, but the fact is, since the initial Giaino attack, Chamber leaders have begun to weigh a larger role in CPI manpower work.

Because of their individualistic approach, conservative businessmen did not rush out to greet CPI's move to find work for the hard-core unemployed. CPI has placed its stress on seeking employment opportunities for these persons among small firms, rather than the big ones.

For instance, a spokesman at Olin—one of the biggest employers in the city—said as far as he knew he could recall only "20 to 25" persons who showed up there and identified themselves with CPI. He admitted there could have been others, but they didn't acknowledge their CPI training or contact.

FIRM DID TRAINING

Another firm, after having unsuccessful results with the first batch of people CPI sent to it, finally worked out an arrangement to have CPI simply equip applicants with basic job motivation and the company then trained them itself. This approach apparently is better than some of the others, because at last report at least six of the nine men involved are still on the job after six months. This is what can happen when business assumes the role of a working partner, rather than merely a passive recipient of whomever CPI wants to send it.

Manpower development will "only work when it is fused with business," says Hall, who also notes that "manpower would have been better off if business had been brought into play earlier."

But even with business on the scene, there will still be the need for a "follow-up" which CPI admittedly feel is necessary for the success of a manpower program.

In its OEO application, CPI said, "Follow-up on an intensive level is essential to the success of a manpower program; it has often been said that an individual placed on a job will leave the job within a short time, for reasons which could probably have been resolved, had there been closer communication between him, CPI staff and the employer."

Lacking the "follow-up" which it prescribes for its own programs, CPI can hardly claim that its manpower program has been a success. And without proven success in the manpower projects—which means, in its simplest terms, without jobs for most of the poor and unemployed of this city—the whole CPI program and the national "war on poverty," are both endangered.

[From the New Haven Register,
Jan. 26, 1968]

CPI IN CONFLICT: HALF-MILLION IN RESEARCH EXPENDITURES HAS PRODUCED VERY LITTLE USABLE DATA—PART II

(By Donald Dallas and William E. Keish, Jr.)

Rep. Robert N. Gialmo has pointed out—that well over one-half million dollars has, in the midst of the "war on poverty", been poured into a mountainous accumulation of notebooks and file-folders here during the past five years.

For welfare and public service professionals who know how to make use of social science research the great puzzle is that so little usable data has emerged from all the file-filing and questionnaires.

Even CPI officials agree that most CPI research projects have been started and left unfinished, or partially finished, or wound up with less than definitive results. They insist that eventually they will be able to fit the pieces together and to make them relevant to CPI and other cities—when more money, more staff, and added resources become available. With Executive Director Lawrence N. Spitz, they predict that "the final report will more than justify the expenditure of the funds."

AMBITIOUS STUDY

Gialmo's basic complaint about research funds being "wasted" centered on an overdue "youth development" study. A highly complicated "pure" research effort designed to produce facts that could be used nationally, this study has taken the bulk of the \$625,000 spent by the CPI Research Division.

The original idea was to create a "methodology" or scientific procedure for studying slum youths and then to go ahead with a study of 2,000 inner-inner city young people. The idea was to find out as much as possible about their motivation, education, beliefs, and frustrations, and other things that might contribute to an understanding of urban social needs and particularly the needs of the rising generation of poor young people. The group was then to be interviewed three years later for a direct check on the effect which CPI programs had on their lives, their attitudes, and so on. Obviously, there was the hope that expensive efforts like that of CPI would prove—through solid measurements, that they make life better for the people they serve.

The study remains up in the air. The interviewing started more than four years ago in 1963. It ended in 1964. But the first analysis and documentation is not yet complete. And there's no available money for the "after" part of what is essentially a "before-and-after" concept.

Scheduled for final completion by June, 1966, the study is still being processed 18 months behind-time. The latest word is that part of it should be ready for release sometime within the next five or six weeks. But at the most what eventually emerges will be only half the job that was started.

The study is being completed by Dr. Elmer Luchterhand, who now lives in Scarsdale, N.Y., and teaches at Columbia University and Brooklyn College. He headed up the Research Division at CPI before it was "phased out" last August.

DECLINE COMMENT

Contacted last Thursday, Dr. Luchterhand declined to make any immediate public comment on the report. His reticence exactly matches the reticence at the CPI offices. When CPI officials are questioned about the report, or about other research projects, they refer all inquiries to Luchterhand.

The result—as in other aspects of the CPI record—is the whole thing is kept under wraps.

One CPI official in fact, recently told The Register that Dr. Luchterhand was the only

person who could adequately explain the CPI research efforts—or its costs. That comment, surprising as it may seem, was actually put on the record by a CPI research review group in 1966. The review group came to the conclusion that "it did not feel competent to assess present research activity." One member of the group, the report says, "asked bluntly, 'What good does it do?' Would the program be affected by our recommendations?"

The youth survey was—and is—a big one. It involved interviewing 2,000 youngsters, 1,500 in the New Haven area and a control group of 500 in Bridgeport (Who would not come under CPI's control or supervision). What the study will produce, or how it can be given perspective now that the second stage of the research has been completely abandoned, is uncertain.

But the CPI confusion over research extends and far deeper than just that one mountain of notebooks, theories, file folders, etc.

The whole "research" operation—a series of studies, semi-studies, bunches of dates, and what-have-you—has been from the outset fraught with conflict, dissension, diverging directions; a kind of generalized sprawl. Like the entire CPI operation itself, it has developed "like Topsy."

Those, incidentally, are CPI's own words—"like Topsy."

A CPI report to the Ford Foundation last summer after five years and more than a half million dollars of research—points out that CPI research activities "while fairly substantial, far-reaching, and in most cases useful and relevant, have developed like Topsy."

OVERALL STRATEGY

The main deficiency here in New Haven, the 1967 report emphasizes is that many of the programs do not "fit in an overall research evaluation strategy."

This would seem to mean that, at this time and date, the notes in one file cabinet have not been successfully related, in understandable terms, to all the notes in some other file cabinet.

Other shortcomings spotlighted in the CPI report included "instant program planning," the weak quality of the research work itself, the conflict with "pure" and "management-oriented" research interests, on inability to use the data gathered as a useful basis for programs and the failure to find enough independent and qualified people to carry out the research.

The comment concerning "instant program planning" means that because of "radically changing federal grant submission and funding dates," CPI would compose "hastily drawn up application."

This is, in the word used by those familiar with the tricks of federal Treasury-tapping, "grantsmanship." As one CPI board member explained it, the significant CPI change of direction in 1963 from the community school concept to a heavy investment of cash and energy in the Manpower programs was fundamentally due to "grantsmanship." As explained, the money or the grants—were available from the federal government, and "Tom Seessel had a genius for writing programs." The "program" is the proposal made to the U.S. government about why it should provide money for local activities.

Thomas Seessel, who has since left CPI, was head of a small staff of "whiz kids" known as the "department of project processing and program review." Another observer explained how the department worked. He said, CPI, would "lock a joker in a room and not let him out until he had a program proposal."

Not research, thus, nor "neighborhood participation," nor any form of civic decisionmaking—not even "need"—were the basic determinants of the willy-nilly, crazy-quilt, on-off pattern of the availability of federal funds have as much to do with the

CPI we know, as the specific needs and problems of New Haven neighborhoods.

PROGRAM TO SELL PROGRAMS

According to Alphonso Tyndall, director of the Dixwell Community House and a critic fundamentally sympathetic with the goals of CPI, this process was the "big thing that hurt." CPI, he concluded, became "not a program to meet the needs of the poor, but to sell programs."

The conflict between the "pure" as opposed to "practical" interests of different researchers among themselves and other CPI staff—and the resulting hangups—is another key reason why research, which could be considered vital in order to plot future CPI programs, had been consistently lagging behind the existing schedule for action.

Gialmo, for example, pointed out that "in the opinion of a former member of the research staff, the research program was of doubtful value because the research objectives were never clearly defined."

Mr. Spitz, at a recent press conference, dismissed these complaints as those of merely an * * *

But a former member of the research staff, assistant director for evaluation research at the Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, recently wrote the Register (in a basic endorsement of CPI) to say that what was disappointing was that the research did not contribute more to the immediate action effort."

"As a former member of CPI's research staff and as one of those disappointed with the relationship between CPI's research and action efforts," he said, he did not question, the desire of CPI's research division to conduct "long-term evaluative research for . . . CPI's national sponsors." But, "we are disappointed that there is little response to our suggestions that greater efforts be made to focus research on immediate action problems."

Spitz's personal position and preference on the way research should be undertaken, he said at a recent press conference, lies somewhere "in between" the conflicting views of "pure" researchers and practical researchers. Thus, CPI has proposed to the Ford Foundation an "intermediate structure" (the Rand Corporation, a Defense Department "think tank team" has been cited as an example) which would be formed to reconcile and utilize the long-range and the short-range, the abstract and the down-to-earth, the theoretical and the real elements of the CPI research picture.

"Clearly," says the 1967 CPI report to Ford, "one large task for the immediate future should be a thorough review of this work, an effort to relate the pieces, and analysis of what general conclusions may be drawn for assistance in planning future activities." The problem is that these problems, conclusions, and troubles were not resolved long before now . . . and are not resolved yet.

**Another Dissenter Leaves State
Department**

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 the Baltimore Sun announced the resignation of David G. Nes, a Foreign Service officer with 26 years' experience, and on February 7 the Sun carried an extensive article by Philip Potter on the resignation. According to the article, Nes was disenchanted with the "political leadership" of the State Department in handling Vietnam and the Middle East.

Nes' disenchantment extended to the highest echelons of State and even higher. The Sun states:

The controversial 51-year-old career diplomat, whose resignation was made public yesterday, made clear in an interview today that Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, and Nicholas Katzenbach, Under Secretary, were his principal targets, but his criticism extended to President Johnson.

It will be remembered that Nes criticized Ambassador-designate Richard Nolte for his handling of the Arab-Israel issue recently. According to the Sun account:

Nes feared his evaluation of Nolte as an "amateur" diplomat who arrived in his Cairo post too late on the eve of the Israeli-Arab conflict earned him the hostility of Katzenbach, a Nolte roommate at Oxford. In any case, Katzenbach did not want to see Nes when he came back from Cairo.

Thereafter, the assignments Nes received were without meaning, and he sent in a resignation last December 14, effective January 31, because "no one wants to sit at taxpayer's expense doing nothing."

To a certain extent the case of Nes sounds so much like the Otepka and Koczak cases which I have commented on recently. All three men fell out of grace with the ruling clique at State and were given the "bubonic plague" treatment. Of course, Otepka is a civil service employee, and he is now appealing the recent State Department ruling on his case to the Civil Service Commission. Whether CSC will stall and delay his case as the State Department has done in the past remains to be seen.

In the case of Koczak and Nes, they have no recourse to CSC as they are not civil service employees. This is an area where corrective action is certainly in order. Foreign Service officers are at the mercy of the ruling coterie at State, and if they do not hew the line, FSO's can be selected out without appeal privileges. Or, as in the case of Nes, they can be given assignments "without meaning" and just wait for them to quit in disgust.

Without commenting on Nes' evaluation of the Arab-Israel and Vietnam situations, I think that in the interest of fairplay legislative action is needed to provide a measure of justice to a very key segment of Federal workers and to perhaps prevent Foreign Service officers from becoming little marionettes of an authoritarian leadership in the State Department.

"The Retarded Victims of Deprivation"—

An Address by Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, to the 18th Annual Convention of the National Association for Retarded Children, Portland, Oreg., October 19, 1967

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many Members of Congress

will be interested in a most thoughtful address delivered by Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League, at the 18th annual convention of the National Association for Retarded Children which was held in Portland, Oreg., last year.

Mr. Young's address entitled "The Retarded Victims of Deprivation," follows:

THE RETARDED VICTIMS OF DEPRIVATION (An address by Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

My purpose in being here is to explore with you the intimate connections between my cause—the cause of the people who have been denied human rights because of the color of their skin—and your cause—the cause of the people who have been denied human rights because they have been victims of an accident of nature.

Basically, we all fight for human dignity, we want justice, compassion and understanding extended to all human beings so that hope, joy and fulfillment can be part of the life experience of even the weakest and the humblest among us.

The civil rights struggle is not only a struggle for laws and judicial decisions. It is also—particularly at this time—a struggle against the rejection, the poverty and ill health that millions of Negroes and people from other minority groups still suffer in our affluent society.

Another obvious connection exists between my struggle and yours. We now know that mental retardation is not always the result of an inborn defect. It may be caused—and is indeed often caused—by physical, cultural, or emotional deprivation.

In this way too many children, too often poor Negro children, pay a heavy toll for the injustices of our society.

It is believed nowadays that only about a quarter of all the mentally retarded have brain damage, or an organic defect that can impair brain function. This type of retardation affects all groups similarly, whether they are rich or poor, white or Negro. It is usually severe retardation associated with physical handicaps; its prevention and treatment must be essentially scientific and medical, and our hope for its victims is founded on progress in medical and behavioral research and in a better knowledge of human genetics.

The other three-quarters of the retarded show no obvious brain damage. They have a milder form of retardation and few or no physical handicaps. They usually come from the poorer strata of our society, typically census tracts where the median level of education is 8 years and the median level of income \$3,000—or less per year per family. While this second type of retardation occurs at far below 1 percent in high income and well educated groups, it rises to amazingly high levels, as much as 15 percent in deprived rural areas and in the murk of the urban ghettos.

It is of the retarded victims of deprivation—many of them Negroes—that I am going to talk today.

It brings great credit to the true civic spirit and the true feeling of human solidarity of the National Association for Retarded Children that the theme of its convention this year should be "Reaching Out" and that it has invited me to talk about the heavy burden the Negro bears in relation to mental retardation. Indeed, the picture that I am going to draw will be one that will challenge your admirable organization with new problems and new responsibilities.

The Negro community needs your pioneering experience and your support in its struggle.

Because the Negro has suffered generations of discrimination, abuse and neglect, he still lives, by and large, a life of isolation from the mainstream of society; and also a life of poverty, to an extent which is

rarely known in the white world. He, therefore, more than the members of any other single ethnic group, pays a heavy price for injustice in the form of a large number of mentally retarded children—children that become retarded not because they have a bad heredity, but only because the frail and sensitive minds of the very young cannot withstand the bleakness, the harshness and the cruelties of the life of the poor.

Since deprivation as a cause of mental retardation is my primary concern here perhaps I should spell out more precisely the nature of the deprivation experienced by millions of poor Negroes.

Despite the legislative and judicial decisions of the last decade and the current thrust toward social justice under the leadership of President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey, a report prepared by the National Urban League shows that while progress has been achieved, it is not fast enough to narrow the gap between the general conditions of the whites and those of the Negroes. Although Negroes enjoy better opportunities than in the past, the prosperity of the white community develops at a much faster rate, so that the actual gap between whites and Negroes increases rather than narrows. This cruel fact means that unless more determined strides are made to break down racial barriers, the disparity between Negroes and whites will be larger in 1975 than it is today.

Let us consider some relevant figures:

Comparative mortality rates are good indicators of underlying social and economic conditions and clearly demonstrate the nature of the gap.

By 1963, there was little difference in overall mortality between whites and non-whites (9.5 per thousand and 10.1 per thousand). This shows only that in the end death does not discriminate; all of us, white or black, must die sometime. However, if we look at the age at which we die, radical differences appear.

Infant mortality and the death rate for children between the ages of 1 and 4 are almost twice as high for Negroes as for whites (44.1 as compared to 22.3 per thousand among infants, and 1.8 as compared to 0.9 per thousand among the 1-to-4 year olds). At least three times as many Negroes die between the ages of 25 and 34 as do whites. And for the next twenty years—all through the prime of life—the mortality rate for Negroes is nearly twice as high as for whites.

It is not until you get into the very top age brackets—75 and over—that the white mortality rate exceeds that of Negroes, for the simple reason that relatively few Negroes live long enough to figure in this part of the table. Those few that do are obviously indestructible.

What kind of life does the average Negro live?

POVERTY'S CHILDREN

Negro infants are twice as likely to be born prematurely—and as you know, prematurity in itself is a major factor contributing to mental retardation. This high rate of premature births occurs because of the poor health of mothers, because of their ignorance of family planning and of the importance of medical supervision during pregnancy, and even more often because of a lack of access to resources providing such knowledge or services.

The children of poverty are commonly born to mothers who were themselves poorly nourished in their adolescence; they are children who are often unplanned, unwanted, or born out of wedlock.

Moreover, these children often grow up in homes where there is no father and an unavailable working mother. All too frequently, they are left alone in their cribs, without tactile and other normal adult-child relationships. They are not encouraged to explore their environments nor do they receive the usual complement of loving care which chil-

dren require in order to grow healthy emotionally and intellectually. They are deprived of the stimulation which all of us experienced when we were children.

Though there may be quite a bit of noise around them, they hear few words in daily conversation from adults and the words they do hear usually have negative connotations.

There are many "unavailable" mothers—not only working mothers, but also those who are unable to supply the needs of their children because of difficulties of their own; they are emotionally unavailable. Yet others cannot arouse themselves sufficiently from their passivity of lethargy to show affection for their children. Others are deeply depressed and mentally ill and they reject their children for any of a multitude of reasons.

Tragically, the parents in such families frequently fail to react to the presence of retardation. They are underprivileged and must constantly fight for survival. There is no proper family structure, the home is disrupted and disruptive, and the difference between the child's IQ and that of the parents is relatively small. Such parents do not see any reason to seek help and very often distrust the social institutions that can provide it.

Under these conditions, people have to concentrate all their meagre energies on keeping body and soul together. They have neither the means nor the ability to provide their children with stimulating conversation, with books, music, travel, or the other intellectual and cultural advantages bestowed almost automatically on most children of the middle and upper income groups.

When motivation and opportunity for learning are lacking in the early years and other adverse conditions are added—poor diet, bad health habits and sanitation, lack of pre-natal and post-natal care, emotional disorders, crowded living conditions—the result is often stunted intellectual development.

Children from families like these arrive at school age without either the experience or the skills necessary for learning. They are backward in language and in the ability for abstract thinking necessary for reading, writing, and arithmetic. Their failure to learn becomes complicated by frustration and anxiety. They eventually graduate to the streets and far too many to the reformatory.

These children are the innocent products of malignant environments, environments which are a catalogue of injurious factors. They are the children who in our otherwise well endowed and affluent society, inherit the circumstances, not the genes, that predispose them to mental retardation.

It is important here to emphasize that I am describing not the Negro family, but the impoverished Negro family. Obviously, there is no such thing as the Negro.

But when it comes to the conditions under which Negroes live, certain inescapable generalities arise. When Negroes reach adulthood, they find that for them unemployment rates are regularly more than twice as high as those among whites, whatever their occupation, educational level, age, or sex. The Negro college graduate can expect to earn only as much as the white manual worker who never went beyond the eighth grade. At comparable occupation levels, the white worker earns 50 percent more in a lifetime than does a Negro. The Negro is the last hired, the first fired, and when he works he is paid less than his white counterpart.

The unemployment rate in depressed areas often exceeds 50 percent at a time when the over-all rate of unemployment is a low as 3.5 percent. Unemployment in our ghettos is chronically higher than it was for society at large during the great depression. If the same situation prevailed in the entire nation, we would be on the verge of revolution.

WANTED: A MAN WITH A JOB

Art Linkletter once interviewed a little Negro girl on nationwide television and

asked her, "What kind of man do you want to marry?" The child said, "I want to marry a man with a job."

You might think that the discomforts and deprivations experienced by a Negro family receiving \$2,400 annually would be the same as those experienced by a white family in similar circumstances. But this is not so for many reasons.

For one thing, given the economics of the ghetto, the Negro dollar buys less than the white dollar. First, consider how overcrowded the urban ghettos are. It may interest you to know that if the entire population of the United States lived at the same density as people live in the worst blocks of Harlem, the entire population of the United States could be housed in three of the five boroughs of New York City. Where overcrowding like this exists, the functioning of supply and demand drives rentals up and the Negro pays more for less.

The Negro also pays more than whites for goods bought on credit, largely because he is judged a poorer credit risk. Interest rates in the ghetto are frequently extortionate. Also, poor Negro families are larger than poor white families, so that what the Negro earns, and gets less for, is spread over more people.

Things that improve the lives of the affluent and even for poor whites, often cause reversals in the lives of Negroes. A good example is urban renewal. Because so many urban Negroes live in slums, it is estimated that 60 percent of the persons dispossessed by urban renewal have been Negroes. Poor whites have less difficulty in relocating; there are more neighborhoods to which they can go. Poor Negroes, confined to the ghetto, simply find themselves faced with a reduced housing supply and, with a reduced supply of housing, rents go up. Those displaced by urban renewal usually wind up paying an average of 10 percent more for rent after relocation than before, with no corresponding increase in income.

CYCLES OF FUTILITY

In addition to discrimination in housing, discrimination against Negroes operates in education and in jobs that might otherwise provide an escape from poverty.

In the main, it is fair to assume that poor whites are poor because they are the least able whites. But poor Negroes include not only those who are the least able, but many of those whose abilities are in the middle and even superior ranges. These able Negroes are poor because they are trapped in an endless cycle of poverty, because they are subject to racial discrimination and are denied access to fields in which their earning ability could be developed and made use of. How tragic it is that today the greatest freedom the Negro experiences is the freedom to die in Vietnam. Here, too, America achieves its only true integration and learns, as General Westmoreland puts it, that "over here, the first thing you find out is that geniuses and idiots, cowards and heroes come in all colors. No race has a monopoly on virtue and no race has a monopoly on vice."

The woeful fruits of historic educational discrimination in the South highlight the fact that a failure of education in any area of the United States has its effect everywhere else. In Illinois, the department of public health conducted a test of literacy among poor, able-bodied Negroes, aged 16 to 64. Of those educated in Illinois, 3 percent were functionally illiterate; 35 percent illiterate. Of those educated in Mississippi but resident in Illinois, 23 percent were functionally illiterate and 81 percent, or four out of five, were illiterate. Obviously, the poor southern Negro, badly educated in the South and transplanted to a northern or western city, where educational standards rise year by year, falls farther and farther behind. Held back by their heritage from the Southern Way of Life, able-bodied Negroes find it harder and harder to compete.

And all this is happening now, at a time

when the spectre of automation demands higher and higher skills, and when the really pervasive economic problem is the need to upgrade the work skills of whole sections of the population in as short a time as possible.

This is the face of poverty. This is the world of the Negro American, the Mexican laborer, the American Indian, the Puerto Rican immigrant and also to some extent the poor white in impoverished rural areas. It is breeding ground of as much as half of our mentally retarded people, the dull-eyed children, the juvenile delinquents, the dropouts and socially unadapted youngsters who drive teachers, lawmakers, and governments to despair.

LAW AND JUSTICE

Can there be any doubt why riots occur in such settings? Can there be any doubt about the pathological condition of many of our cities? Can there be any doubt that urban and racial problems are inseparable? And can there be any doubt that the social conditions which produce mental retardation also produce urban conflict? Can there be any doubt about the extent of our common cause, yours and mine?

There is today much hue and cry for law and order. It is time we stopped talking about law and order as ends in themselves. Hitler had law and order. What we must have is law and justice. We shall never have order—and, indeed, will not deserve order, until we have justice.

What is the cost to the nation of mental retardation caused by deprivation? It cannot be estimated in terms of human suffering. The intangibles cannot be measured, for mental retardation involves a human being, a social and psychic nature that has an indeterminable order of magnitude. But the financial cost to the economy is known to be staggering in terms of undeveloped human resources.

We know that to provide adequate care for the severely retarded and handicapped is expensive. But the loss of potential earning power that results from not training and educating those who can be made to lead self-supporting lives, is astronomical.

During World War II, more than 700,000 persons between 18 and 37 were rejected for military service because of mental deficiency. According to the first report of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, an estimated 2 million retarded persons capable of learning to support themselves remain untrained today although they have a potential annual earning capacity of 6 billion.

This tragic condition emphasizes how important it is to help the children of the poor. It is they, the children, who have the best chance of escaping poverty. A child lifted out of poverty breaks out of the vicious cycle by which poverty is passed on to the next generation.

Unless we take action now, the "culture of poverty" which holds the secret and the key to the problem will go on reaping its grim toll year after year. The "Culture of Poverty," a term created by Oscar Lewis, aptly describes the attitudes of people for whom poverty has become an accepted way of life. It is made up of lethargy and indifference, sometimes strange forms of rebellion and escapism. It is by no means a prerogative of the Negro people (it was first recognized among Mexicans in Mexico City) and it exists among all large, poor, urban communities isolated in the midst of general prosperity. It is a world that has renounced middleclass targets of success and social status, ethics, and social values. Nevertheless, it is a world with its own rules, taboos, pride, and scale of values. This is the world we have to learn to break into, to communicate with and to convince despite its skepticism and its suspicion. I hope I have shown you that anything we can do to solve the conditions which lead to an all

too common kind of mental retardation can help to solve the problem that is threatening the very stability of American life today.

Our nation is confronted with a crisis, a crisis which is both urban and racial. At its core lies the same problem of human deprivation that concerns you, because it can be so cruel and evil to young minds that it may damage them for life. To eliminate economic poverty requires removing another kind of poverty afflicting most middle-class Americans—a poverty of will and concern for others.

It is not known precisely how many among those whose retardation is due solely to deprivation are Negroes. Most of them remain invisible, faceless, nameless, unseen and unrecognized, remote from the institutions and organizations that could help them. We may guess, however, that there are many of them. Conventional approaches such as financial relief unaccompanied by family counseling, jobs without job tailoring or training, have often failed in slum areas.

A chronically impoverished population cannot respond to opportunity as if poverty for them was accidental. The harm already done to many of them is too deep. It has long ago penetrated to the very body and soul of its victims. Therefore, only a concerted, comprehensive, multi-faceted approach of economic, social, and health relief can result in rehabilitation.

The type of retardation caused by social and cultural deprivation occurs more frequently among Negroes than among whites for the simple reason that Negroes experience social and cultural deprivation far more frequently than do whites. Severe, inborn defects, however, occur with the same frequency among Negroes as among whites.

Throughout the country, one in a thousand persons is in an institution for the mentally retarded. How does this figure apply to the Negro? Among the severely retarded, Negroes are probably underrepresented because all such institutions have long waiting lists and getting to the top of the list requires a spokesman the Negro seldom has. On the other hand, among the mildly retarded, who may be institutionalized because of mild delinquent behavior, the Negro is often overrepresented. A middle-class child, equally retarded and having committed the same misdeed, is likely to remain with his family, while the Negro child, not having the same social protections, is apt to end up in an institution. Again, the system works against him.

Even more tragic in the over-all picture is the fact that the Negro is apt to encounter segregation and discrimination within the institution to which he is assigned. I know of quite a few settings in which Negroes are housed separately and treated separately, which usually means they are the recipients of poorer programs and that their chances of a return to society are diminished.

THE UNREACHED

Have you asked yourselves whether the proportion of Negroes in relation to whites in such community programs as day care centers, sheltered workshops, etc., reflects the proportion of Negroes in the community? Possibly it does in some places, but in most places it does not. Negroes remain unreached by those with the services Negroes need most urgently, needs which are more desperate because the Negro's economic capacity to cope with a severely retarded child at home is usually less than that of his white counterpart.

THE UNASKED

Ask yourself how many Negro families belong to your local association for retarded children, despite the non-discriminatory bylaws of the National Association for Retarded Children. If you want the help and understanding of society at large for your children in need, shouldn't you ask yourself

how often you have reached out to extend simply sympathy, advice, and moral support to a Negro family burdened with the same needs but timid in calling out for help? As a group, Negroes do not want charity, or paternalism or the isolationism called for by the widely publicized "black power" rebellious fringe. What they do want is justice and a chance to participate actively in the mainstream of American life, to whose spiritual values they have contributed so much, being the nation's oldest and largest minority group.

If really welcomed to do so, Negro parents will join the campaign against mental retardation and will put their strength and the enthusiasm of a newly found opportunity to the service of the common struggle.

Consider how ridiculous it is that Negroes are so often condemned to unemployment or underemployment at a time when we continually hear cries of concern about a manpower shortage. Why shouldn't they become an important, immediate source of additional manpower, particularly as auxiliaries to professionals in health, education, and social work? It would cost relatively little in money and effort to upgrade even the unskilled to the point at which they would become valuable assistants to presently overburdened professional staffs. Negroes, particularly Negro women, would then discover the joy of a life of meaningful service in the community and could bring their well known love, patience, and devotion to children into play to help those who need it so much.

For a long-range new supply of professional manpower, a well conducted campaign among high school students would motivate them toward careers in special education, and the health professions would reap a rich harvest among young people who yearn for a meaningful future.

I suggest that the National Association for Retarded Children, with its 1,250 local units all over the country, in every type of community, could render an immense service to the community at large, and an even greater service to mentally retarded people, in undertaking this type of reaching out.

We should not delude ourselves into believing that society will treat its mentally retarded citizens as equal and deserving human beings as long as it fails to treat others decently simply because they have dark skin or fails to offer them meaningful help at a time when they struggle so painfully to emerge from centuries of oppression.

My fight and your fight are inseparable in that both aim at changing a general narrow-minded, self-righteous and selfish public attitude into one of enlightenment and compassionate humanism.

We have made some progress, and I am happy to announce that the National Urban League, the National Association for Retarded Children, and the Family Service Association of America are now working on the formulation of a program to combine the expertise and knowledge of each of these agencies in a special effort directed at the mentally retarded and their families. The over-all objective is to help families in low-income areas with mentally retarded members to utilize existing services, of which they are now either ignorant or to which they are hostile, and to stimulate new services designed to meet their needs. We must develop this work wisely.

In searching for the truly mentally retarded among an underprivileged population it is important to bear in mind that intelligence and achievement are intimately related to the amount and quality of schooling. Although race and culture *per se* are irrelevant, our conventional aptitude and achievement tests, most of which rely heavily on middle class concepts and experience, commonly fail to reveal the undoubted in-

telligence of deprived children, many of whom survive only by the ready exercise of native wit.

In Louisiana, for example, it has been demonstrated that the closer to New Orleans Negro children dwell, the higher their IQ's, for the simple reason that the city schools are better. Also, the longer Negro children from the South live in New York City and attend New York City schools, the higher their IQ's become.

A study of "verbal destitution" among southern Negro college students revealed that those students most retarded in reading and reading comprehension come from small segregated high schools. They had the language patterns typical of the only adult models with whom they had any contact—that is, poorly educated teachers, parents, and clergy.

One researcher working with the children of the Negro poor found that they invariably failed the question, "What is wrong?" when shown a picture of a house with broken windows. In their environment, broken windows are normal.

In the course of testing a group of Negro children at the University of Pittsburgh, researchers asked them to color a picture of a banana. Every one colored it brown. None had ever seen a fresh banana.

Teaching materials that show a white middle class environment complete with trees, flowers, pets, parks, toys, and comfortable surroundings are incomprehensible to many Negro youngsters. Such unfamiliar images intimidate and disorient them and diminish their ability to learn.

RELATIVE RETARDATION

Einstein was once quoted as saying that in the society of Australian aborigines, he would rightfully be regarded as intellectually deficient for not being able to track a wallaby or throw a boomerang. If the aborigine ever did get around to drafting an IQ test, all of western civilization would presumably flunk it.

DISMAY THROUGH EDUCATION

By the same token, it is entirely possible that a sophisticated five-year-old in the suburbs may know what caviar is, while the sophisticated five-year-old in the ghetto may know what a syringe is. I submit that the intellectual achievement is about equal. Testing and teaching materials must clearly take cognizance of cultural and class differences if the true potential of the individual child is to be recognized and realized.

Traditional methods used so far have tended to ignore the action style of the deprived child. They usually avoid indigenous language and characteristics and place all their stress on middle class modes of behavior which may be totally alien. Differences in cultural background are commonly ignored—a practice that can totally inhibit the deprived child's ability to learn.

I have no respect for the teacher who writes off the deprived child as uneducable because she doesn't get middle class responses from him. Nor have I any respect for the teacher from an impoverished background whose own hard-won middle class status makes her recoil from the poverty she thought she had left behind her.

Take a slum child, for example, who is asked, "If you had 24 apples and you gave 12 away, how many would you have?" This child may well be able to do the arithmetic, but never in his life heard of anyone having 24 apples or of anyone who ever gave anything away. He may be so utterly overwhelmed by the implications of the question that he can't think of it as a problem in arithmetic. If he is then embarrassed before the class for failing to answer, or to answer within the prescribed time, his difficulty in responding to classroom stimuli will clearly get worse.

Or, again, there's the teacher who asks a child about his father and learns that he

hasn't one and exclaims, "Oh, yes, yes, I understand," making it clear from both her tone and manner that she assumes the child is illegitimate, when in fact the child's father is dead.

Slum children survive by being alert to what's going on around them, and in a case like this, the whole class resents the teacher's misunderstanding. The child is humiliated, the class gets a disagreeable insight into the teacher's point of view, and the teacher's rapport with the class is in disrepair.

Another thing that must be borne in mind is that it is basic to all learning that the child have a sense of reward. For a deprived child, rewards may never come in his home surroundings. If he doesn't learn the meaning of reward in school he may never learn it and be confined for the rest of his life to an existence without achievement.

The teacher who has heart as well as head can identify the strengths of deprived children. If they can survive in the slums, they are, by definition, educable. A study of Harvard has visibly demonstrated the importance of teacher-expectation. Teachers in a selected school system were told that certain children, chosen at random, would show dramatic improvement in academic achievement over a period of a few months. Purely because, the teachers' expectations of those children were high. They *did* show dramatic improvement.

Having drawn your attention to the special challenge the deprived child represents, I would list the most desperate needs among deprived Negroes and suggest the kinds of program that would accomplish the most in alleviating the burden of mental retardation among them.

The needs, of course, are both remedial and preventive. All enlightened measures designed to relieve the Negro community of poverty and ignorance are basic to prevention. Adequate housing, economic development of the ghetto, improved medical care, and adequate schools have clear implications for a reduction in the incidence of mental retardation.

The Head Start program, responding directly to the needs of deprived children, is of particular importance, although it should be initiated at earlier ages than at present and sustained throughout the elementary school years in order to compensate more fully for cultural deprivation in the home.

I am delighted to see that the Office of Economic Opportunity has now started experimenting with a program of parent-child centers which is, in fact, a pre-Head Start program of day care for children of the poor who are three years old and younger.

There is a crying need for more maternal and infant care centers at the heart of areas inhabited by "high risk" mothers, areas in which the incidence of prematurity is high and health habits are poor, as is the case in urban ghettos and in the rural South. Easily accessible, community-centered birth control clinics, whose staffs are highly trained not only in the technicalities of birth control, but in respect for human dignity, privacy, and freedom of conscience are an important element in the prevention of mental retardation.

In contrast to general programs of this kind, which are mainly the responsibility of the public sector, diagnostic and remedial services are more directly the responsibility of the private voluntary agencies, because they are better geared to person-to-person relations, more open to innovation, more flexible.

For example, important services could be channeled into target areas through the combined efforts of the National Association for Retarded Children, the National Urban League, and the Family Service Association with their many local chapters. They could assume the tasks of screening target populations to determine individual needs; of locating families in distress because of the presence within the family unit of a retarded

child; of awakening legitimate desires for help; of directing children to the proper diagnostic and testing facilities; and later making referrals to appropriate special education classes, to training facilities and specialized medical services. They could undertake programs for counseling and educating parents on proper attitudes toward the retarded child, which should always accompany actual care for the child.

Where adequate services are lacking, the voluntary agencies should advise parents on how to organize themselves to petition for services they are entitled to under the law and how to form pressure groups, the most efficient way for citizens to ensure their rights.

This latter is the area in which the National Association for Retarded Children has functioned most effectively in the past and in doing so has brought immeasurable relief to distressed families. I hope and pray that you, its members, will now open your hearts and minds to the plight of those still beyond the reach of adequate care, that you will reach out to the unfortunate, the timid, and the frightened in genuine concern for all those who need the benefits of NARC's rich experience in citizen organization in the service of the retarded.

Finally, and I must be completely candid with you, NARC cannot conduct an effective outreach program in behalf of the disadvantaged minorities, and be taken seriously, unless these minorities are represented on your boards, your committees and among your staff members where you have professional staff at work. The best witness to your work will not be the result of exhortation or rhetoric. It will be the result of example.

I am aware that this challenge comes at a moment when many Americans are indulging themselves in what is called a "backlash." I recently addressed another national association, and afterwards a fellow came up to me to say that while he had been very sympathetic to the Negro cause at an earlier date, now, with the cries of "black power" and the riots, and one thing and another, he was no longer as sympathetic.

I asked him to tell me what he had done when he was sympathetic. How many Negroes had he hired or trained? How many had he helped to move into his neighborhood, his school, or his country club?

Well, it turned out he hadn't done any of those things. He hadn't done anything at all. My reaction to which is that nothing from nothing is nothing.

I hope and pray that, strong in the feeling of doing justice, you will search out Negro parents and welcome them in the crusade that will finally guarantee retarded children in the Negro community the care and the hope that they have never known in the past.

Gold Still Counts for Trust

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, honest and principled people require few laws for harmonious assembly, and, likewise, honest, altruistic nations could engage in international trade without metallic money.

As the following editorial, which appeared in the San Diego Union on February 3, 1968, points out:

The fact remains that people and nations do not trust each other.

And therefore confidence in a currency depends upon its being backed by some-

thing of intrinsic value—that something generally being gold.

Our economic survival demands the controlling influence of gold backed currency.

The editorial follows:

GOLD STILL COUNTS FOR TRUST

It is highly important for congressmen to distinguish between the academic and the practical as they assess Tuesday the value of having gold as a backing for some of our money.

Rep. Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas, underlined one current favorite line of discussion when he said:

"Gold in no way, shape or form gives value to a nation's currency . . . the so-called gold cover (the gold backing for 25 per cent of our paper money) is part of outdated mythology which has no place and no meaning in 20th Century economy."

That is the academic viewpoint.

Far more realistic is the assessment of William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Tucson, Ariz., Star:

"If one assumes that most governments and most people are honest, reasonable and prudent, then it would be possible to dispense with gold as a monetary medium of exchange . . . When people demand too much, governments cannot be honest and gold plays its role."

Still another expert of the value of gold, Premier Georges Pompidou of France gives another pragmatic assessment of the value of gold as an international medium of exchange:

"Gold from the viewpoint of the international system is the policeman. You do foolish things, you spend too much—that costs you gold. You are reasonable, you save, you earn a good sum, gold comes to you . . . When one is not controlled by police, one indulges in excesses."

Whether we theorize that gold is a "barbarous metal" or a part of "outdated mythology," the fact remains that people and nations do not trust each other. Gold remains the ultimate medium of exchange when confidence in a currency without intrinsic value fails.

And unfortunately, the excesses of the United States of America through the so-called "Great Society" at home or the wasteful projects abroad has lessened confidence in the dollar.

As a result, even if the gold cover is removed, the disturbing question remains: What if it doesn't work? Foreigners hold about \$30 billion in dollars they could exchange for about \$11.5 billion of our gold. Only confidence in the dollar keeps them from doing so.

And the certitude is that even at the optimum if there is no run on U.S. gold, the removal of the gold cover is not a solution to the problem but only buys some time.

Academic polemics about the gold cover may be politically feasible in the approaching season. But if we are thinking of survival we must get down to the practical fact that gold does count and we had better do something about it.

The Future Farmers March Ahead

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Future Farmers of America are preparing for their 40th anniversary celebration. It was in Kansas City, Mo., in the year of 1928, that a small number of high school students met for the first time as a group

for the purpose of founding an organization especially for farm youths. In just four short decades this small group has grown to a membership of almost a half million boys in chapters throughout our 50 States and Puerto Rico.

Every year, since its beginning, one week in February has been set aside as National Future Farmers of America Week. Every year the activities of the year past have been recounted and evaluated and plans outlined for the coming year. Certainly it is to the credit of these early youths and their leaders, and to those who have followed them, that the agenda has become more ambitious with each succeeding year.

The Future Farmers in Kentucky, and particularly in our Second Congressional District, are very active. Our people take a great deal of pride in these young folk who, by their fresh and enthusiastic approach, are a constant reminder that the farm, both as a family home and a business enterprise, is not losing its place of importance in today's world but, rather, is embued with a new prominence.

Our young farmers are inspired today by the same basic belief that led to the establishment of the Future Farmers of America 40 years ago—a belief in the future of farming. This belief has been sorely tried at times. It is being tried now, for there are some who say that our rural communities and farms are facing extinction. In traveling throughout our district I have met and come to know some of these young men who—or so say the doubters—are about to become extinct. My young friends are somewhat amused by such talk and dire prophecy, for while they recognize the fact that our agricultural way of life is changing, they know, far better than those who are pronouncing their doom, that certainly it is not diminishing.

To embrace the belief in the future of farming, as each Future Farmer has done, is to accept its corresponding responsibility. By the example of their parents and the training within their organization, Future Farmers are encouraged not only to accept this responsibility but to seek it. As we all know, there is a segment of America's young—a small one to be sure—who are in rebellion against all that we revere in our Nation. I believe—sincerely believe—that our rural young have had and want no part of this movement. Although members of the same generation, they find it impossible to identify with the beatniks and the hippies. No need have they for a synthetic utopia for the very nature of farm life, in its simplicity, is nevertheless alive and dynamic. Here on every hand are God's blessings. Here on every hand are the true miracles—the real happenings.

Our Future Farmers are sound and solid. They possess a directness and an ingenuity that perhaps has become lost for most of us. I was told recently of a soldier who solved a rather stubborn problem he encountered in Vietnam. It seems that the bare ground around his camp was just a little too much for this man. After several unsuccessful attempts at growing native grass he wrote to his family back home for some bluegrass seed. Forthwith he was sent 50 pounds, it flourished and once again Kentucky's

fame had spread across mountains, plains, and seas. It came as no surprise to me to learn that this proud Kentuckian—now wearing the uniform of his country—was once a Future Farmer from our congressional district.

The Future Farmers of America have my admiration and my support and I wish them a future replete with success.

Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in December 1967, Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, convened a meeting in Bermuda of a group of private U.S. citizens to consider the grave situation in Vietnam. As a result of this meeting, a memorandum on Vietnam was issued which reflects the substantial consensus of the group.

The memorandum is indicative of the growing alarm at the course of escalation in Vietnam on the part of increasing numbers of responsible Americans. The memorandum is a sober assessment of what is necessary to reverse this dangerous trend. The memorandum and a list of signatories follows:

MEMORANDUM ON VIETNAM, DECEMBER 12, 1967

(NOTE.—The following memorandum represents substantial consensus among those present at a private meeting organized by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in December 1967, although it should not be assumed that every participant agrees with all of it. It does not represent an official Endowment position.)

This statement is not addressed to the past; it concerns the present and future.

There now appears to be serious danger that the momentum of the Vietnam conflict may carry hostilities to disproportionate and even perilous levels. Under the circumstances there is a need to explore policy alternatives for the future. To do so is not to criticize earlier decisions or to suggest abandoning our resistance. But if we were to pursue present objectives by widening the war as by ground probes into Laos and Cambodia, our commitments would escalate along with our risks, and the next step could be an invasion of North Vietnam. Such developments would entail unacceptable risks and threaten world peace.

It seems most unlikely that widening the war, and particularly invading North Vietnam, would lead to military victory or shorten the war. Rather, this would heighten the possibility of direct Chinese and Soviet intervention, further alienate friendly and neutral nations, and jeopardize other world-wide American interests. It would also deepen divisions inside the United States and curtail programs essential to our domestic tranquillity; it could revive isolationism.

The United States should modify its strategy so that it can defend South Vietnam without surrender and without increasing the risks of a wider war. United States policy should not be dependent on Hanoi's decisions.

First, in the war in the South every effort should be made to reduce violence to levels at which a sustained effort can be maintained with the support of both the American and Vietnamese people. The emphasis should not be on the military destruction of communist forces in the South but on the

protection of the people of South Vietnam and the stabilization of the situation at a politically tolerable level. Tactically, this would involve a shift in emphasis from "search-and-destroy" to "clear-and-hold" operations.

Second, we should stop the bombing of North Vietnam. From now on the costs of strategic bombing will increasingly exceed the benefits. This step would tend to shift international pressures from Washington to Hanoi. It should not be made contingent upon an immediate military *quid pro quo* nor taken in the expectation that it would lead to early negotiations. If North Vietnam chose to exploit the cessation flagrantly by expanding its forces in the South, bombing of infiltration routes could be resumed, with the prospect of increased domestic political support.

Third, the South Vietnamese government at all levels should be steadily pressed to assume greater and greater responsibility, both political and military, for the defense and pacification of the country. To achieve this purpose, the United States should seek every opportunity to make aid to the South Vietnamese conditional upon fulfillment of their commitments.

Fourth, a major problem arises concerning the role of the National Liberation Front as an organized factor in the political life of South Vietnam. In seeking an end to open hostilities, we should recognize that the risks of attempting to cope with the National Liberation Front primarily by political means on a long-term basis, although real, are less than the risks for the United States of persisting in an indefinitely prolonged attempt to destroy the National Liberation Front or to exclude it by American military force.

In sum, United States policy should aim at moderating the level of hostilities regardless of whether formal negotiations for an ultimate settlement are now possible. In the large, United States posture should be one that can be sustained for an indefinite period with reduced risks and increased political benefits until such time as the conflict can be resolved in an honorable and peaceful fashion.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

Among the participants were the following (Associations are given only for purposes of identification):

Harding F. Bancroft, Executive Vice President, The New York Times, Carnegie Endowment Trustee, former US delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

Lincoln Bloomfield, Professor, Center for International Studies, M.I.T., former State Department official.

Charles G. Bolté, Vice President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former Member of the US Mission to the United Nations.

John Cowles, President, The Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

Daniel Ellsberg, Economist and former member, US Mission in Vietnam.

Miss Frances FitzGerald, author of recent articles on Vietnam in *Atlantic*.

Ernest A. Gross, Partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle, Carnegie Endowment Trustee, former US delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

Roger Hillsman, Professor, School of International Affairs, Columbia University, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former State Department official.

Milton Katz, Director of International Legal Studies, Harvard Law School, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

George Kistlakowsky, Professor, Department of Chemistry, Harvard University, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, 1959-61.

Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation, former State Department official.

Richard Neustadt, Director, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, former Special Consultant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Matthew B. Ridgway, General, U.S. Army, retired.

Marshall D. Shulman, Director, Russian Institute, Columbia University, former State Department official.

Donald B. Straus, President, American Arbitration Association, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

Kenneth W. Thompson, Political Scientist. James C. Thomson, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Harvard University, former White House aide.

Stephen J. Wright, President, United Negro College Fund.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor, Harvard Law School, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Charles Yost, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, former US Ambassador to Laos and US Deputy Representative to the United Nations.

Dramatic Action by Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant publicly made known its plans to significantly reduce air pollution in Saginaw, Mich. It is a tremendously expensive undertaking for this Saginaw General Motors Corp. plant which will replace its coke-fired cupolas with electric induction melting furnaces.

In this massive 5-year changeover, a company official summed up this project by saying:

In the control of melting emission this is as absolute as you can get today.

It is with pride that I bring to the attention of all Members of the Congress newspaper articles from the Saginaw News in its editions of February 8 and 9, 1968, centering on this dramatic announcement.

With our Federal Government, State and local governments becoming more keenly aware each day of the absolute health needs for clean air, it is significant that this multimillion-dollar project has been planned and now put into effect by the own initiative of this plant and its corporation.

Playing a major role in the planning that took months, yes, years, was Elmer E. Braun, central foundry division's general manager, along with the capable leadership of Charles E. Drury, division works manager, and Arthur J. Karam, plant manager.

In closing, permit me to quote from the editorial, which sums up what has been called a "great step forward." The quotation is:

GM's undertaking at Malleable, we believe, will go a long way toward restoring and preserving that confidence. This one proves that big business is aware, does care and is will-

ing to invest in the most modern of devices to eliminate or drastically reduce air pollution for both the environmental and economic good of all.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Saginaw News, Feb. 8, 1968]

MALLEABLE'S NEW FURNACES TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION

Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant announced today plans to significantly reduce air pollution by replacing its coke-fired cupolas with electric induction melting furnaces.

Elmer E. Braun, division general manager, said the Saginaw General Motors Corp. plant will be furnished with the highest volume induction melting installation in the world, involving the use of giant, coreless induction furnaces.

"In doing so," he said, "we will eliminate a major source of smoke and at the same time modernize the plant's melting facilities with the most advanced equipment available."

Announcement of the plan was made at noon today in a program at the Central Foundry Division headquarters. Attending were state, county, and city officials, area businessmen and industrialists and GM officials.

Details of the plan were explained by Charles E. Drury, division works manager and Arthur J. Karam, plant manager. They said that work on the multi-million dollar first phase has already begun and that the complete changeover will be accomplished in approximately five years.

The decision to use induction melting was based on several factors, some of which may pertain only to the Saginaw plant and its particular product lines, according to Drury. He listed the age of existing melting facilities; the need for melting flexibility and close metallurgical control, evaluation of over three years' experience with large induction furnaces at the Saginaw and new Defiance, Ohio, plants.

"This will be the most ambitious project the Saginaw plant has ever undertaken," Karam said. "It can only be done a step at a time, because we must maintain operations throughout the transition period." The plant employs about 3,000 persons and is the world's largest producer of malleable iron and ArmaSteel castings—products used extensively in industry and defense.

Phase One, now underway, includes the relocation of some existing facilities, improvement of additional land needed, installation of one melting unit with preheaters, material handling equipment, a building addition, and a new power distribution system. Initial equipment orders have been placed.

The first new furnace will begin operating in 1969, eliminating the need for one of the plant's three operating cupolas. This will reduce the effluent by about one-third. The remaining two furnaces are scheduled to become operational at intervals of approximately 1½ years with corresponding reductions of melting effluent being achieved at each step.

"By early 1972," Karam said, "our induction melting installation should be completely operational and the use of the last cupola discontinued. We then will have achieved virtual elimination of melting emissions, a goal toward which we have been striving since 1946 when we installed the first cupola wet cap control units. Later efforts included improved wet caps, the development of a small experimental cupola gas scrubber, installation in 1960 of a low-energy Venturi scrubber, and extending the stacks to permit installation of gas incinerators. In 1964, we purchased and installed a 33-ton induction furnace, then the world's largest, to provide actual operating experience and data."

Heading the list of GM officials were Joseph G. Godfrey, GM vice president and former general manager of Saginaw Steering Gear Division, and Wallace E. Wilson, vice president and group executive.

State officials included John C. Soet, Lansing, director of Occupational Health Department; Bernard D. Bloomfield, Lansing, assistant director, and Russell Scoville, Saginaw, local engineer for Occupational Health and Air Pollution.

County officials included James L. Colli-son, chairman of the Saginaw County Board of Supervisors, and Julius Sutto, Saginaw County Comptroller.

City Officials included Mayor Henry G. Marsh, Councilmen Benjamin J. Marxer, Paul H. Wendler, Warren C. Light, Fremont F. Ruhl, Robert L. Loucks, James W. Stenglein; Thomas H. Eynon, city information officer; Dwight D. Hughes, chairman of the city planning commission, and Howard G. Sheltraw, director of the city planning department.

Businessmen and industrialists included B. G. Campbell, vice president of sales for Consumers Power Co.; G. Hutton Schrader, president of the Greater Saginaw Chamber of Commerce, and Anson Hedgecock, Jackson, vice president of Consumers Power Co.

Special guests at the luncheon will be Reidar G. Brustad, Oslo, Norway, public relations manager for GM Norway; Charles B. McCabe, public relations manager of GM Austria; Giovanni Costantini, public relations manager of GM Italia, and Bendt Hansen, public relations manager for GM International in Denmark.

Melting iron in coreless electrical induction furnaces produces little smoke compared to the conventional coke-fired cupola, and that effluent can be easily controlled. Because the heat is produced electrically, no combustibles, such as coke and carbon are required. Further, there is no need for the continuous exhaust of high velocity, high temperature gases which pick up and carry minute, solid particles from cupolas.

The first wide use of induction furnace melting for iron came about in Europe during the early 1950's. Such furnaces at that time had a 5-ton holding capacity with sufficient electrical power input to melt 1½ tons of metal per hour. The advantages in the use of this melting procedure was recognized by American foundrymen. Larger furnaces were designed to meet the larger output required by U.S. foundries. The Saginaw plant's original furnace, which holds 33 tons and melts eight tons per hour, was a major step forward.

The four induction furnaces now in use at the division's Defiance Plant No. 2 are still the largest in the world from the standpoint of electrical power input—each with a power input of 6,250 kilowatts and capable of melting 10 tons per hour. The success of these 33-ton furnaces made practical the development of a 75-ton holding furnace with a 17,000 kilowatt power input. Such a furnace, in combination with preheating of the metal charge, will make possible an output of 40 tons per hour which is equivalent to the output of a large malleable iron cupola.

[From the Saginaw News, Feb. 9, 1968]

FOUNDRY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LAUDED

Civic, business and health officials have commended General Motors Corp.'s Central Foundry Division following its announcement of a five-year, multi-million-dollar project to install new melting furnaces which will practically eliminate air pollution from the foundry's smoke stacks.

Work already has begun on the electric furnaces—the largest of their type in the world. They will replace the foundry's coke-fired furnaces, eliminating by one-third the smoke, ash, soot and cinders which come from the foundry's stacks. The first new fur-

nace will become operational in 1969. The project, which also includes buildings and power plant additions, will be complete by 1972.

A specific dollar cost was not given for the project at the foundry, which employs about 3,000 persons and is the world's largest producer of malleable iron and ArmaSteel castings.

John C. Soet, director of occupational health for the Michigan Department of Public Health, was one of those who commended Central Foundry for what he called its attitude of social responsibility and quick response to state air pollution regulations in the emissions control law passed last year by the Michigan Legislature.

Soet was among the state, county and municipal officials at Central Foundry Division's luncheon Thursday at Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant for the announcement of the project.

Eimer E. Braun, division general manager, introduced Soet and their guests who spoke briefly to express appreciation for the company's decision to replace the four coke-fired cupolas now used to melt metal. Others who spoke included Mayor Henry G. Marsh; Wallace E. Wilson, General Motors Corp. vice president and chief of the group of which Central Foundry Division is a part. He gave the corporation's views on air pollution. Charles E. Drury, division works manager, explained details of the replacement program, along with Arthur J. Karam, plant manager.

Pollution, especially pollution in the air, is vexing to state health officials, Soet said. He added that operating foundries in the state are significant contributors to air pollution. Members of the Air Pollution Control Commission, he continued, are aware of the industry's value to the state's economy and are gratified by the response of many foundries to the air pollution control program.

Central Foundry's plan to install electric furnaces will reduce considerably the amount of particulates in the air around Saginaw, he said, and is a commendable example of the kind of pollution controls needed.

Marsh expressed to Central Foundry and GM officials the appreciation of the city for the efforts to relieve the problem of air pollution here. He called the decision an "example of progress at its best."

"Central Foundry's program is an excellent start for a campaign to eliminate air pollution," Wilson said, "and is indicative of the General Motors policy on all types of pollution in the air, on land and in water."

Karam told the group in response to a question that the electric induction furnaces for melting iron would virtually eliminate all polluting smoke from the foundry. He said 1972 should let the division reach its goal of eliminating pollution which they had been striving for since 1946 when the first cupola wet cap control units were installed.

Braun also read a message from Lt. Gov. William G. Millikin which expressed appreciation to General Motors and the Central Foundry Division for the air pollution control project.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Feb. 9, 1968]

MALLEABLE PROJECT GREAT STEP FORWARD

To somewhat paraphrase Gov. Romney's recent State-of-the-State theme, anybody interested in a better, cleaner, safer Saginaw—and that presumably includes all of us—will welcome announcement that work has begun to make coke-fired cupolas at Central Foundry Division's Malleable Iron Plant a thing of the past.

This is a dramatic announcement that has to be measured in more ways than merely

what it is going to cost General Motors to transform Malleable's melting process into a virtually smokeless operation through installation of coreless electric induction furnaces. Suffice to say that will be plenty.

More important, however, is what this project means in terms of environmental improvement, economic development, industrial advancement and, in fact, public confidence. As with an iceberg these are the things beneath the surface that do not show up in complex blueprints, cost sheets or explanations in the language of engineering.

Obviously the number one factor in the undertaking is what it is going to mean relative to reduced air pollution. And what it is going to mean to the air over Saginaw is great indeed.

There is, of course, no quick route to this changeover. As GM and Malleable officials pointed out Thursday, the foundry's three coke-fired furnaces will have to be replaced one by one in a phasing out program which won't be completed for five years. It is a huge job and production must continue while the changeover installations are being made.

But what is greatly encouraging is the fact that with each replacement, electric furnace for coke-fired, the so-called melting emissions will be reduced by about one-third. That means smoke and it says that by the time all electric furnaces are operative Malleable melting operations will be virtually non-pollutant to the air.

One company official summed up the project this: "In the control of melting emission this is as absolute as you can get today." That's a big and encouraging statement.

Yet from still another standpoint, one of the more significant aspects of the Malleable melting furnace modernization program has nothing directly to do with the foundry. This is the very stimulating effect it will have on redevelopment in the South Saginaw area and particularly as it relates to future river front projects.

Virtual elimination of foundry smoke wastes from the air and removal of cupolas will enhance chances for even greater development by removing from skyline view those things which discourage investment.

From the manufacturing standpoint the project speaks for itself. Installation of the electric furnaces at the Malleable plant, the largest producer of iron and certain steel castings, may very well make it the model for all foundry melting processes in the country.

Combining the best in both air pollutant control and advanced production characteristics, the Saginaw project could be the major breakthrough that the foundry industry has been looking for.

It must be said again, however, that nothing transcends the project's worth more than its environmental benefits.

National concern over the quality of the air we breathe is as intense as concern over water pollution. Therefore this city, which yet hasn't been faced with a problem of polluted air as great as that being encountered in many other places, is fortunate to have inherited a cleaner-air project of this magnitude.

This brings us to one of the points made earlier—public confidence. It is perhaps one of the most critical facets of all in the issue of air pollution and industry's responsibility in this regard.

GM's undertaking at Malleable, we believe, will go a long way toward restoring and preserving that confidence. This one proves that big business is aware, does care and is willing to invest in the most modern of devices to eliminate or drastically reduce air pollution for both the environmental and economic good of all.

As far as this community is concerned, it bears a direct relationship to a better, cleaner, safer Saginaw.

A Clearer View of Lincoln

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of *Ebony* magazine features an arresting article concerning Abraham Lincoln's views on slavery and the black man in America. This article, titled "Was Abe Lincoln a White Supremacist?", contains information regarding President Lincoln's attitudes and actions which have never been given sufficient attention, not only by popular accounts, but even by many professional historians.

The author of the article, Lerone Bennett, Jr., senior editor of *Ebony* magazine, is well-known as a careful and thoughtful historian. This article, and the dialog that I am sure it will provoke among both historians and in the public media, will do much to achieve a more accurate and clearer view of President Lincoln. It is of the greatest importance that contemporary American accurately understand the views and perspective of this famous President.

I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed immediately following my remarks.

The article follows:

WAS ABE LINCOLN A WHITE SUPREMACIST?

(By Lerone Bennett, Jr.)

The presidential campaign was over and the victor was stretching his legs and shaking off the cares of the world in his temporary office in the State Capitol in Springfield, Ill. Surrounded by the perquisites of power, at peace with the world, the President-elect was regaling old acquaintances with hilarious stories of his early days as a politician. One of the visitors interrupted this entertaining monologue and remarked that it was a shame that "the vexatious slavery matter" would be the first question of public policy the new President would have to deal with in Washington.

The President-elect's eyes twinkled and he said he was reminded of a story. According to eyewitness Henry Villard, President-elect Abraham Lincoln "told the story of the Kentucky Justice of the Peace whose first case was a criminal prosecution for the abuse of slaves. Unable to find any precedent, he exclaimed at last angrily: 'I will be damned if I don't feel almost sorry for being elected when the niggers is the first thing I have to attend to.'"

This story, shocking as it may sound to Lincoln admirers, was in character. For the President-elect had never shown any undue interest in black people, and it was altogether natural for him to suggest that he shared the viewpoint of the reluctant and biased justice of the peace.

In one of the supreme ironies of history, the man who told this story was forced by circumstances to attend to the Negroes. And within five years he was enshrined in American mythology as "the Great Emancipator who freed the Negroes with a stroke of the pen out of the goodness and compassion of his heart."

Over the years, the Mythology of the Great Emancipator has become a part of the mental landscape of America. Generations of schoolchildren have memorized its cadences. Poets, politicians, and long-suffering blacks have wept over its imagery and drama.

No other American story is so enduring.

No other American story is so comforting. No other American story is so false.

Abraham Lincoln was *not* the Great Emancipator. As we shall see, there is abundant evidence to indicate that the Emancipation Proclamation was not what people think it is and that Lincoln issued it with extreme misgivings and reservations. Even more decisive is the fact that the real Lincoln was a tragically flawed figure who shared the racial prejudices of most of his white contemporaries.

If, despite the record, Lincoln has been misunderstood and misinterpreted, it is not his fault. A conservative Illinois lawyer, cautious and conventional in social matters, Lincoln never pretended to be a racial liberal or a social innovator. He said repeatedly, in public and in private, that he was a firm believer in white supremacy. And his acts supported his assertions. Not only that: Lincoln had profound doubts about the possibility of realizing the rhetoric of the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address on this soil; and he believed until his death that black people and white people would be much better off separated—preferably with the Atlantic Ocean or some other large and deep body of water between them.

The man's character, his way with words, and his assassination, together with the psychological needs of a racist society, have obscured these contradictions under a mountain of myths which undoubtedly would have amused Lincoln, who had a wonderful sense of the ironic and ridiculous. The myth-makers have not only buried the real Lincoln; they have also managed to prove him wrong. He said once that it was impossible to fool all of the people all of the time. But his apothecosis clearly proves that it is possible to fool enough of them long enough to make a conservative white supremacist a national symbol of racial tolerance and understanding.

If the Lincoln myths were the harmless fantasies of children at play, it would be possible to ignore them. But when the myths of children become adult daydreams and when the daydreams are used to obscure deep social problems and to hide historical reality, it becomes a social duty to confront them. When, at the height of the summer rebellion season, President Lyndon B. Johnson said he intended to follow a Lincolnian course, Professor Vincent P. Harding of Spelman College rebuked him, pointing out in a letter to the *New York Times* that Lincoln's vacillating Civil War posture was a prescription for social disaster today.

Because, as Professor Harding suggested, we are envired by dangers and because we need all the light we can get; because Abraham Lincoln is not the light, because he is in fact standing in the light, hiding our way; because a real emancipation proclamation has become a matter of national survival and because no one has ever issued such a document in this country—because, finally, lies enslave and because the truth is always seemly and proper, it has become urgently necessary to reevaluate the Lincoln mythology. The need for such a reevaluation has already been recognized in some scholarly circles. Some scholars have confronted the ambiguities of the Emancipation Proclamation and have suggested that Lincoln's reputation would be more securely based if it were grounded not on that document but on his services as leader of the victorious North. Analyzing the same evidence, David Donald said in *Lincoln Reconsidered* that perhaps "the secret of Lincoln's continuing vogue is his essential ambiguity. He can be cited on all sides of all questions." Donald was not quite correct, for Lincoln cannot be cited on the side of equal rights for black people, a fact that has discomfited more than one Lincoln Day orator. Commenting on Lincoln's determined opposition to a policy of emancipation, Professor Kenneth Stampp wrote: "Indeed, it may be said that if it was

Lincoln's destiny to go down in history as the Great Emancipator, rarely has a man embraced his destiny with greater reluctance than he."

To understand Lincoln's reluctance and his painful ambivalence on the question of race, one must see him first against the background of his times. Born into a poor white family in the slave state of Kentucky and raised in the anti-black environments of southern Indiana and Illinois, Lincoln was exposed from the very beginning to racism.

It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for young Abraham Lincoln to emerge unscathed from this environment. By an immense effort of transcendence, worthy of admiration and long thought, Lincoln managed to free himself of most of the crudities of his early environment. But he did not—and perhaps could not—rise above the racism that was staining the tissue of the nation's soul.

It appears from the record that Lincoln readily absorbed the Negro stereotypes of his environment, for he ever afterwards remained fond of Negro dialect jokes, black-face minstrels and Negro ditties. "Like most white men," Professor Benjamin Quarles wrote, "Lincoln regarded the Negro as such a funny." More to the point, Lincoln, as Quarles also noted, regarded the Negro as inferior.

There is a pleasant story of Lincoln awakening to the realities of slavery on a visit to New Orleans in 1841. According to the traditional account, an aroused Lincoln said: "If I ever get a chance to hit that thing [slavery] I'll hit it hard." Since the man who reported this statement did not accompany Lincoln to New Orleans, the story is of dubious value. More telling is the fact that Lincoln distinguished himself as a public official by a reluctance to hit slavery at all.

In the general literature, Lincoln is depicted as an eloquent and flaming idealist, whaling away at the demon of slavery. This view is almost totally false. In the first place, Lincoln was an opportunist, not an idealist. He was a man of the fence, a man of the middle, a man who stated the principle with great eloquence but almost always shied away from rigid commitments to practice. Contrary to reports, Lincoln was no social revolutionary. As a matter of fact, he was an archetypal example of the cautious politician who assails the extremists on both sides. It is not for nothing that cautious politicians sing his praises.

It should be noted, secondly, that Lincoln's position on slavery has been grossly misrepresented. Lincoln was not opposed to slavery; he was opposed to the *extension* of slavery out of devotion to the interests of white people, not out of compassion for suffering blacks. To be sure, he did say from time to time that slavery was "a monstrous injustice." But he also said, repeatedly, that he was not prepared to do anything to remove that injustice where it existed. On the contrary, he said that it was his duty to tolerate and, if necessary, to give practical support to an evil supported by the U.S. Constitution.

More damaging is the fact that Lincoln apparently believed that immediate and general emancipation would be a greater evil than slavery itself. Eulogizing Henry Clay on July 6, 1852, he associated himself with that slaveowner's colonization ideas and said that Clay "did not perceive, as I think no wise man has perceived, how it [slavery] could be at once eradicated, without producing a greater evil, even to the cause of human liberty itself." In other speeches of the same period, Lincoln commended travel to black people and noted with admiration that "the children of Israel . . . went out of Egyptian bondage in a body."

A third point of significance is that Lincoln's opposition to the extension of slavery was a late and anomalous growth. In the 1830s and 1840s, in the midst of one

of the greatest moral crises in the history of America, Lincoln remained silent and lamentably inactive. In his few public utterances on the subject in the 30s and 40s, he very carefully denounced both slavery and the opponents of slavery.

For many white Northerners, the most agonizing moral issue of the day was the fugitive slave law, which required all Americans to assist in the capture and return of runaway slaves. Many whites, some of them quite conservative, refused to obey the law. Others, more daring, organized an open resistance movement, moving runaway slaves from station to station on the Underground Railway.

Instead of aiding this effort, Lincoln opposed it, publicly announcing his support of the fugitive slave law. In a private letter to Joshua F. Speed in 1855, he said: "I confess I hate to see the poor creatures hunted down, and caught, and carried back to their stripes, and unrewarded toils, but I bite my lip and keep quiet."

Lincoln came down off the fence, rhetorically, in the 50s when the Kansas-Nebraska act reopened the whole question of the extension of slavery to the largely uninhabited territories of the West. This was, he said, a clear and present threat to free white men and to what he called "the white man's charter of freedom"—the Declaration of Independence. In his public speeches of this period, Lincoln was given to saying in the same speech that he believed in white supremacy as a practical matter and in the Declaration of Independence as an abstract matter of principle.

The Lincoln years in Illinois were years of oppression and reaction. Black people could not vote, testify against white people in court or attend public schools. It was a crime for free black people to settle in the state. Although Lincoln was a powerful figure in state politics for more than a quarter of a century, he made no audible protest against this state of affairs. In fact, he said he preferred it that way. When H. Ford Douglas, a militant black leader, asked Lincoln to support a movement to repeal the law banning black testimony, Lincoln refused.

In the famous series of debates with Stephen Douglas, Lincoln made his position crystal clear. He was opposed, he said, to Negro citizenship and to "the niggers and the white people marrying together." Speaking at Charleston, Illinois, on September 18, 1858, Lincoln said: "I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races (applause) that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes; nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition, to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

Lincoln grew during the war—but he didn't grow much. On every issue relating to the black man—on emancipation, confiscation of rebel land and the use of black soldiers—he was the very essence of the white supremacist with good intentions. In fact, Lincoln distinguished himself as President by sustained and consistent opposition to the fundamental principle of the Proclamation that guaranteed his immortality. Incredible as it may seem now, the man who would go down in history as the Great Emancipator spent the first 18 months of his administration in a desperate and rather pathetic at-

tempt to save slavery where it existed. He began his Presidential career by saying that he had neither the power nor the desire to interfere with slavery in the states. And he endorsed a proposed Thirteenth Amendment which would have guaranteed that slavery would never be molested in existing states and Washington, D.C.

"My policy," Lincoln said, "is to have no policy." In this famous statement, Lincoln was something less than candid. For he did have a policy and that policy was to win the war without touching slavery. "It is the desire of the President," Secretary of War Simon Cameron wrote a general on August 8, 1861, "that all existing rights in all states be fully respected and maintained." When Lincoln's policy foundered on the reef of Southern intransigence, Lincoln complained sadly to a friend: "I struggled nearly a year and a half to get along without touching the 'institution.' . . ."

In accordance with the real policy of the Lincoln Administration, the War Department refused to accept black troops and Union generals vied with each other in proving their fealty to slavery. Some generals returned fugitive slaves to rebel owners; others said that if black slaves staged an uprising behind enemy lines they would stop fighting the enemy and turn their fire on their black friends. Union officers who refused to go along with the "soft-on-slavery" policy were court-martialed and cashiered out of the service. When, in August, 1861, General John C. Fremont emancipated Missouri slaves, Lincoln angrily countermanded the proclamation, telling Fremont's wife that "General Fremont should not have dragged the Negro into it . . ." A year later, when General David Hunter freed the slaves in three Southern states, Lincoln again countermanded the order, saying that emancipation was a Presidential function.

That this policy was changed at all was due not to Lincoln's humanitarianism but to rebel battlefield brilliance and to the compassion and perseverance of a small band of Radical Republicans. Foremost among these men were Charles Sumner, the U.S. senator from Massachusetts; Wendell Phillips, the brilliant agitator from Boston; Frederick Douglass, the bearded black abolitionist; and Thaddeus Stevens, the Pennsylvania congressman who virtually supplanted Abraham Lincoln as the leader of the Republican party. As the war continued and as Northern casualties mounted, the Radical Republicans put events to use and mobilized a public pressure Lincoln could not ignore. Delegation after delegation waited on the President and demanded that he hit the south where it would hurt most by freeing the slaves and arming them. Lincoln parried the pressure with heat and conviction, citing constitutional, political and military reasons to justify his anti-emancipation stand. Lincoln usually expressed his opposition to emancipation in a troubled but polite tone. But he could be pushed across the border of politeness. When Edward L. Pierce urged the President to adopt a more enlightened policy, Lincoln, according to Pierce, exploded and denounced "the itching to get niggers into our lives."

The traditional image of Lincoln is of a harried and large-hearted man fending off "extremists of the left and right" only to emerge at the precise psychological moment to do what he had always wanted to do. This image clashes, unfortunately, with evidence which suggests that sudden and general emancipation was never Lincoln's policy.

Lincoln was given to saying that his constitutional duties prevented him from doing anything substantial to give point to his "oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free." But it is obvious from the evidence that Lincoln's problems were deeper than that. For when his duty was clear, he refused to act. On several occasions he refused to take anti-slavery action

which was mandated by Congress and he sabotaged some anti-slavery legislation by executive inaction. Somehow, duty, in Lincoln's view, almost always worked against the black man.

Lincoln defenders say that he resisted emancipation pressures because of his fear that premature action would alienate white supporters in Northern and Border States and endanger the prosecution of the war. But this view does not come to grips with the fact that Lincoln was personally opposed to sudden and general emancipation before 1861 and the further fact that he continued to oppose sudden and general emancipation after the circulating Proclamation proved that his fears were groundless. Nor does the traditional Lincoln apologia touch the mass of evidence—in Lincoln letters as well as in private and public statements—which shows that Lincoln was personally opposed to sudden emancipation on social and racial grounds.

It was not the fear of emancipation but the fear of what would happen afterwards that palsied Lincoln's hands. He was deeply disturbed by the implications of turning loose four million black people in a land he considered the peculiar preserve of the white man. He spoke often of "the evils of sudden derangement" and warned Congress against "the vagrant destitution which must largely attend immediate emancipation in localities where their numbers are very great." He said over and over again that it was his considered judgment that "gradual, and not sudden, emancipation is better for all." Count Adam Gurowski believed Lincoln was concerned about poor white fear of black competition. "Be sure," he wrote in a May 7, 1862, letter, "that Lincoln is at heart with Slavery. He considers that emancipation is a job which will smother the free States. Such are his precise words."

Lincoln also feared racial conflict. Like many white liberals, he was consumed by fears of black violence. More than one visitor to the White House found him in agony over the possibility of a Nat Turner-like uprising behind the enemy's lines.

An additional factor in Lincoln's opposition to the principle of sudden emancipation was his racial bias. He considered black people unassimilable aliens. There was not, in his view, enough room in America for black and white people. He didn't believe white people would sanction equal rights for black people and he didn't ask white people to sanction equal rights for black people. Since he did not propose to confront racism, he told black people they would have to travel or accept a subordinate position in American life.

Insofar as it can be said that Lincoln had an emancipation policy, it was to rid America of slaves and Negroes. When he failed in his attempt to end the war without touching slavery, he fell back to a second plan of gradual and compensated emancipation extending over a 37-year-period. This was linked in his thinking with a companion policy of colonizing black people in South America or Africa.

As the pressure for emancipation rose, Lincoln argued passionately and eloquently for his plan of gradual emancipation and abrupt emigration. On August 14, 1862, he called a hand-picked group of black men to the White House and proposed a black exodus. In "a curious mixture of condescension and kindness," to use James M. McPherson's phrase, Lincoln told the black men that it was their duty to leave America. "You and we," he said, "are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it is right or wrong I need not discuss, but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence."

Lincoln did not seek the opinions of his visitors. He did not propose, he said, to discuss racism, to debate whether it was founded on reality or justice. He was simply, he said, presenting a fact: white people didn't want black people in America and therefore black people would have to go. "There is," he said, "an unwillingness on the part of our people harsh as it may be, for you free colored people to remain with us." The only solution, Lincoln said, was a black exodus. "It is better for us both," he said, ". . . to be separated." He proposed a black settlement on Central American land, "rich in coal;" and he asked his visitors to help him find black settlers "capable of thinking as white men."

Although Lincoln's plan received a generally hostile reception in the black community, he pursued it with passion and conviction. For several months after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, he was deeply involved in a disastrously abortive attempt to settle black people on an island off the coast of Haiti. When that venture failed, he shifted to the Southwest, conferring with contractors on the feasibility of settling black people in the state of Texas.

While Lincoln was trying to send black people away, Congress was busy emancipating. In the spring and summer of 1862, Congress forbade military officers to return fugitive slaves, authorized the President to accept black soldiers, and emancipated the slaves in Washington, D.C. Finally, on July 17, 1862, Congress passed the Second Confiscation Act, which freed the slaves of all rebels. This act, which has received insufficient attention in general media, was actually more sweeping than the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, which came two months later.

Lincoln followed Congress' lead slowly and grudgingly, signing most of these acts with evident displeasure. But the drift of events was unmistakable, and Lincoln changed steps, saying with great honesty that he had not controlled events but had been controlled by them. Conferring with the member of a congressional committee charged with drafting a plan for buying the slaves and sending them away, Lincoln urged speed, saying: "You had better come to an agreement. Niggers will never be cheaper."

Orthography apart, Lincoln caught here the spirit of the times. At that moment, in late July of 1862, the Union war effort was bogged down in the marshes of Virginia, and England and France were on the verge of intervening on the side of the Confederacy. At home, the heat was rising fast, fueled by mounting Northern casualties. Faced with mushrooming pressures at home and abroad, Lincoln reversed his course and "conditionally determined," to use his words, to touch the institution of slavery.

Lincoln adopted the new policy from necessity, not conviction. In public and in private, he made it clear that he was not motivated by compassion for the slaves. Taking his stand on the ground of military necessity, he said his new policy was designed to weaken Southern white men and to strengthen the hand of Northern white men. "Things," he said later, "had gone from bad to worse, till I felt we had reached the end of the rope on the plan of operation we had been pursuing, and that we had about played our last card." Lincoln said he was driven to the "alternative of either surrendering the Union, and with it, the Constitution, or of laying a strong hand upon the colored element."

There was truth in this, but it was not the whole truth. There is evidence that Lincoln was forced to adopt the new policy by political pressures. Edward Stanly, military governor of North Carolina, said Lincoln told him that "the proclamation had become a civil necessity to prevent the Radicals from openly embarrassing the government in the conduct of the war. The President expressed the belief that, without the proclamation for which they had been clamoring, the Radicals would

take the extreme step in Congress of withholding supplies for carrying on the war—leaving the whole land in anarchy." Count Gurowski gave a similar version of Lincoln's metamorphosis and concluded, in a fine phrase, that Lincoln was literally "whipped" into glory.

Responding to a parallelogram of pressures, Lincoln issued a preliminary Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862. In this document, he warned the South that he would issue a final Emancipation Proclamation in 100 days if the rebellion had not ended by that time. The proclamation outlined a future policy of emancipation, but Lincoln had no joy in the black harvest. To a group of serenaders, who congratulated him on the new policy, Lincoln said: "I can only trust in God I have made no mistake." To his old friend, Joshua F. Speed, Lincoln expressed misgivings and said he had "been anxious to avoid it." To Congressman John Covode of Pennsylvania, Lincoln explained that he had been "driven to it," adding: "But although my duty is plain, it is in some respects painful. . . ." Still another visitor, Edward Stanly, received a dramatic account of Lincoln's resistance to a policy of emancipation. "Mr. Lincoln said," according to Stanly, "that he had prayed to the Almighty to save him from this necessity, adopting the very language of our Saviour, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me,' but the prayer had not been answered."

On Thursday, January 1, 1863, Lincoln drank from the cup, and apparently he liked neither the flavor nor the color of the draught. When he started to sign the document, his arm trembled so violently, an eyewitness said, that he could not hold the pen. Lincoln, who was very superstitious, paused, started. Then, attributing his shakes to hours of handshaking at a New Year's Day reception, he scrawled his name, saying he did not want the signature to be "tremulous" because people would say "he had some compunctions."

Nothing indicates this better than the Emancipation Proclamation which is, as J. G. Randall and Richard N. Current indicated, "more often admired than read." Cold, forbidding, with all the moral grandeur of a real estate deed, the Proclamation does not enumerate a single principle hostile to slavery and it contains not one quotable sentence. As a document, it lends weight to the observation of Lincoln's law partner, William Herndon, who wrote: "When he freed the slaves, there was no heart in the act."

There wasn't much else in it, either. Rightly speaking, the Emancipation Proclamation, as Ralph Korngold wrote, was "not an Emancipation Proclamation at all." The document was drafted in such a way that it freed few, if any, slaves. It did not apply to slaves in the Border States and areas under federal control in the South. In other words, Lincoln "freed" slaves where he had no power and left them in chains where he had power. The theory behind the Proclamation, an English paper noted, "is not that a human being cannot justly own another, but that he cannot own him unless he is loyal to the United States."

The Proclamation argues so powerfully against itself that some scholars have suggested that Lincoln was trying to do the opposite of what he said he was doing. In other words, the suggestion is that the Emancipation Proclamation was a political stratagem by which Lincoln hoped to outflank the Radicals, buy time and forestall a definitive act of emancipation. This is not the place to review the political stratagem theory in detail. Suffice it to say that on the basis of the evidence one can make a powerful case for the view that Lincoln never intended to free the slaves, certainly not immediately.

Lincoln's post-Proclamation behavior lends substance to this view. For contrary to all logic, he continued to agitate against his

own policy. On the eve of the Proclamation, he again recommended to Congress his favorite plan of gradual and compensated emancipation. And he continued, according to several witnesses, to doubt the wisdom of the Emancipation Proclamation. Three weeks after signing the document, he reportedly told Wendell Phillips that the Proclamation was "a great mistake." Two months later, he told Congressman George W. Julian that the Proclamation had "done about as much harm as good." In the following months, Lincoln repeatedly said that he still favored a gradual emancipation plan which contradicted the spirit of his own Proclamation.

To this bleak picture one should add in all justice that Lincoln can be quoted on both sides of the issue. He reportedly said later that the Proclamation and the arming of black soldiers constituted the heaviest blows against the rebellion. It should also be said that Lincoln, after a period of vacillation and doubt, helped to win passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, which made the paper freedom of the Proclamation real. Having said that, it remains to be said that Lincoln never fully accepted the fundamental principle of the Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment. As late as February, 1865, he was still equivocating on the issue of immediate emancipation. At an abortive peace conference with Confederate leaders at Hampton Roads, Virginia, Lincoln said, according to Alexander Stephens, that he had never been in favor of immediate emancipation, even by the states. He spoke of the "many evils attending" immediate emancipation and suggested, as he had suggested on other occasions, a system of apprenticeship "by which the two races could gradually live themselves out of their old relations to each other."

At Gettysburg, Lincoln shifted gears and announced a new policy of liberation and social renewal. America, he said, was engaged in a great war testing whether it or any other nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" could long endure. The war, he said, would decide whether "government of the people, by the people, for the people" would perish from the earth. But 20 days later when he unveiled his own postwar policy, it was obvious that all meant the same thing to Lincoln that it had always meant: all white people. In his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction, Lincoln said he would recognize any rebel state in which one-tenth of the white voters of 1860 took an oath of allegiance to the United States and organized a government which renounced slavery. What of black people? Slavery apart, Lincoln ignored them. Incredibly, the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Army abandoned his black soldiers to the passions of Confederate veterans who feared and hated them. Lincoln barely suggested "privately" that it would be a good thing for Southern states to extend the ballot "to the very intelligent (Negroes), and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks." But these were private sentiments, not public acts; and they were expressed in an extremely hesitant manner at that. Lincoln didn't require fair or equal treatment for the freedmen. In fact, he didn't make any demands at all. Reconstruction, Lincoln style, was going to be a Reconstruction of the white people, by the white people and for the white people.

It seems that Lincoln never reconciled himself to the implications of emancipation. Shortly before his death, Lincoln summoned General Benjamin F. Butler to inquire about the possibilities of "sending the blacks away." According to Butler, he said, "I wish you would examine the question and give me your views upon it and go into figures as you did before in some degree as to show whether the Negroes can be exported." Butler went away and came back two days later with a sad story. "Mr. President," he said, "I have gone very carefully over my calcu-

lation as to the power of the country to export the Negroes of the South and I assure you that, using all your naval vessels and all the merchant marine fit to cross the seas with safety, it will be impossible for you to transport to the nearest place fit for them . . . half as fast as Negro children will be born here."

Lincoln's assassination and the aggressive dissemination of the "Massa Linkun myth" pushed the real Lincoln with his real limitations into the background. And black people were soon pooling their pennies to erect a monument to the mythical emancipator. When, on April 14, 1876, this monument was unveiled, with President U. S. Grant and other high officials in attendance, Frederick Douglass punctured the myths and looked frankly at the man. Douglass praised Lincoln's growth, but he also rehearsed his limitations.

Truth [Douglass said] is proper and beautiful at all times and in all places, and it is never more proper and beautiful in any case than when speaking of a great public man whose example is likely to be commended for honor and imitation long after his departure to the solemn shades, the silent continent of eternity. It must be admitted, truth compels me to admit, even here in the presence of the monument we have erected to his memory, Abraham Lincoln was not, in the fullest sense of the word, either our man or our model. In his interests, in his associations, in his habits of thought, and in his prejudices, he was a white man. He was preeminently the white man's President, entirely devoted to the welfare of white men . . . In all his education and feeling he was an American of the Americans.

Speaking thus of interests and passion and public acts, Frederick Douglass, who knew Lincoln well, sounded the discordant notes of a national, not a personal tragedy. For, in the final analysis, Lincoln must be seen as the embodiment, not the transcendence, of the American tradition, which is, as we all know, a racist tradition. In his inability to rise above that tradition, Lincoln, often called "the noblest of all Americans," holds up a flawed mirror to the American soul. And one honors him today, not by gazing fixedly at a flawed image, not by hiding warts and excrescences, but by seeing oneself in the reflected ambivalences of a life which calls us to transcendence, not imitation.

Protests Against South Africa's Ex Post Facto Terrorism Act of 1967

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago an eminent group of American lawyers, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, adopted a resolution protesting the prosecution in South Africa of 35 inhabitants of South-West Africa under the Republic of South Africa's Terrorism Act of 1967. It called on the legal profession throughout the world, including South Africa, to speak out and protest the trial under this ex post facto act. The New York Times, in an editorial, commented on the significance of that resolution. On Sunday, February 11, it commented editorially on the significance of the sentencing of 33 of those defendants. Previously, Mr. Morris Abram, U.S. Representative on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, made a statement speak-

ing after the news of the sentencing on February 9. He said in part:

These men, originally 37 in number, were arrested without warrants, dragged 1800 miles from their homes to a foreign land, detained in solitary confinement under a law which permitted their imprisonment without legal interference until such time as they had given answers "satisfactory" to their oppressor. Then they were tried by South Africa, whose mandate over South West Africa had been terminated by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Thus they were tried by a nation which did not have the jurisdiction to try them, under an *ex post facto* law so recognized by the Justice who passed sentence on them, presumably in mitigation of the sentence which we have been led to believe, might otherwise have been a capital sentence providing for their execution.

As a lawyer, I have examined this South African law under which these men were tried. I concluded at one time that the acts listed by that law as substantive capital crimes are as a matter of fact human rights, human rights recognized under the various provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, it is so vague as to furnish no possibility of effective defense or fair trial. It presumed these men to be guilty until they proved their innocence.

Now, one would have thought that some grave civic disruption occurred that had caused the South African Government to stray so far from the rule of law and to invite the disrespect of every person who believes in freedom. But as one looks at the charges and as one peruses the evidence, one finds that instead of there being some grave monstrous, pervasive civil disturbance of uproar in the country, one finds that actually one person had been killed somewhere by somebody in all of the activities which were listed in the charge sheet.

This tragedy is even greater in its dimensions when one considers that it has occurred in a State which pretends to practice the rule of law, namely, South Africa.

I place the resolution, editorials, and statement to which I refer as extension of remarks in the RECORD. This is a matter of urgency and importance which involves the well-being of the people of an international territory, since that territory was made a mandate following World War I. From 1920 on, these people have looked to the international community to protect their rights. Since World War II, the Government of South Africa has increasingly ignored both their rights and the legitimate concern of the international community. It has ignored the actions of the General Assembly to which Mr. Abram refers and resolutions passed by it and by the Security Council, calling for the release and repatriation of these South-West Africans whom it unlawfully holds in jail. It continues to apply the terrorism act, with all its inadmissible provisions to South-West Africa.

The material mentioned above follows:

STATEMENT BY MORRIS B. ABRAM, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION ON THE SENTENCING OF THE SOUTH WEST AFRICANS BY THE COURTS OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Chairman, we listened with interest, sympathy and concern to the intervention a few moments ago by the distinguished representative of Iran. We would like to join him in the expression of outrage at the conduct of the South African Government with respect to the trial and sentencing of the group of South West Africans under so-called Terrorism Act especially adopted for that pur-

pose by the Republic of South Africa—their alleged crimes had been committed. We feel deep sympathy for these victims of injustice.

These men, originally 37 in number, were arrested without warrants, dragged 1800 miles from their homes to a foreign land, detained in solitary confinement under a law which permitted their imprisonment without legal interference until such time as they had given answers "satisfactory" to their oppressor. Then they were tried by South Africa, whose mandate over South West Africa had been terminated by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Thus they were tried by a nation which did not have the jurisdiction to try them, under an *ex post facto* law so recognized by the Justice who passed sentence on them, presumably in mitigation of the sentence which, we have been led to believe, might otherwise have been a capital sentence providing for their execution.

As a lawyer, I have examined this South African law under which these men were tried. I concluded at one time that the acts listed by that law as substantive capital crimes are as a matter of fact human rights, human rights recognized under the various provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, it is so vague as to furnish no possibility of effective defense or fair trial. It presumed these men to be guilty until they proved their innocence.

Now, one would have thought that some grave civic disruption occurred that had caused the South African Government to stray so far from the rule of law and to invite the disrespect of every person who believes in freedom. But as one looks at the charges and as one peruses the evidence, one finds that instead of there being some grave, monstrous, pervasive civil disturbance or uproar in the country, one finds that actually one person had been killed somewhere by somebody in all of the activities which were listed in the charge sheet.

This tragedy is even greater in its dimensions when one considers that it has occurred in a State which pretends to practice the rule of law, namely, South Africa.

Mr. Chairman, we know that some States have institutions with which they do not comply in practice. For example, there are some States which theoretically guarantee free speech and free press and due process, States which have been reported recently to have secretly tried and sentenced to hard labor teachers, writers and scientists for their writings. However, we did not learn about these circumstances until recently because the glare and the spotlight and the cleansing nature of publicity had not focused on the State in which that had occurred.

However, there was a spotlight on South Africa. It has been of some use though it has by no means been effective. It at least has served to ameliorate these dreadful sentences, and prevented the execution of these South West Africans who ought to be free and who ought never to have been imprisoned. It was the force of publicity, for example, that galvanized bar associations and other private groups in the United States on behalf of these Africans. But the fact that the sentences were modified from what had been expected, namely a capital sentence, does not modify the indignation that we express here today and the sympathy that we express and the outrage that we feel.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1968]

CITY BAR ON SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

In terms almost as strong as those we have already used in these columns, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has now voiced its protest against the infamous trial of 35 South-West Africans under South Africa's "Terrorism Act."

The resolution, virtually unprecedented in

its nature, declares that this act offends civilized principles of law, including due process, and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on three counts: it was made retroactive for five years; defendants are guilty unless they can prove innocence "beyond a reasonable doubt," and the crime of "terrorism" is defined so broadly that someone could be hanged for an act adjudged to embarrass "the administration of the affairs of the state."

The Association correctly points out that the defendants were imprisoned, held incommunicado, stripped of rights essential for proper defense, and are being tried in South Africa, more than 1,000 miles away from their homes in Ovamboland. Furthermore, South Africa is applying this act to territory it does not own, the international status of which has been confirmed by the World Court and actions of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is very rare that the New York Bar comments on the administration of justice in foreign countries, but its appeal for support in this protest merits wide response and will surely get one, perhaps even from lawyers in South Africa.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1968]

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA INJUSTICE

There is one long-run certainty about the life sentences South Africa's Supreme Court has inflicted on nineteen South-West Africans under the vicious, retroactive Terrorism Act: They will breed more terrorism and Communism than they deter.

When Justice Joseph Ludorf convicted the defendants two weeks ago, he barred the death penalty out of concern that the law had been passed long after the alleged "terrorism" had been committed and the defendants jailed. This concern did not deter him yesterday from giving life sentences to the nineteen and twenty-year sentences to nine others.

Justice Ludorf said the crimes were so grave he was obliged to impose such sentences without considering the ages, marital status or number of dependents of the convicted. But the truth is that all the acts of terrorism of which these men were charged resulted in a single death and not one of the defendants was even accused of participating in that particular incident.

This is typical of the burlesque of justice that has at every stage marked this miserable affair—condemned by the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly and by lawyers and religious organizations around the world.

The convicted are residents of a country South Africa has never owned. They were arrested in South-West Africa, hauled a thousand miles from their homes to South Africa, and held in solitary confinement for as long as 400 days while the Pretoria Government enacted the law under which they then were elaborately tried—in a language only a few among the 37 original defendants could understand.

"We find ourselves here in a foreign country," said defendant Toivo Herman Ja Toivo, standing unafraid before Justice Ludorf, "convicted under laws made by people whom we have always considered foreigners." Then he added: "No South African will live in peace in South-West Africa, for he will know that his security is based on force."

White South Africans, and especially those who live in South-West Africa, will have occasion to remember those words.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1968]

TRIAL IN SOUTH AFRICA

A South African judge has ruled out the death penalty for thirty South-West Africans, but their conviction of "terrorism" under a draconian, retroactive law still remains a travesty of justice and an offense against civilized behavior.

In deciding not to execute the defendants, Supreme Court Justice Joseph Ludorf indicated some concern over the fact that South Africa had passed the Terrorism Act long after most of the alleged offenses in South-West Africa had occurred. This suggests that South Africa's judiciary is not yet as blind as the Government that concocted this monstrosity.

It is regrettable that Justice Ludorf did not throw the case out of court altogether and order the repatriation of the accused, as demanded, by both the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations and by bar associations and religious groups of many countries. For the act denies most of the ordinary legal safeguards. Anyone charged under it is guilty unless he can prove innocence "beyond a reasonable doubt." Above all, the law is being applied to a country South Africa has never owned. In fact, it was enacted specifically for territory administered by Pretoria only under a League of Nations mandate revoked by the U.N. General Assembly even before the law was passed.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, JANUARY 3, 1968

Resolved, that The Association of the Bar of the City of New York hereby records its deep concern over and its protest against the actions of the Republic of South Africa in prosecuting 35 South West Africans under the Republic of South Africa's Terrorism Act of 1967, in that:

1. The Terrorism Act of 1967 offends general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, accepted standards of due process of law and the rule of law, and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly:

(a) by reason of the vague and sweeping definition of the crime of "terrorism", punishable by death, which includes an act which "had or was likely to have had" the result of embarrassing "the administration of the affairs of the State" or furthering or encouraging "the achievement of any political aim, including the bringing about of any social or economic change . . . in cooperation with or with the assistance of any foreign government or any foreign or international body or institution"; and

(b) by the provision making the Act retroactive for five years prior to its enactment; and

(c) by the provision that the accused is presumed to be guilty and the burden is on him to prove his innocence beyond a reasonable doubt.

2. The detention of the defendants and the conduct of the trial further offend general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, accepted standards of due process of law and the rule of law, and violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly in that the defendants have been imprisoned, virtually incommunicado and stripped of rights essential for proper defense and a fair trial, and are being tried in Pretoria, Republic of South Africa, more than 1,000 miles from their homes in South West Africa.

3. The application of the Terrorism Act of 1967 to South West Africa and these prosecutions thereunder by the Republic of South Africa ignore the fact that South West Africa has a special international status in view of the terms of the Mandate for South West Africa, the opinions of the International Court of Justice and the actions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Be it therefore further

Resolved, that the Association, recognizing the heritage and traditions of the legal profession and of the judiciary in the Republic of South Africa, calls upon the members of the legal profession in South Africa

and throughout the world to weigh the serious issues raised by this Act and the trial, to heed the concern expressed by this Association and to join with us and all others having concern for international due process and the rule of law to speak out and protest this trial.

The Casey Bill Gains Support Across the Nation—Income Tax Deduction for Housing and Home Repair

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, since its introduction, H.R. 358 has steadily gained support. Confronted with a \$3.3 billion decline in the home repairs business over a 5-year period beginning in 1960, and by the failure of homeowners to make home repairs because of prohibitive costs, we have now a strong basis for immediate action.

While this proposal is by no means a panacea to the problems of the home repair industry or the homeowner, it does take a significant step toward providing substantial relief to both. The bill itself provides a \$750 income tax deduction for the repair or improvement of the taxpayer's home, or for rapid amortization over 60 months for such improvements to rent property.

My statements in the RECORD of February 27, 1967, and May 15, 1967, discuss at great length the substantive reasons for enacting H.R. 358; however, at this point, I would like to share with my colleagues here in the House, letters and articles representative of the nationwide support forming behind this bill:

[From the Western Paint Review, January, 1968]

INDUSTRY ASSOCIATIONS SUPPORT HOME IMPROVEMENT TAX DEDUCTION LEGISLATION

Joe McManus, Los Angeles Painting & Decorating Contractors comments, "HR 358 is one of the most important measures before Congress! Some 20% of the nation's 63 million units of housing are considered substandard and billions will be spent to rehabilitate the housing of our cities. It is logical and reasonable that some incentive should be given to maintaining the standards of present housing to keep it from becoming sub-standard and in need of rehabilitation. PDCA believes this can best be accomplished through private initiative. Home owners are faced with increasing real estate taxes, school taxes, sales taxes and income taxes which leaves little left to maintain homes in proper condition. The nations home owners need the provisions of HR 358.

COLUMBIA, S.C.,
August 31, 1967.

Representative ROBERT CASEY,
House Office Building,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: It is understood that you are considering a bill (House Bill 358) to allow a tax deduction up to \$750 for repairs or improvements to property used as dwellings. Those who know the housing situation in our city consider this a most worthwhile and desirable piece of legislation. In the case of rental housing this legislation is considered urgent and necessary.

As the Building Official for the largest city in South Carolina, I consider this legislation imperative for the following reasons:

1. One of the principal reasons for unrest and disorders in our cities is unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated dwelling units.

2. In our city it is not economically feasible for the owners of dwellings to bring the worst buildings up to decent standards. Of course there are some landlords who charge too much and still do not maintain their rental property. The landlords in general, however, are currently charging the maximum the low income tenants can afford to pay and still do not receive excessive return on invested capital. Landlords are most reluctant to spend \$750 to rehabilitate a building when: it is not worth more than \$750 in total, they are only getting \$25 per month rent now, the tenant could not pay increased rental. If we condemn the buildings which probably should be condemned, hundreds of low income families would be without a place to live. They would most likely move in with other families living in only slightly less squalor and make our housing problems worse. In recapitulation, the hard facts are that the lowest income people just can't afford the decent housing they need.

3. It is believed that the passage of this legislation would bring about the biggest building rehabilitation boom this country has seen and thereby contribute materially to our sagging economy.

4. It is heart-rending to see the conditions under which some of our people live, yet unless landlords are given some incentive to make improvements, they cannot or will not do so.

It appears to me that rehabilitation through private initiative would be more economical and efficient than massive Federal Programs. In fact, I think we need some of both, i.e., some Federal low-cost housing projects and House Bill 358.

Thanking you for your kind attention, I remain,

Very truly yours,

J. E. ALTMAN,
Building Official.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
September 18, 1967.

Representative CASEY,
House of Representatives, U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Please push onward in your efforts for H.R. 358. We are in the class of "unfortunate discriminates" who rejuvenated a neglected but still sound old Victorian stone mansion for rentals. Our taxes were raised and with full occupancy (we cater to teachers) we are lucky to break even each month. Right now the only road is to let the property degenerate or lose our shirts.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MAURICE ASHLAND.
Property is in Boise, Idaho but the circumstances are the same the country over!

LOS ANGELES PAINT, VARNISH AND
LACQUER ASSOCIATION,
Arcadia, Calif., January 8, 1968.

HON. ROBERT CASEY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Our Association sits in one of the most vulnerable areas in the country for violence and destruction. Unless ways are found to subdue this condition or channel it into constructive areas, we will continue to have problems.

Your Bill, H.R. 358 as it pertains to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 would be a great assist in putting idle and potentially destructive hands to work. The opportunity to open additional areas of work for the people of Southern California is of great importance. We support your legislation 100%.

Sincerely,

D. W. KENNEDY.

WASHTENAW COUNTY CHAPTER OF
THE MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF THE
PAINTING AND DECORATING CON-
TRACTORS OF AMERICA,

October 5, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: The Washtenaw County Chapter of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America wish to give full cooperation in favor of H.R. 358, The Casey Bill. We feel it will be a benefit to a great number of home owners in our own area—the city of Ann Arbor and Washtenaw County.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WINNICK,
Secretary.

SOCIETY OF PAINTING AND DECORATING CONTRACTORS OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,

Newtonville, Mass., January 25, 1968.

During the sessions of the 77th Annual Convention of this organization held in Boston on January 19-20, 1968, the delegates unanimously voted to urge your support of H.R. 358 which is presently before the House Ways and Means Committee and to further request that you use your good offices toward obtaining hearings on this legislation in the near future.

The plight of the average home owner today is often pathetic. Many do not have large or increasing incomes. While pride of ownership makes proper maintenance of one's residence most desirable, ever increasing taxes on income, social security and real estate, plus the increase in living costs leaves little remaining for home upkeep and repair. An incentive must be provided to properly maintain these residences. If this is not done, the only alternative will be further need for federal appropriations to remove the horror of blighted areas. The present Congress has been faced with the need of providing astronomical funds for such purposes.

H.R. 358 would provide such incentives and lessen the need for further appropriations. Some will oppose H.R. 358, claiming that the Federal Government will face a heavy loss in revenue. We do not agree with such opinions. Enactment of the legislation proposed would not only increase employment in building material manufacturing plants, but help provide full employment for those required in making repairs and improvements. Enactment would also increase job opportunities for the many under employed. Thus this increased employment would provide greater revenue to the government through earnings taxes.

In conclusion, we are of the opinion that enactment of H.R. 358 is just plain good business for the entire nation and its future economy. Again we urge your active participation in speedy enactment of H.R. 358 and your efforts are sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. HASSELL,
Secretary.

INSULATION BOARD INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Ill., November 27, 1967.

Subject: H.R. 13152.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Insulation Board Institute's membership comprises the twelve companies listed on this letterhead which are major manufacturers of various types of building materials including insulation board which is represented by our Institute.

On behalf of our members, I wish to strongly endorse H.R. 13152 which has been introduced by Representative Jerome Waldie of California and provides for tax credits for home improvements on residences and accelerated depreciation on rental property.

It is my understanding that this legisla-

tion is the same as introduced by Representative Seymour Halpern of New York, H.R. 11155, and the original Bill of the same type introduced by Representative Bob Casey of Texas.

I urge your support as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee of this legislation when it is considered by your Committee. With the threat again of a shortage of many for construction loans and at higher interest rates, it appears that the construction industry, particularly residential construction, is faced with a continuation of the present depressed market. Legislation of this type which can help stimulate this important segment of our economy, and at the same time without direct government financial subsidy, is obviously in the best interest of the entire economy. It is of particular importance both to homeowners and tenants who can best be served by a strong competitive construction industry, including both builders and manufacturers, which such legislation can help maintain during a continuing lag in housing starts which now faces the industry during 1968.

We will certainly appreciate your active support to the passage of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

INSULATION BOARD INSTITUTE.
CHARLES M. GRAY,

Manager.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Frankfort, Ky., September 20, 1967.

Re House Bill 358.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: As a fellow Kentuckian, Democrat, and Legislator, I am writing to you to express an appeal for your support of House of Representatives Bill No. 358, which is presently pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

As I understand this bill, it would allow for a Federal tax deduction of up to \$750.00 for repair or improvement of personal property, which would indeed, encourage a number of people to take long-delayed action toward improving their property, and also, give them an incentive to maintain it properly.

My own district is representative primarily, of middle and low-income families, who would certainly benefit by the passage of this bill, and it seems to me it would also obtain the following results.

(a) Instill in a person confidence and pride to maintain a clean and nice looking home.

(b) Eliminate the slum areas to a certain extent, and prevent other areas from becoming decadent and subject to complaints of becoming slum districts.

(c) Improved housing conditions would be a deterrent to riot situations and acts of violence.

(d) Better housing, as a result, would also bring in increased revenues, particularly, on the local level through sales taxes on equipment and material, would improve employment, and would increase the values of real estate. This would certainly be a stimulant for the state of Kentucky.

Any effort expended by you to get this bill up for discussion and action would be appreciated. Also, if you have any additional information on this bill which you think I might be interested in, I would appreciate your forwarding same to me. Many thanks.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. SIEMENS.

[From Newsletter, National Association of Wholesalers, August 1967]

A BILL TO SPUR HOUSING REPAIRS

A bill to encourage home improvements has been gaining increasing recognition. Introduced last January by Representative Bob

Casey (D.-Texas), H.R. 358 would allow "a tax deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer for making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing." For repairs and improvements to his own residence, a taxpayer could deduct the cost up to \$750 per year. As to the rehabilitation of rental housing, the taxpayer would be allowed to amortize the cost in a 60 month period, beginning the month after such repairs are completed. At present, capital improvements are now amortized over a much longer period. For example, a new roof is amortized over a period of 20 years. Representative Casey stated that the bill, if enacted, would strike a "crippling blow at urban blight by giving the people a tax incentive to repair their homes and rental properties." The Congressman also cited the incentive as an economic thrust to the lagging home repair and remodeling industry, creating a demand for many products and jobs.

Many wholesaler-distributors who serve the building construction, repair, and decorating industry have expressed interest in the bill. At a July meeting of the NAW Pros, the chief staff executives of member organization recommended to the Executive Committee that NAW support enactment of H.R. 358. The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, but to date no hearings have been scheduled.

[From the American Plywood Association's Management Report, Aug. 25, 1967]

BILL PROPOSES HOUSE REPAIRS TAX DEDUCTION

The attention of the forest products industry is directed to House Bill 358, introduced recently by Rep. Robert Casey, (D-Tex.) which would allow a tax deduction up to \$750 for repairs or improvements to property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence. Included is a deduction for owners of rental housing who rehabilitate or restore their property with expenditures amortized over a 60-month period.

Some government agencies may oppose such a tax incentive on the basis that it will cost the federal government dearly in revenue. At the same time, other government officials are talking in terms of expending \$10 billion, and up, to rebuild blighted areas in major cities.

Rehabilitation through private initiative would seem to be the more economical method. Homeowners, faced with increasing real estate taxes, school taxes, sales taxes and other burdens, need the provisions of H.R. 358.

The Casey Bill appears to be a medium range project, with no action expected this year. But those who regard its provisions as being helpful to the forest products industry may send letters of support to Congressman Casey, or to Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

MEMORANDUM TO ALL LOCAL ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

NATIONAL PAINT, VARNISH
AND LACQUER ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1967.

As most of you are aware, NPVLA has taken a lead during the past year in supporting legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax deduction up to \$750. for "the repair or improvement of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence" and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate (over a 60-month period) the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing.

Besides paints and allied products, home maintenance and repair will include such products as lumber, concrete, plaster, insula-

tion board, tile, structural clay products, plumbing, heating and cooling systems, electrical systems, roofing, bricks, siding, aluminum, steel and plastics. Altogether some 30 trade associations and labor groups representing these industries have expressed their strong support for this legislation by letters and statements; some have adopted resolutions voicing this support.

Sponsor of this legislation (H.R. 358)—which would be not only a boon to industry and labor, but also would reduce the burden on the harassed taxpayer—is Representative Bob Casey (22nd District—Texas). Similar bills have been introduced by Representatives Seymour Halpern of New York's 6th District (H.R. 11155) and Jerome Waldie of California's 14th District (H.R. 13152). Additional sponsors of this progressive legislation are expected next year in both the House and Senate.

This type of legislation had failed in prior Congresses, but the climate this year seems to have changed for the better—similar tax proposals were made to allow the taxpayer to amortize expenditures deemed to be in the national interest (e.g. college tuition fees and water pollution abatement). Tax concessions for such purposes are no longer considered to be special interest legislation. All Americans recognize the need to arrest the spread of urban blight and decay, and the "Casey" bill would help accomplish this.

No hearings on this legislation were held during the First Session of the 90th Congress because of the more pressing problems of anti-poverty, riots and Viet Nam—taxes—inflation—spending! However, after a brief recess for the Christmas holidays, Congress will return (about January 15th) to tackle the huge backlog of legislation which carries over automatically to the Second Session. It is hoped that the "Casey" bill will be among those called up for hearings early next year.

NPLVA will continue to follow this legislative proposal closely and to coordinate support measures as may be feasible. Rep. Casey will include in the Congressional Record copies of letters, resolutions and other indications of interest. Reps. Halpern and Waldie will do the same. We would be pleased to receive a copy of any evidence of support communicated to your Congressman.

Remember—The expenditure of very large sums are being considered and proposed to halt deterioration of the nation's urban areas and to provide decent living quarters for an ever-expanding population. Available records indicate that approximately \$1 billion less was spent for maintenance and repair of owner-occupied and rental property in 1965 than in 1960, yet there were 7 million more homes in 1965. This indicates that these homes are not being maintained adequately; and, unless this trend is stopped, the Federal Government will be forced to spend additional billions in the future to rehabilitate them.

The "Casey" bill (H.R. 358) will not only reverse this trend, but it will stimulate the economy by generating increased production in those industries discussed above, and it will create additional jobs for the vast army of workers required to make the repairs and to paint, install plumbing and electrical wiring, heating units and all the other products mentioned. These stimulants should more than offset the loss of tax revenue from the reduced income tax paid by individuals taking additional deductions under the Bill, which would be the only valid reason for opposition by the Administration.

To ensure prompt attention to this legislation and favorable action, enthusiasm must be generated at the "grass roots" level; and, individual members of Congress, particularly the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, must be convinced of the merits of the legislation and the overwhelming desire of the general public for such a measure.

Your Local Association can be very help-

ful in this project, and I request that you take all means at your disposal to educate the public in your local area and to foster support for this legislation, coordinating with other building trade industries whenever appropriate.

The following actions are suggested and recommended:

- Include comments on this legislation in your bulletins and other communications;
- Schedule, as early in the year as possible, a workshop or discussion on this legislation at one of your regular meetings;
- Spread the word, as appropriate and feasible, through paint salesmen and paint dealers in your area;
- Publicize this legislation, whenever practical, before civic and business groups; and
- Contact personally, if practicable, or otherwise write your Congressman and urge him to support this legislation.

Let's all get together now and work hard to get our story across to Congress and to the Administration—to convince both of the tremendous potential benefits of this sound and progressive legislative proposal! To assist you in this project, I am enclosing a copy of Rep. Halpern's bill to New York Associations, Rep. Waldie's bill to California Associations and Rep. Casey's bill to the remainder. I am enclosing also for your information a list of the members of the House Ways and Means Committee before whom the proposal first must be reviewed and approved before it can get "off the ground."

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. ROLAND,
Executive Vice President.

MINNESOTA COUNCIL OF PAINTING
AND DECORATING, CONTRACTORS OF
AMERICA,

St. Paul, Minn., February 8, 1968.

HON. ROBERT R. CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: The Minnesota Council of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America at its annual convention held in Rochester, Minnesota the 25th through the 27th of January 1968, by unanimous vote urges your support of H.R. 358 which is presently before the House Ways and Means Committee and further requests that you use your good offices toward obtaining hearings by the committee on this legislation.

H.R. 358 was introduced by Congressman Casey of Texas and would provide for a tax deduction up to \$750.00 for "the repair or improvement of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence" and also would permit amortization over a 60 month period for owner or rental housing who rehabilitate or restore such property. We believe this legislation to be sound and timely and that assisting in its passage during this session of Congress is worthy of our best efforts.

The plight of many home owners today is pathetic. Many do not have large increasing incomes. While pride of ownership makes proper maintenance of one residence most desirable, even increasing taxes on income and real estate, plus increasing living costs, leaves little remaining for home upkeep and repair. Some incentive must be provided to properly maintain these residences. If this is not done the alternative will be a further need for federal appropriations to rehabilitate blighted areas. The present Congress has been faced with the need of providing astronomical sums for such purposes. Enactment of H.R. 358 would provide the incentive and would lessen the need for further appropriations for rehabilitation.

Some will oppose this legislation claiming that the Federal Government will face a heavy revenue loss. We cannot accept such reasoning as being factual. Enactment of this

proposed legislation would increase employment in building material manufacturing plants, help provide full employment for those workmen required in making improvement and repairs, and would increase the number of job opportunities for the underemployed. Such increase in employment would thus provide greater revenue to the government through earnings taxes. In conclusion, we are of the opinion that the enactment of H.R. 358 is just good business policy.

It enhances private initiative, provides an incentive to the heretofore neglected nation's homeowners, provides greater employment opportunities, increases property values and further maintains what we like to call our "high American Standard of Living".

Your active participation in a speedy enactment of H.R. 358 is urged and will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

AL SHUSTER,
Executive Secretary.

Turn to God

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high privilege to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at the annual Presidential prayer breakfast, held on February 1, 1968. The address is entitled, "Turn to God":

TURN TO GOD

(The annual "Presidential Prayer Breakfast," held on February 1, was attended by the President, the Vice President, several members of the Cabinet, a Supreme Court Justice, the Governors of seven States, high military officers, and many members of Congress. The function was arranged by the Prayer Breakfast Groups of the Senate and the House. More than 1,000 persons—mostly from the Government—were present. An excerpt from a stirring address follows.—David Lawrence, Editor.)

(By General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army)

For my text I turn to the Letter of James, 3rd Chapter, the 13th through the 18th Verses. I use the Phillips translation:

"Are there some wise and understanding men among you? Then your lives will be an example of the humility that is born of true wisdom. But if your heart is full of rivalry and bitter jealousy, then do not boast of your wisdom—don't deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart.

"You may acquire a certain superficial wisdom, but it does not come from God—it comes from this world, from your own lower nature, even from the devil. For wherever you find jealousy and rivalry you also find disharmony and all other kinds of evil.

"The wisdom that comes from God is first utterly pure, then peace-loving, gentle, approachable, full of tolerant thoughts and kindly actions with no breath of favoritism or hint of hypocrisy. And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves."

Our Nation today is troubled and uneasy. We have those who believe that we should pull out of Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia. We have those who believe we are not doing enough in Southeast Asia. We have those who believe that we are not doing

enough for the underprivileged of our own country. We have those who believe that we are fostering and harboring a segment of parasites within our population. We have those who believe that the laws of our land can be flouted and that they can choose the laws they will obey and the laws they will ignore. We have those who believe that disrespect for the law should be confronted with the club or a gun. Parents across our land are concerned with the use of drugs and dope among our young people.

So, where do we turn? What do we do? How many of us—referring back to James—"... deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart"? How many of us have given real thought to the commandment that was read in our first scripture: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart."?

We are a part of a social structure that is growing more crowded with each passing day. It is becoming more difficult for an individual to establish an identity. The older among us are too busy and too preoccupied to communicate with the younger. Our consciences become hardened by continuing exposure to both the contemptible and the pitiable. Unable or unwilling to take corrective measures, we offer at first only our contempt or our pity. Contempt and pity give way to acceptance. Acceptance leads finally to the worst attitude of all—uneasy indifference, anomalous as that may seem. We ignore with the vain hope that the distasteful or the hard to solve problem will somehow go away.

I wonder if it isn't time for each of us to reflect upon the 8th and 9th Verses of the 4th Chapter of Genesis. Remember that, after Cain slew his brother, the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" Cain replied, "I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?"

The answer is yes. I am my brother's keeper. Each of us is his brother's keeper, and in the eyes of God all of us are brothers. We dare not be indifferent to our brothers' needs, whether those needs be material, spiritual, or just plain communication.

There is a solution to the problems of this world—turn to God. There is a solution to the conflicts between nations—turn to God. There is a solution to the problems of our cities and of our streets—turn to God. Not in a superficial way, but in a human and compassionate way—as man to man and friend to friend. There is a solution to the problem of our young—together with them, turn to God.

"What's in it for me?" Just the satisfaction of becoming a compassionate human being.

Finally, if we ever wonder how far we should carry our love for one another, remember that Jesus was not content with the old commandment to love our neighbors as ourselves. True to His manner, He added glorious new dimensions to that injunction by saying, in the words of our final text, "This is my commandment, That ye love one another as I have loved you."

We can never hope to match His matchless love, but we grow in grace and glory every time we try.

The 50th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the Congress paid tribute to

the 50th anniversary of the short-lived free government of the Ukraine. Many of us drew the parallel at that time between the aggressive and expansive communism which has shattered the legitimate desires of the Ukrainians and the new colonialism that employs communism as an allegedly liberating force from governments favorable to the Western idea of a free and open society.

The continued courage of the Ukrainian people and their unshakeable desire to recapture their own destiny nakedly reveals the cynical use of nationalism as the tip of a tyrannical spear. Many nations in the less developed portions of the world are now being manipulated by Communists posing as patriots. As the Ukraine was the first to feel the weight of Soviet communism imposed by force, their unending struggle to assert a true nationalism and the consequent political, economic, and cultural repression of their attempts at freedom represents a very strong argument against the opinion, held by some around the world, that the United States is the only threat to the full expression of a nation's destiny.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 10 brings into sharp focus the ultimate result of a war of national liberation for an independent nationality within the Soviet Union. I commend this editorial to the attention of all those with short memories who believe that the embrace of the Soviet bear is warm and comforting or that communism guarantees a government responsive to a people's needs:

FERMENT IN THE UKRAINE

The infamous judicial frame-ups of dissident literary intellectuals in Moscow in recent years are apparently only part of a broader revival of Soviet secret police activity and ruthlessness.

That is the clear meaning of the recent revelations about the persecution of independent-minded Ukrainian intellectuals who have learned the hard way that today's K.G.B. has forgotten none of the tricks of Stalin's old N.K.V.D. And the Ukrainian heretics have also had to learn at high cost that slave-labor camps like those in which Solzhenitsyn's Ivan Denisovich underwent his ordeal belong to contemporary Soviet life, not merely to history.

But an important element distinguishes the Ukrainian terror campaign from that in Moscow. The secret police is hounding the Ukrainian intellectuals because of their nationalism, a sentiment which has been reborn in a generation conceived and raised under Soviet rule. A Ukrainian does not have to be very perceptive to grasp the fact that the vaunted equality of peoples in the Soviet Union is a sham.

In great Ukrainian cities like Kiev, Kharkov and Odessa, Ukrainian language and culture occupy the role of poor relations to the Russian language and culture. Moscow obviously fears that sensitivity to such affronts may make some Ukrainians reflect that if the Ukraine were independent its rich natural resources, highly developed modern industry and educated population would put it on a par with nations like France and West Germany.

Outside the Communist bloc Moscow's propaganda seeks to inflame nationalism as a force against the West, cheering on Arabs against Israel, Angolans against Portugal, and Hong Kong Chinese against the British. Can there be any surprise then that intelligent non-Russians in the Soviet Union see the aptness of this anti-colonial propaganda to their own situation, problems and aspirations?

Project Concern

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent birthday of one of the most humane and worthwhile enterprises with which I have had the privilege of being associated. Five years ago, Dr. James W. Turpin—minister, physician and practical dreamer—saw the beginnings of realization of his greatest dream. He launched, in Hong Kong, Project Concern, an independent nonprofit organization offering medical care to the needy of all ages.

The project's first year of field activity was filled with challenges, but the dedication and talent of Dr. Turpin and his associates were equal to the task.

From its initial small staff, Project Concern has grown to an international staff of more than 137 doctors, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory technicians, teachers, X-ray technicians and supporting staff—and volunteers from more than 30 countries serving in many capacities.

Five years after its inception, Project Concern can point with justifiable pride to some remarkable accomplishments:

Project Concern has registered more than half a million patient visits in Hong Kong, South Vietnam and Mexico.

Project Concern has established in Hong Kong four outpatient medical clinics and now operates both a feeding program for more than 1,000 children and a school program for over 400 students.

Project Concern provides hospital services at DaMpaoc, Vietnam and a mobile clinic unit which pays regular visits to more than two dozen villages and strategic hamlets. The project has developed in cooperation with the Vietnamese Government a hospital in Dalat, a village medical assistant—VMA—self-help-training program for local young men and women, and gives midwifery training to young women hospital medical assistant—HMA—graduates.

Project Concern operates, in Tijuana, Mexico, an out-patient clinic, a maternity and pediatric ward, a school for 300 children, and a feeding and clothing service.

And looking always to the future, Project Concern soon plans to build Baja Calif.'s first mother-and-child center. It will be a modern and thoroughly equipped hospital for the poor living in the Tijuana area.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Project Concern and Jim Turpin, the extraordinary physician and humanist who inspires its operations, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD, at this point, a message authored by Jim Turpin and appropriately called, "A New Emancipation Proclamation":

A NEW EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

They call me a free man. But am I truly free? In my world I find hungry, sick, poor

and illiterate people. They are shackled by chains they cannot loosen. It seems their bonds reach out and rob me of part of my freedom, and partial freedom is no freedom at all.

All men yearn to be fully free, they from their want, I from their need of me. I can choose to attempt eliminating them or their need. Unable to justify their unnecessary death, I choose to help them become self-sufficient.

Be it therefore proclaimed that:

1. No man is free as long as even one man is held in the bondage of hunger, human servitude or dependency on others;
2. A man free only to be hungry, sick, poor or illiterate knows no true freedom;
3. All men everywhere yearn for escape from such privations;
4. My freedom is a freedom to be involved with them in establishing their independence;
5. Ultimate freedom will be ours only when this growing concern reaches all men.

Project Concern invites you to join us in this new Emancipation Proclamation. From the youngest school child to our oldest "freedom fighter," we trust you will become even more deeply involved in the joy of freeing others—now!

Cold War Escalation in the Mediterranean

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, not nearly enough publicity has been given to the Soviet naval buildup in the Mediterranean in the recent past. The February 5, 1968, issue of the Washington Report, the weekly publication of the American Security Council, zeroes in on efforts by the Soviets to expand their influence in this area. States Holmes Alexander, the guest editor of February 5 issue:

Look north of Britain, look south of France, the Russians are outflanking the landlocked stalemate in the heart of Europe. The combined navies of NATO, which is longhand for the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, were supposed to prevent this breakout, but the rules of the Cold War favor the enemy. The crafty Soviets are winning positions-in-strength that can be as disastrous to the Free World as Trafalgar was to the French and the loss of Suez was to the British.

The Soviet buildup was confirmed by representatives to NATO in December of last year at a 3-day conference to the North Atlantic Allies. According to the NATO group there had been a "marked expansion" in Soviet forces in the Mediterranean during the last year.

To make matters worse, there has been a squabble between Congress and the Defense Department concerning the building of nuclear vessels. According to the Washington Daily News of December 9, 1967, Congress, 18 months ago ordered the Defense Department to build two nuclear-powered frigates at a total cost of \$258 million. But Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara demurred and Congress agreed merely to "urge" that a start be made toward a nuclear surface fleet.

In the following article, the author recommends that we "give the American Navy whatever it needs to do the job."

This is certainly prudent advice in view of the Soviet effort in the Mediterranean over the past year.

I include the article, "The View From Grosvenor Square," by Holmes Alexander, in the RECORD at this point:

THE VIEW FROM GROSVENOR SQUARE: COLD WAR ESCALATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., a seadog of bull terrier poise and fighting propensities, paces his headquarters, Grosvenor Square, London, and growls with frustration. He has reason. McCain is commander in chief, U.S. Naval forces, Europe. The American strategic concept for this part of the world sometimes seems as tattered as a shell-torn battle flag.

Look north of Britain, look south of France, the Russians are outflanking the landlocked stalemate in the heart of Europe. The combined navies of NATO, which is longhand for the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, were supposed to prevent this breakout, but the rules of the Cold War favor the enemy. The crafty Soviets are winning positions-in-strength that can be as disastrous to the Free World as Trafalgar was to the French and the loss of Suez was to the British.

One must go to foreign reference for apt analogies. The U.S. Navy has never lost a major engagement that endangered its role as a world power. Today we are slipping toward an Apocalypse catastrophe both in the Mediterranean and the North Atlantic, and McCain can see what's coming. Never was a victory-minded sailor in such a tight set of psychological irons. He cannot order a shot in anger, and does not feel free to talk for quotation. He can only describe the harrowing situation, as he did to this newsmen, and exhort the scribe to check it out and report it.

McCain's parting remark was to bid his visitor, headed into the Middle East, to be sure and interview American ship commanders in the Mediterranean. But a few weeks later, three ships of the Sixth Fleet approached Istanbul, Turkey, and were prevented from landing at that NATO port by a mob of student-demonstrators. And in Beirut, Lebanon, when the reporter asked Ambassador Dwight Porter when and if the Fleet might dock, the story was much the same. The people and government of Lebanon were friendly, said the Ambassador, but the dock workers' union wasn't—hence no shore leaves for American sailors.

These tawdry examples indicate the quandary of American seapower, and the vacuum which the Russian Navy is moving to fill. The Sixth Fleet, a detachment of the Atlantic Fleet, has the dual purpose of maintaining peace and friendship in the Mediterranean world and of buttressing that flank of NATO. The purpose of the Russian presence is to nullify our efforts and to bring the entire area into the Communist sphere. Today there isn't anywhere along the Med's eastern and southern shores (unless it's Haifa, Israel, which we diplomatically avoid) that our sailors are welcome.

But Russian sailors, intensely indoctrinated for super-correct behavior and exaggerated friendliness, are warmly received at Latakia in Syria, and Alexandria and Port Said, Egypt. Recently, a delegation of Russian Navy officers made a hush-hush call at Mers-el-Kebir in Algeria, two thousand miles from the Soviet homeland. Actually, it wasn't a social visit. Mers-el-Kebir is a French-built navy base, soon to pass into Algerian control, and it had been receiving Soviet freighters which reportedly were bringing 90-foot missiles.

The turn of events in the Mediterranean staggers the imagination and mocks the witness of personal observation. At the time of the Cuban missile crisis (these self-same Soviet freighters were probably there) the Sixth Fleet, with its two carriers, two cruisers, its Polaris submarines and 40-odd other vessels, was supreme in the waters between Europe and Africa. The Russians had only

two to four ships in the million square-mile spread, and these were there under the sorry pennants of a loser's legend, since Russia for centuries hadn't been able to win at sea, and had many times failed to establish herself in warm water.

Despite attempts to take advantage of the early Cyprus troubles, Russia placed no more than 10 or 12 ships in the area in January '67. Then, suddenly, with the Arab-Israeli June war, the Soviet had 47 ships, almost equal to the Sixth Fleet's normal complement of 50. The Communists were not merely making a show of force. Their two cruisers, numerous destroyers and submarines were missile-armed to fight, but more especially they had the short-range missiles and torpedoedoes for commerce raiding. Particularly intriguing and alarming to American observers were two Russian assault ships, capable of putting 1000 fighting men on beach heads. The U.S. Marine detachment, 1500 strong, was not much larger. Supremacy had passed from American hands, and superiority was in contention.

In a pitched battle, there's no doubt that the Sixth Fleet has the seapower, airpower and nuclear sock to blast the Russians off the water and out of their home cities. It's the Cold War positioning, where bluff and audacity are the plays, that we are losing. The enemy is roaming the Mediterranean, once a NATO lake, in frowning gray hulls that plainly tell the helpless, poverty-ridden, unstable inhabitants that the same force which rules in East Europe is standing offshore from their vulnerable peninsulas and scattered islands. In three years the Soviet presence, measured in ship-days, has increased 600 percent.

Before examining the Soviet sea monster more closely, we must notice the other claw of the pincer which the Admiral watches from Grosvenor Square. This talon arches out from the Baltic Sea and down from the Arctic Ocean where Soviet nuclear-driven, nuclear-armed submarines hide under fog and ice. The Norwegian Sea, off that nation's Atlantic coast, is the practice ground for Russian war games which have increased every year in participants and complexity. The make-believe battles are between surface ships, and between submarines that are pitted against landbased aircraft. From McCain's viewpoint, all this dummy practice for cutting the Western world's lifeline between North America and West Europe.

In two world wars, the Battle of the Atlantic was crucial to eventual victory. Today, with Britain deficient as a naval force and France an arrant deserter, it's very much up to the U.S. Navy's Eastern Atlantic Command which, like the Sixth Fleet, is being drained of men and materials for the war in Asia. Again, if it came to shooting, there's little doubt that the Russian flotillas would end up with Davy Jones. But in Cold War terms the Communists are exerting a relentless and simultaneous abrasion upon the morale and confidence of Norway and Denmark, the northern NATO partners, and upon Greece, Turkey and Italy, the southern partners. Meanwhile, an inexorable time factor seems running everywhere in favor of the enemy.

We must ask whence came this emergence of Soviet seapower. The quasi-peaceful manifestations can be taken as outcroppings of scientific and industrial growth. Russia is the fastest moving nation of all in fish culture, with protein factories off every coast in the world. She has 200 oceanographic and hydrographic research vessels at work. Her merchant marine calls at 500 ports in 61 countries, and ranks far better than our own. Nearly all these craft are of postwar construction and equipped with the best of modern devices. Since Communist statecraft is total, we have to assume that every moving Soviet object in water, air and space is an active gatherer of military intelligence and of potential use in warfare.

Slavic creativeness accounts for much, but

the Western World never expected Mother Russia's womb to deliver an armada of warships in an abnormally short period of gestation. Tradition was against it. Professor James Billington, the American Russologist, writes that fear of the sea "was perhaps to be expected among an earthbound people whose discovery of the sea coincided with their traumatic discovery of the outside world." Czarist Russia almost never had a sea victory over its maritime neighbors, Turkey and Egypt, unless allied with such seagoing powers as Britain and France. On occasion a Russian fleet would lurch out from the Bosphorus to make a grab at the Greek island of Corfu, the Ionian islands and even at Crete, midway in the Mediterranean. But these conquests never held. An ambitious naval program was blizzed out of existence by the Nazis, and Russian submarine forays in World War II were reckless but feckless. As recently as Khrushchev's regime, the Soviet Navy was a coastal defense unit. Programs for aircraft carriers were begun and cancelled.

But, if U.S. Navy thinkers are right, the modern Kremlin discovered a tenuous relationship between guerilla warfare and operations at sea. The so-called "wars of liberation" could be fought on oceans as well as in jungles. If the capitalist powers were weak by being over-wealthy and too democratic, they were also awkward in being dependent upon their long seelines of supply. Admiral Gorchkov, Chief of the Soviet Navy, wrote in 1963:

"Atomic submarines are the foundation of combat might . . . New submarines, aircraft and surface ships with the powerful weapons have radically changed former concepts of the Navy's missions. . . ."

Soviet leaders made use of the Toynbee principle of challenge-and-response. Natural handicaps of the landmass, inland seas and ice-locked harbors could be turned to advantage. Shipyards could operate in the interior without much foreign scrutiny. The four great fleets at the coastlines of the Arctic, the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the Pacific could be centrally supplied by intersea transfers.

There was an inland route of every ocean. The Volga-Dan canal system connects the Caspian Sea with the Black Sea which has egress into the Mediterranean. The Marinski canal system connects the Baltic-White Sea waterway with the Volga River. But by far the most impressive link in the USSR's intersea exchange is the Northern Arctic Sea Route which allows Soviet ships to pass from European Russia to Asian Russia without leaving Soviet territorial waters. The fog-shrouded, ice-jammed passage from Murmansk, just behind the Scandinavian peninsula on the Barents Sea, to faroff Vladivostok on the Pacific is certainly the most difficult regular sea route in the world, and it may be the most significant. Writing in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for December, 1967, Navy Captain T. J. Laforest calls it "an integral geographic part of the Soviet Master Plan for world economic domination."

While these routes were carrying shipping and ship supplies, twenty Navy officers training schools with four year courses in navigation, gunnery, engineering and general seamanship were turning out cadets for summer cruises. Lack of bases was another handicap to be surmounted. Russian planners copied American "fleet trains" to reach distant fleets, and devised floating bases in weather-protected international waters. There are two principal anchorages in the Mediterranean, one off the Greek island of Kithira; another in the Tunisian Gulf of Hammamet. These logistic-depots will serve very well until the Russians get permanent tie-up harbors in Egypt, Syria and Algeria, with a possible missile-base at the latter place just opposite the U.S. Polaris base at Rota, Spain.

Soviet entrance to the Mediterranean is not

restrained on the western end, past Gibraltar. Turkey controls the eastern ingress at the Dardanelles, but the Montreux Convention permits peaceful passage of ships if reported in advance. Turkey has quarreled with Greece, the U.S.A. and Britain over the Cyprus affair, and has become progressively friendly with Russia, despite 13 wars in 200 years with the Bear.

It is not necessary to guess very wildly about Russian capabilities in the Mediterranean. The two Soviet cruisers there during the Six Day War are identified by the Pentagon as OCA-159 (Sverdlov class) and CLG-145 (Kirov class), both heavily armed with six inch guns and guided missiles. The destroyers and submarines are also missile-equipped. There is a sizeable complement of Elints (electronic intelligence trawlers) that watches every American move. Soon to join the amphibious assault vessels are two Russian helicopter-carriers for putting "navy-infantry" (the Russian equivalent of Marines) ashore. Last October, in an ominous exhibit of strike-power, an Egyptian Russian-made warship, with a Russian-trained crew, jumped an Israeli destroyer. The Elint was destroyed in a matter of minutes with Russian-made Styx sea-to-sea missile that works by automatic, unjammable, infrared, homing guidance. It was about the fastest job of destruction in naval history.

As U.S. Navy authorities study the Mediterranean, they see hostile or distrustful countries in an almost unbroken line eastward from Algeria to Turkey. On the northern shore they see the client-nation of Franco Spain, the ex-partner of Gaullist France, an Italy flanked entirely by neutralist or Communist neighbors, a disturbed Greece with land frontiers up against Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Rumania, a changing Turkey that is contiguous to the USSR and Nasserite Syria.

Only the sea-borders of these nations front on Western power, which means the Sixth Fleet. When American ships had the run of the Mediterranean, a comforting blanket of friendship and encouragement covered them all. The 26,000 merchant ships which carry 99 percent of the imports into innumerable ports and inlets were guarded by mighty vessels, by more than 200 carrier-borne warplanes, by underwater arsenals of nuclear deterrence and, above all, by the immeasurable prestige of an invincible custodian.

But today the Mediterranean inhabitant and politician cannot sight a hull and know it almost surely has to be a guardian of peace. The hull might be a merchant-raider, or it might be the transport of some landing party to support a Communist coup.

From the Grosvenor Square headquarters, the pincer prongs say that Soviet power is no longer contained in continental Europe. The only known way to meet Communist penetration on land or sea is by the employment of such manifestly superior force in which allies have complete confidence. Sadly, the U.S. Navy can no longer display near-omnipotence nor offer full security.

The "drawdowns" ordered by Defense Secretary McNamara to reinforce the Seventh Fleet in Asia have enfeebled the European naval forces. True, as McNamara has insisted, the billets are filled with bodies and the inventories show sufficient supplies on hand or on order. But the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, reporting last year, found many deficiencies: "destroyer escorts . . . unable to go to sea . . . shortages of trained and experienced petty officers . . . boatswains mates, electronic technicians, diesel engineers, aviation ordnance men . . . many pilots billets . . . filled by nonpilots."

In both the North Atlantic and Mediterranean, the Russians are approaching naval parity. The deterrence that flows from American superiority, let alone supremacy, is no longer self-evident.

A solution? In layman's language—give the American Navy whatever it needs to do the job.

HOLMES ALEXANDRIA,
Guest Editor.

Vietcong Offensive Has Devastating Effect on the People

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the recent events in Vietnam appeared in the February 12 Newsweek. Everett G. Martin, who has been the bureau chief for Newsweek in Saigon until recently, makes a most sobering statement entitled "The Devastating Effect on the People":

THE DEVASTATING EFFECT ON THE PEOPLE

(By Everett G. Martin)

(In January, after months of indirect harassment, the South Vietnamese Government effectively expelled Newsweek's Saigon bureau chief Everett Martin. Though no formal reason was given for the expulsion, the evident cause for it was official anger at Newsweek articles dealing with corruption and ineptitude in the South Vietnamese Government and Army. Below, Martin, who is now in New York pending reassignment to Hong Kong, reflects on the current Viet Cong offensive in the light of his two years in Vietnam.)

Like most journalists familiar with Vietnam, I have long been unconvinced by the deluge of official optimism on the progress of the war. Yet when the enemy attacked last week, I was utterly taken aback by his daring and tenacity—and, most of all, by his ability to coordinate his assaults with a precision he had never before displayed.

The offensive itself, however, came as no surprise. For more than three months, it has been apparent—or, at least, it has been apparent to newsmen on the scene—that the situation in Vietnam's populated areas was steadily deteriorating. There was, first of all, the fact that all enemy forces from local guerrillas to main-force units were better armed and more aggressive than ever before and that enemy defections to the Saigon government were falling off sharply. Time and again, the enemy demonstrated that he retained complete initiative as he drew U.S. forces off to remote border areas and simultaneously demoralized the populated areas by increasingly violent attacks on provincial cities and villages. With U.S. forces spread ever thinner, it was clear to anyone who traveled the countryside that the main roads were no longer as safe as they had been and that virtually every major city was threatened by encircling guerrillas. In fact, the enemy had even penetrated the most prized example of successful pacification—the area around Qui Nhon.

DOUBTS

Now all the fears evoked by these conditions have become reality—and the effect on the people of South Vietnam can only be devastating. With good reason, rural South Vietnamese have long doubted their government's ability to defend them, but today those in the cities who thought they were immune from the war realize that they, too, are no longer safe. Worse yet, they now have reason to doubt the capability of U.S. power to defend them.

Statements that U.S. military men knew in advance that the enemy would attack, while intended to be reassuring, have in reality exactly the opposite effect. Last year after

Quang Tri was overrun, the people were told the attack had been expected. This only upset them more, and they asked the very practical question: "If you knew, why couldn't you do something about it?"

Furthermore, the statement by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker that last week's attacks will be resented by the Vietnamese population and will hurt the Viet Cong politically is extremely wishful. Things just don't work that way in South Vietnam. The Saigon government has as yet failed to provide the people with any reason to support it, and there is even less likelihood that such support will be forthcoming now. It is far more realistic to expect ordinary Vietnamese to react the same way they did after earlier Viet Cong attacks on the cities: that is, with even greater indifference to the efforts of the government and the U.S. to rally their support. And one can only imagine the reaction of the citizens of the heavily populated cities of Saigon, Cholon, and Hué to being bombarded by their own planes in the desperate effort to kill the guerillas in their midst.

U.S. computers have yet to churn out what the effect of the Viet Cong offensive has been on the pacification program, but before I left Vietnam last month there was already mounting evidence that it was not running on schedule. In fact, a high Vietnamese offi-

cial involved in the program told me flatly that pacification would not work. He may have overdrawn his case, but he said that within two weeks after the so-called Revolutionary Development teams come into a hamlet they are so demoralized by official corruption and obstructionism that they become ineffective.

Making a hamlet secure is often said to be 90 per cent of pacification. If this is true, then last week's events have pushed the program back to its beginnings, for the one cold fact that the guerrillas drove home last week was that no place in South Vietnam is secure.

The U.S. and the South Vietnamese governments must now face the task of putting back together the pieces of a puzzle that the Viet Cong were all too handily able to smash. The first effort in this direction has been the official attempt to convince the world and the Vietnamese people that the enemy paid an intolerably heavy price for his victory. This may prove true, but official estimates of enemy casualties last week should be viewed with the utmost skepticism. Body counts of enemy dead are at best always open to doubt; almost every reporter in Vietnam has his own personal example of inflated reports of enemy dead in battles that he himself has observed. To think that in the midst of last week's chaos and breakdown of communications a

careful tabulation of such an enormous number of bodies was actually made defies logic and contributes further to the credibility gap.

THREATS

Of more importance is the question of what will happen to the fledgling democracy that the U.S. has tried so hard to foster. Given the state of open warfare throughout Vietnam last week, it was, of course, necessary that President Nguyen Van Thieu declare martial law. But in the heat of events, it should not be forgotten that the one thing that might restore the shaken faith of the Vietnamese people would be to see representative government finally begin to function.

It is an open secret in Saigon that many in the military junta would much prefer to go back to their old method of ruling by decree with complete suppression of opposition opinion. The capital in recent weeks has seethed with rumors that some members of the junta might stage a coup to bring back military rule. Now the national emergency has given them what they want for the moment. If any attempt is made to return to military rule as a permanent system of government, then the tragedy that befell the South Vietnamese last week will have reached its fullest proportions.

SENATE—Wednesday, February 14, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

His Beatitude Elisha II, Armenian Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, offered the following prayer:

We come from the holy city of Jerusalem to pray with this august body for armistice and peace in the name of the Prince of Peace and declare unto you, that you, each one of you, your very souls are the essence of our life, the life of Jerusalem, the life of Bethlehem, the life of Nazareth.

We live in you, in each of you; in your pursuit of peace, in your quest of freedom, in your thirst of serenity and love, our life has deeper, truer meaning.

We are bound up inextricably with the soul of all of you and we love you with infinite love; each one of you, each individual soul is a glowing spark of that torch eternal, kindling the light of survival for us within the sacred and hallowed walls of the Holy Sepulcher.

We look to the channel of your being for the pulse of Jerusalem, the heartbeat of Bethlehem; the glory of Christendom's holy shrines.

Vested, as we are, with the Holy Spirit, we ask God's blessing upon you, your blessed country, the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States and all who exercise just and rightful authority. May you continue as the repository of our hope, the citadel of our courage and the anchorage of our resolution.

May you further be endowed with wisdom equal to your strength, and strength equal to your lofty spirit, and courage commensurate with your responsibilities, to the end that your Nation may continue to lead the world in the advancement and fulfillment of the noble goals embodied in your Declaration of Independ-

ence and personified by your emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

O Lord, source of our faith, in Thy name we bless this medal of the Order of the Holy Sepulcher, symbol of resurrection and revival of faith, so that the President, who will receive it at our hand, will continue to lead this Nation in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

Washington, D.C., February 14, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARTKE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1968, and Monday, February 12, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 13, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior

to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 256)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Two weeks ago, on January 18, this agency reported to me, and to the world, that agreement had at last been reached with the Soviet Union on a complete draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty, which has been submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva for consideration by other nations, is the most significant achievement of the Agency since its establishment 7 years ago.

On January 23, I forwarded to the Congress a request that the life of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency be extended for an additional 3 years. At that time I noted the role of the Agency in bringing us close to the final conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, and pointed out that the treaty "is not a creation of the United States. It is not a creation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the creation of all nations, large and small. . . ."

While the United States and the Soviet Union, as Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, have had the responsibility for preparing the draft treaty, a reading of this report will make plain the